

**URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**October 8, 2014 – 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. Vice Chair Jim Coulter and Commissioners Thomas Regan, Lois MacMillan, Loree Arthur, David Kellenbeck, and Dan McVay were present. Commissioner Blair McIntire was absent. Also present and representing the City was Parks & Community Development (PCD) Interim Director Lora Glover and Senior Planner Tom Schauer.

**2. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC: None**

**3. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (public testimony will be taken on all items at the same time)**

**14-40500008.a. – Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

**14-40500008.a.1. – County Coordinated Population Forecast Update**

**14-40500008.a.2. – Population Element 6 Update (Addendum 1)**

**14-40500008.a.3. – Housing Element 9 Update (Addendum 1)**

**14-40500008.a.4. – Economic Element 8 Update (Addendum 1)**

**14-40500008.a.5. – Urbanization Element 14 Update (Addendum 1)**

**14-40500008.a.6. – Amendment to Grants Pass Comprehensive Element 13**

**(Policies): UGB and Urban Reserve Criteria and Procedures; Internal Consistency with Efficiency Measures**

**14-40500008.b. – Development Code Text Amendments and Efficiency Measures**

**14-40500008.c. – Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs)**

**14-40500008.c.1. – Interim IGA for UGB Expansion Areas**

**14-40500008.c.2. – IGA for Urban Reserve Areas**

**14-40400001.a&b. – Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Amendment and Urban Reserve Boundary Designation**

**14-40400001.a. – UGB Amendment**

**14-40100001.b. – Urban Reserve Boundary Designation**

**14-40200003 – Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments**

**14-40200003.a. – UGB Comprehensive Plan Amendments (UGB Expansion Areas)**

**14-40200003.b. – Urban Reserve Land Use Allocations and Map**

**14-40200003.c. – Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendments and Overlay in Current UGB**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, at this time we will open the public hearing of the Urban Area Planning Commission to consider the following files for the Grants Pass urban growth management planning work including the proposed UGB amendment, urban reserve designation, and other related items and amendments. We will begin the hearing with the staff report followed by public comment and then the public comment portion of the hearing will be closed and the items will be discussed and acted upon by the Planning Commission. Tonight we will start by having a three-minute time for you to speak for anyone that wishes to address the Commission on this matter. The Planning Commission is making a recommendation to the City Council and Board of County Commissioners who will make the decisions. We will open the public hearing to take testimony on all of the items at the same time. After the public comment portion of the hearing is closed the Urban Area Planning Commission will deliberate and vote on the recommendations for the proposals. There is no formal Planning Commission recommendation on the proposed intergovernmental agreements but an informal recommendation can be provided to the City Council and Board of County Commissioners if the Planning Commission would like to provide one. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Urban Area Planning Commission to consider this matter? Seeing none, does any commissioner wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest? Seeing none, this is a legislative action not a quasi-judicial so ex parte contact is not applicable. The recommendations must be consistent with the applicable criteria which are noted in the staff report. In this hearing the decision will be based on specific criteria. All testimony and evidence should be directed toward those criteria. In accordance with state law this decision will be submitted to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) in the manner of periodic review. Therefore, the decision is not

appealable to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Instead, persons who participated at the local level orally or in writing during the local process leading to the final decision may object to the City's work task submittal by filing an objection with the DLCD. To be valid objections must: A) be in writing and filed with the DLCD's Salem office no later than 21 days from the date the decision notice was mailed by the City, B) clearly identify an alleged deficiency in the work task sufficiently to identify the relevant section of the final decision and the statute, goal, or administrative rule the task submittal is alleged to have violated, C) suggest specific revisions that would resolve the objections, and D) demonstrate the objecting party participated at the local level orally or in writing during the local process. Failure to raise an issue or objection with enough detail to afford the Planning Commission, City Council, or Board of Commissioners an opportunity to respond to the issue may preclude a valid objection. We will now begin with the staff report.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, thank you Chair, members of the Planning Commission, and citizens. The items this evening, as you noted, are subject to the legislative hearing guidelines of Article 9 of the development code. The Planning Commission will be making a recommendation for final decision by the City Council and Board of Commissioners. The decision will be submitted to DLCD in the manner of periodic review. There are additional exhibits that were received today or since the packet was mailed. On the website all of the materials that had been submitted to us prior to the packet being distributed last week were included in the packet and posted on the website. That has materials received through what we have labeled as Exhibit 5. We have some additional exhibits that were received since then. One of those, Exhibit 6, recommended some additional minor revisions to the proposal. We had listed some of those in Exhibit 4 in your packet. Exhibit 6 includes a few other amendments that I will go through as part of the presentation. We did provide some copies of that Exhibit 6 on the back table next to the informational materials for those who care to see that. The other exhibits we received were submitted by other parties. We have an October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 letter submitted by Josh Lobombard the Southern Oregon Regional Representative from DLCD and he is here this evening. We received an e-mail submitted by Stephen and Cynthia Siler. These are on the dais and I e-mailed these to the commissioners earlier and provided copies as well. On Monday evening the Rural Planning Commission held their hearing to look at the County coordinated population forecast. At that time two letters were submitted pertaining to the work that is before you this evening. I asked for a copy of those so we could be sure those were presented to you as part of the record. One is in October 6<sup>th</sup> letter from Donald and Amy Abernathy and the other

is an October 6<sup>th</sup> letter from Helen and Jay McCall. Those were received earlier. This afternoon we also received a letter dated October 7<sup>th</sup> from Douglas E. Sammis and Christine C. Sammis. I received that and e-mailed that out and there is a copy of that on the dais as well. Just this evening earlier a letter was submitted dated October 8<sup>th</sup> by Gary and Courtney Buckmaster and copies of those were placed on the dais just a few moments ago as well.

There are several different items here in the proposed amendments so they are labeled in groups. Items that start with 14-40500008 Exhibits a1-a6, b, and c1-c2 include text amendments. Exhibits a1-a6 include a1 which is the County coordinated population forecast that the Rural Planning Commission considered on Monday. That is not an item that you'll be making a recommendation on this evening. Exhibit a2 is the update to the population element of the Grants Pass comprehensive plan based on the updated County coordinated forecast. Items a3-a5 are the updates to the housing, economic, and urbanization elements of the comprehensive plan. Item 14-40500008.b is the packaged bundle of development code text amendments. 14-40500008.c is the intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) for the UGB and urban reserve areas. 14-40400001.a&b are the UGB amendment and urban reserve boundary designation. Then, 14-40200003.a-c are the map amendments with a) comprehensive map amendments and designations for the UGB expansion areas, b) the urban reserve and land use allocations and map for urban reserves, and c) the series of comprehensive plan and zoning map amendments for lands for up-zoning within the current UGB. Just to clarify the only items that are subject to zoning map amendments at the time as opposed to comprehensive plan map amendments are those proposed inside the UGB. There is no re-zoning of lands outside the current UGB proposed as part of this this evening.

In order for the criteria to be satisfied there is no recommendation on the County coordinated forecast this evening for the comprehensive plan amendments. Those must be consistent with the provisions of Section 13.54 of the comprehensive plan. The development code amendments must be consistent with section 4.033 of the development code for the zoning map amendments and Section 4.103 of the development code for the text amendments. For the urban growth boundary amendment it must be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 14, Oregon Revised Statute 197.298, Oregon Administrative Rule 660 Division 24 pertaining to urban growth boundaries, and Section 13.6.3 of the comprehensive plan. For the urban reserve boundary designation it must be consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 14, Oregon Revised Statute 195.145, and Oregon Administrative Rule 660 Division 21 dealing with urban reserves.

For the intergovernmental agreements those are a little different than the typical land-use provisions and criteria. The consistency with the criteria is addressed in your staff report in detail. The other provisions that apply, generally to all of these, include the Statewide Planning Goals for citizen involvement and those are addressed in there as well, the other applicable criteria that apply to all of these.

I will summarize what the major categories are. The comprehensive plan amendments are based on the new County coordinated forecast and that was developed starting in 2013. That new forecast, compared to the forecast that is currently adopted and in place, provides for slower growth for Josephine County as a whole for the Grants Pass and Cave Junction urban areas. Therefore it means a smaller urban growth boundary and urban reserve area. The forecast also updates the planning period so we are looking at the UGB through 2033 and the urban reserves for 10 years beyond that so from 2033 to 2043. The purpose of updating the provisions of the comprehensive plan, the population, housing, economic, and urbanization elements are for consistency with the new forecast and planning period. The urbanization element also includes provisions that outline the policies and alternatives that were considered and recommended. The description of each of those is provided in a little more detail in the agenda and in the staff report. Finally, there are the provisions amending Section 13 that deal with comprehensive plan procedures and policies dealing with urban growth boundaries and urban reserves establishing local provisions and looking at general overall consistency with some of the proposed code amendments so everything is internally consistent.

There is a pretty extensive bundle of development code amendments to implement the efficiency measures policies and the urbanization element. Generally, those are intended to allow greater use of properties that are already in the urban growth boundary, to look at land-use patterns for the community as a whole, and to look at how to best meet those needs for the next 20-30 years overall rather than only looking at how those needs could be met in expansion areas on the edges. Generally, those efficiency measures and the provisions that allow greater use of properties make a difference in reducing the size of the overall needed size of the urban growth boundary expansion into rural areas.

The intergovernmental agreements are necessary to specify how the UGB expansion areas will be managed and maintained and how the urban reserve areas will be managed and maintained between the City and County. For the urban growth boundary expansion areas those will retain

County rural zoning for an interim, at least. Therefore we can't apply our current intergovernmental agreement that applies to the current urban growth boundary that applies to properties that already have urban zoning. This will be an interim agreement. Lands in the UGB expansion areas will retain their rural zoning for an interim period while work is done to update the infrastructure and public facility and services plans. Land-use and building codes will continue to be administered by Josephine County during the interim period. There is an information sheet on the back table that identifies the policy discussion that will occur during this interim period, over the next year sometime, to talk about what the alternatives are for rural to urban re-zoning of the UGB expansion areas. Once those infrastructure plans are done alternatives range from re-zoning everything to urban zoning and managing it like the current urban growth boundary all at one time or phasing in that urban zoning gradually over the 20 year period as additional lands are needed. That decision and that policy discussion still need to occur. For the urban reserve areas that intergovernmental agreement provides for management of those. There are some mandatory provisions in state law and some optional provisions as to how those can be managed. Those will retain their rural zoning until they are at some point included in the urban growth boundary. Urban reserve areas are those areas that are planned for where urban growth boundary will expand next as the top priority in the future providing greater certainty about the direction of growth and allowing for the City and County to coordinate on planning for infrastructure for that longer period with some knowledge of where that growth will occur beyond the current urban growth boundary. Again, within this area land use and development codes and building codes will continue to be rural and managed by Josephine County. There will be some additional provisions for coordination with the City based on those updated infrastructure plans and making sure that we do not result in conflicts between rural development and future urbanization. The management agreement also provides some limited options to allow for some clustering development at the same world densities if you have the same density on the overall properties. That is provided in more detail in that agreement.

Getting into the maps and what the needs are the urbanization element walks through what the needs are and the analysis that was done to review different locations and land use needs. The tall column on the left represents the current urban growth boundary with the areas outlined in black identifying the available buildable lands. The areas identified with dashed black lines identify the extent of potential infill and redevelopment. The two smaller boxes on the right at the bottom indicate the size of the urban growth boundary expansion needed relative to the current UGB and the size of the urban reserve areas planned. For the urban growth boundary,

through 2033, 76% of the land need is expected to be man the current urban growth boundary, 62% of that on partially vacant land, and approximately 24% through infill redevelopment so about 24% of the next 20 years need would be met through urban growth boundary expansion. As part of the analysis we looked at the land-use citing criteria and priorities based on considerations of where certain land uses need to locate to be viable. That analysis is provided in the urbanization document. Those areas were evaluated based on those considerations. Part of the efficiencies to look at minimizing the amount of expansion into the rural areas and to look at how to balance land-use considerations for the community as a whole includes the upzoning of some lands inside the urban growth boundary. We had an open house on this on October 2<sup>nd</sup> and we had another open house on September 30<sup>th</sup> to talk more about the UGB expansion areas and have received a number of calls from people with questions about this. For the most part we have had one limited area where there were specific concerns expressed, but for others we have not heard those types of concerns or seen that type of testimony submitted. For the most part due to some specific provisions of state law that deals with transportation planning the re-zones are proposed to be done in two phases. The first phase would be to create what we would call an overlay zone that keeps the current zoning in place of we work on our transportation master plan update and the overlay zoning would be available. If someone chose to develop under the new zoning they would need to do a little more type of the transportation analysis that you would typically have if you were re-zoning property. Once our transportation plan has been completed and updated the new zoning would apply and the old zoning would go away. The requirements for the new zones would be the same as any other zoning district where if you had to do traffic analysis for a bigger development it would be subject to opening day type of traffic analysis for when the development is completed rather than a 20 year look like you would have if you were re-zoning property. It is a phased approach to re-zone where the current zoning would remain still in effect for roughly the 18 months or so that we would expect to need to update the transportation plan but the property owners would also have that opportunity to use it in accordance with the new zoning if they were willing to do the additional type of traffic analysis. I should note in all of these and I'll note on my conclusions the items here in the draft proposal were the work that occurred roughly from the beginning of 2013. We went through hearings on an earlier proposal based on the old population forecast. We had hearings in 2012 on that and a decision was not reached at that time. When we started over in 2013 we received direction on various steps from the City Council and Board of Commissioners on how to move forward. We went through series of steps that were foundational to get direction on how to move to each next step and these items reflect the

direction that they provided through a series of resolutions. The proposed map reflects the County and City resolutions for the urban growth boundary noted in blue and for the urban reserves noted in green. The land-use allocations as described through that analysis process are noted for different residential, commercial, and employment types. The urban reserve areas comprehensive plan map designations will not be property specific like we would have for the urban growth boundary but we need to look at general land-use allocations to those areas to facilitate infrastructure planning and to look at the lands that would be needed in different areas as the urban growth boundary extends into the reserves. The lands won't come into the urban growth boundary from the urban reserves until there is a process done in the future just like what we are doing now where we have pre-identified the general locations where the urban growth boundary would grow as top priority into the urban reserves. There would still need to be a needs analysis done to determine whether there is an adequate land supply in the urban growth boundary so we do not wait until the end of the 20 year period to reevaluate the urban growth boundary. The current boundary is expected to meet needs for the next 20 years and then the reserves are expected to meet needs for 10 years after that. If growth is faster or slower than our forecast then that may affect the timing that is needed and how soon some of those lands may need to be brought in from the urban reserves to the urban growth boundary. If the City opts to evaluate how effective the efficiency measures are or chooses to do other types of efficiency measures in the future then those have the potential to influence the timing for expansion into urban reserve areas. The current urban growth boundary could last longer and mean that those urban reserve lands could meet need for a longer period.

Based on the direction provided in the City Council and County Commission resolutions for their draft proposal, staff is recommending approval of the proposal with additional revisions noted in Exhibit 4, which is attached in your packet, and Exhibit 6 and I'll summarize what those are. I do have graphics for the map amendments that are noted. The first one is a minor change to the urban growth boundary/urban reserve allocation. It doesn't change the outer boundary but it changes a couple properties that are split by the current urban growth boundary. The rest of the property that is outside the urban growth boundary was originally proposed in an area that is part of urban reserves and rather than keep those split that way this would move the balance of those into the urban growth boundary. There is another map amendment that would change the proposed plan designation and then there are few areas where for the re-zones of lands inside the current UGB we are proposing a GC-1 designation rather than a GC-2. That would apply the current general commercial zone that exists today rather than that GC-2 zone that we talked

about in the workshop that is a new zoning district. Exhibit 6 has some information and minor revisions to provisions pertaining to accessory dwelling units. Currently those would have a limit of 800 square feet as proposed and this would change that to 1000 square feet that corresponds to the size of accessory structures that are allowed under the development code and provisions that require owner occupancy of the main home would be removed. There are some provisions with the new R3-2, R4-2, and GC-2 zones that would be revised to allow easier transition for properties where there are existing lots of record or land-use approvals. Finally, in response to comments that were in the letter from DLCD, there have been some changes since the previous economic element was adopted where Grants Pass is now part of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and we need to adopt some additional findings since some additional administrative rules apply to how we deal with short-term supply of employment lands. Exhibit 6 recommends additional findings regarding that issue. We have done work to that effect so we do not believe there will be significant issues with that. The recommendation is consistent with the direction provided by Council Resolution 14.6198 and County Commissioners Resolution 2014.021 for their draft proposals we recommend approval of that subject to the minor amendments noted in Exhibits 4 and 6.

I will go through these maps with you to show you the changes. In the one on the left the gray area is the current urban growth boundary, the green is the proposed urban reserve, and so the balance of these lots outlined in blue would be change from proposed urban reserve to proposed urban growth boundary. This is in the southeast area. Up north near the north interchange we have a few lots that are currently split by the urban growth boundary and proposed UGB expansion area. Some adjacent lots there do not have frontage so the proposal there would be to leave the boundary as it is but to change the proposed plan designation to LR-low density residential. This map reflects the proposals that would change instead of applying GC-2 zoning would apply GC-1 zoning to properties that are pretty well established in terms of a use and development pattern. Some of the other earlier amendments I noted in Exhibit 6 would also ease the transition even without this change in the map amendment. That will conclude my presentation. If you have any questions for me I would be happy to answer those or if you want to move into public testimony I would be happy to answer any questions. Otherwise we will go into public testimony and after that close the hearing for Planning Commission deliberation.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, do any commissioners have any questions? We will now turn it over to public input. You will have three minutes. There will be a green light on the podium when the green light is on your three minutes will start. When you see the yellow light you will have 30 seconds left. When the red light is on we will hope you will be gracious enough to be quiet and sit down. You can talk on any of the matters that were brought up in the staff report. They do not need to be sequential. You can talk about all of them or none of them or some of them. We will require that you speak into the mic and give your name and address clearly for the record please. This is your opportunity so who would like to go first?

Ms. Smith stated, my name is Louise Smith. My husband Joe and I live at the college mobile home park at 1950 Demaray space #6. This was supposed to be our retirement home. We did not plan on ever moving again. We put all of our resources into this place and adapted it for us. My husband is handicapped. We had ramps built and we did not think that we would ever have to move again. I would like to know if you do decide to take the property, how much time we have and if we have any kind of reimbursement. Since we are low income seniors I'd like to know if you are going to give us any help. Is there is going to be anything for low income people?

Chair Fitzgerald asked, did you say "take" the property ma'am? There is nothing about taking.

Ms. Smith stated, well I am talking about if we have to move. We do not have a choice, do we?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this is just about urban growth boundary expansion and urban reserve. It is not about taking anyone's property ma'am.

Ms. Smith stated, when we went to a meeting in 2013 we were told that where we are is going to be a shopping center. Has that changed?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, the City does not own any shopping centers so that is not possible. There is no taking involved in this and this has nothing to do with eminent domain or anything like that ma'am.

Ms. Smith stated, I guess I am confused because I thought that you were going to be changing everything and that our mobile home park would no longer be there.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, no ma'am and if you are in a mobile home park state law controls that and it used to be that there was about a year notice given before that could be converted anyway. There is no taking involved. If the person who owns the mobile home park wishes to convert it and develop it into something else that would be their choice. It will not be the City's choice nor the BCC's choice.

Ms. Smith asked, so we should have no concerns about this?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, not as far as your word "taking" ma'am. No, this isn't about taking.

Ms. Smith stated, I used the wrong term. I just want to know if we can feel secure where we are. I know you say it is the owner's decision but is the City or the County going to make him an offer?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, no ma'am. It is nothing about taking land or buying land or anything to do with that at all. This is just about the expansion for the urban growth boundary. We want to make sure you are okay with this. It does not have anything to do with taking of land.

Ms. Smith stated, I guess I have just totally misunderstood this whole thing.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, I am sure if you would leave your name and address and phone number City staff could explain that for you in detail so that you will have assurance that they are not taking anything from you. I am sorry you had that feeling ma'am.

Mr. Johnson stated, my name is Mark Johnson at 933 SW Princeton Circle. I would like to also submit testimony from Bob and Kay Watts and Shirley Liska. I live over in Princeton Circle in Maurer Meadows. I am concerned about the new G-2. Tom I discussed this last week. The lots that you guys are looking to change over at addresses 897 W. Harbeck, 869 W. Harbeck, 893 W. Harbeck, and there are three other lots over there those are all currently zoned R1-8. We bought our lot back in 2007 with the understanding that those were going to be R1-8 lots. We built our house in accordance with that R1-8 lot. You guys are look into switching that over to GC-2 which would completely downgrade our neighborhood where we have the opportunity of looking into a multi-unit or townhome or the Women's Health Center with the three stories. It

would be a surprise. These changes would lower the value of our homes and change the character of the neighborhood. If we were to move into there not knowing it was going to be a GC-2 we would have never built that type of style of home there. When Maurer Meadow subdivision created their CC&Rs they had many restrictions in there in order to build and maintain the integrity of the neighborhood. (Inaudible) the developers, in order to keep the pre-existing property owners happy on our current neighboring properties, were chosen not to do two-story homes. Their CC&Rs were (inaudible) to keep the neighborhood and maintain that. We oppose the idea of you guys changing the zoning property. If you were to change that from the R1-8 with the impact that it would have there I do not think the need for GC-2 and the offset to gain the R1-8 the neighborhood around there is full neighborhoods. I will hand in these where you can take a look at the neighborhoods there. I just think it would be a travesty for you to come in and devaluate our home within a few years of changing the zoning. On the other side of it, Williams Highway and West Harbeck, that interchange, if any of you have been out there, is not conducive to add larger amount of home properties over there. That misalignment, the cost to develop that, the current right now the people wanted to do the R1-8 and change it would be reasonable. If they're forced to do something with the GC-2 it would be highly ineffective for them to do that with the amount of traffic change they'd have to do there with the traffic light as well as the changing of Williams Highway in the West Harbeck area.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you. If you wish to submit anything to the record staff will take it for you and make sure it is entered.

Mr. Johnson stated, I am submitting this CC&Rs and the lot map with those there.

Mr. Briseno stated, my name is Robert Briseno and I live at 505 Woodson Drive in Grants Pass. I am in favor of the zone changes. I think the thing we need to look at is this is essentially a 30 year plan. It is easy for us to get involved in what our needs are at this moment, but as I look at this room, myself included, in 30 years most of us will not be here. In 30 years most of us that are will most likely not be in our own homes. I think we need to look ahead and see a community that our kids and our grandkids are going to look at and see that these needs that are being proposed here are not just folly, these are based on historical patterns of growth. I think they have done a good job in the past. We have a hospital where it should be. We have Fred Meyer and Wal-Mart where it should be. We have Albertsons where it should be. It takes pressure out of the central part of our town and allows people to continue to enjoy commercial

benefits and housing choices. My view of this is I have to look beyond my immediate needs and realize this is for the future. I understand what this gentleman is saying, but I think that the people who live up behind Albertsons do not feel they are living in the ghetto. They have nice homes up there and are co-existing as well as the people who are co-existing around Fred Meyer and Wal-Mart. We can co-exist. Our dream and vision don't always remain consistent over the 20-30 years that we are homeowners. The future is not for us it is for our children and our grandchildren. That is all I have to say, thank you.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you.

Ms. Watts stated, my name is Kay Watts and I was one of the developers of Maurer Meadows. My husband is a contractor and we have been contracting and developing in the Grants Pass area for nearly 40 years. I am pro-development, but in this particular case and especially on this particular one we're talking about I am against the ability to put in apartments in this particular spot because of the impact on the streets, the surrounding area, and the value of the land. I did submit a letter, you already have it, but I wanted to speak too. I own property there, my children live there, we did build this with a lot of thought into the future, the value of lands, the rising value of lands, and what would be best for everyone. We did have two-story houses in mind and declined to put them in this neighborhood simply because people wanted their privacy. To turn around and put two-story apartments in the backyards of these people who we sold these houses to would be a disservice. I don't mind the development, I don't mind the commercial, I don't mind adding houses, but to turn around and put two-story and to be able to allow that in this particular area or to put dense housing such as apartments in this particular area, no, I'm not for. I'm opposed to it and I think it is bad planning in this particular spot.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you ma'am.

Mr. Painter stated, my name is Jerry Painter and I'm at 2500 Wolf Lane. Our property is on Wolf Lane which is off of the highway there. That whole area, it is not on the map, of Wolf Lane is completely rural. We have animals, most people there have animals, and agriculture. On the other side is a bunch of apartments, dense housing, so you are talking about a dramatic change from an area that is all completely rural to open it up on this side. It has never been done on that side. Further down there is Albertsons but that is almost city. The traffic, as most of you probably know, on highway is pretty bad so more dense housing, if that is what it turns out to

be, would not be a good thing. One of my big concerns is, myself and my neighbors have talked about it, it is rather sudden. We just found out about it this and it is kind of hard to plan ahead for something that is going to take place in two years. I think a 10 or 20 year planning would be much more purport so that everybody knows that this will happen in the far future and can plan effectively. One of the neighbors just did a remodeling job and put a lot of money into it and are going to be under pressure to have multi-housing. Once one comes into the area it is going to be dramatically changed. One person sells and starts putting multi-units in there it is obviously going to change the whole thing completely. For lack of a better term once one starts it will just go on from there like a snowball. If you look at that on the other side going down Redwood Avenue that seems more appropriate because there is a lot of growth and continued growth that is going there. I do feel like if they ever do bring in that fourth bridge, which is supposed to go over there, that would probably help the traffic situation and it may not be such a serious situation, at least in terms of traffic, because it is such a bottle-neck getting over the river and coming down there and so that is only going to exacerbate it. I would ask that you would put this off a few more years unless it is absolutely necessary, which it does not seem to be to me, because it is dramatically changing the whole character of all that area, which is extremely rural. If you ever go there it is all animals and agriculture.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you sir.

Mr. Orvin stated, my name is Chad Orvin at 2381 Williams Highway. I had two questions. One was if my property was identified as one that you are re-zoning from R1-8 to R4-2 if I want to do any additional buildings on my property am I going to be prevented from doing that? For example, a shop or something in the next five years?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, I think that is a very specific question, sir, and I think that it would be best answered by staff rather than perhaps this forum. It is certainly on the record now that you have made that inquiry.

Mr. Orvin stated, as far as planning for ourselves down the road. I heard a lot of people mention if you want to live in a spot and you redevelop/re-zone it that could change what you are allowed to do, correct?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, if something is re-zoned and it is of a different zoning then the application would be different, yes. But from this particular position I cannot answer that question for you. It would be better answered by staff because then they could know your particular property and its zoning and its application as it would be rather than me just giving you an answer from here which would probably be incorrect.

Mr. Orvin stated, that is fine.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, I am sorry. I wish I could give you a real clear answer on that.

Mr. Orvin stated, the other question I have is I am kind of in favor of some of the development and re-zoning so I do not want to seem like I am not. Some concerns people have had here are the traffic flows, which I can understand on Williams Highway and some other places. Do you think a traffic study being completed before you re-zone would be a better use than after the fact?

Chair Fitzgerald asked, I am supposing that is a rhetorical question?

Mr. Orvin stated, it kind of is. But if you are going to re-zone stuff and look at Williams Highway and the high density and the commercial stuff that they are speaking of, wouldn't you want to study the traffic first?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, of course there is a great deal of traffic impact analysis that has been done in the areas with ODOT and –

Mr. Orvin asked, have you also contacted District 7 Schools to see if the school could handle that kind of density there?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, yes, throughout the whole process of the urban growth boundary expansion I can assure you that those entities and agencies were part of the process. It was a six and a half year deal that got us close to this.

Mr. Orvin stated, I just wanted to make sure that all those bases were covered, thank you.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, you are welcome sir, thank you.

Ms. Torro stated, good evening my name is Ida Torro address 498 Parkhill Place. My concern is I have just acquired that property two years ago and I was under the impression that it would remain rural. It is a five acre parcel and my neighbors do not have that same amount of acreage around them. I am the only one in that area that has that much acreage. I was planning on perhaps getting some livestock and doing more farming because that is what I love. My concern is if I become within that boundary am I going to be restricted to some of those plans I had in the future?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we will answer that for you ma'am but because as I said earlier specific questions I am hesitant for this body to make some kind of response to you because it may be incorrect. Now that it is on the record it is better to have that from the staff exactly as it would be applicable to your particular property. They could tell you that and then all your questions would be answered. If you would, one-on-one with Mr. Schauer or Ms. Glover as the interim head of that department, would be very appropriate.

Ms. Torro stated, very good, thank you.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you for participating ma'am.

Ms. Clybie stated, my name is Karen Clybie and I live at 2157 Williams Highway. Since you put our driveway into the city the County Sheriff will no longer traverse it to assist us and the City Police decline to traverse it to assist us and I wondered if this current change would mean that we would get any kind of police or sheriff protection.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, that would be something that is specific again. Mr. Schauer would –

Ms. Clybie asked, so you don't address policing bodies?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this is to air those things and to be on the record and public so everyone has a chance to speak and have their say about this. We really cannot give you direct answers on an individual basis because we really do not have that prerogative, ma'am. However it is our job to try to get you an answer and –

Ms. Clybie stated, that is okay I have been to the police and the Sheriff over and over.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we can get an answer from Chief Landis from Public Safety and we can also get an answer from Sheriff Gilbertson and find out for you ma'am. If you give a specific request on that information I assure you the City staff and/or the Sheriff's department will get you an answer.

Ms. Clybie stated, they have both told me the answer, but I just wondered if things would change with this particular change. That is okay, thank you.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, you are welcome ma'am I am sorry I could not answer direct.

Ms. Rodgers stated, my name is Meadow Rodgers at 3921 Highland Avenue. I do have a specific question that I will save for after the meeting. I do want to voice a concern and have it on record that one of the areas that is being included in this urban growth boundary. Along Highland Avenue there is the freeway and there is a lot of commercial property out there. My business property is on the opposite side. There is the freeway, Highland Avenue, and my property is on the other side away from the freeway. The UGB comes right along, jogs, includes my business property, and then heads back along Highland and includes only the properties between the freeway and Highland Avenue. I do want to voice my concern that a very highly commercialized property is being included in the urban growth boundary, this is a warehouse property, mine plus Ausland Construction, it is a construction facility next to my office. These are commercial buildings, commercial property, I do not foresee why it would be useful as an urban growth property. I do want to voice my concern that it is being included, just that one little jog literally including mine and the property next to me, in the urban growth boundary when they are very clearly obviously properties. As I said before I do have specific questions that I will address after the meeting but I do want it on the record that –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, if you want it on the record ma'am it needs to be done here.

Ms. Rodgers stated, I want to know how that will affect my business property. Is this going to include me as part of the city and cause me to have to pay city taxes? Is this going to cause me

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you very much I appreciate that ma'am.

Ms. Turner stated, my name is Diana Turner I live at 897 West Harbeck Road. My home falls into the proposed zoning for commercial and I oppose it. The traffic, I do not want large buildings that are two-story, privacy. We bought in that area because it was originally county, we have been zoned into the city, and we have been through a lot of changes. I oppose it going commercial. I just wanted to say that for the record.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you ma'am for participating.

Ms. Buckmaster stated, my name is Courtney Buckmaster and I live at 3253 South River Road. This might be redundant because I already submitted this in written form. We attended the informal open house on Tuesday, September 30<sup>th</sup> to review your proposal for the urban growth plan. Both my husband and I would like to thank you all for excluding our farm properties from the growth plan. However, we were shocked and dismayed to realize that you are considering incorporation of the acreage bordering our farm into the UGB. These properties 3130 Leonard Road and 3322 Leonard Road, there are two tax parcels there but only one address, have been farmed continually for at least the past 90 years, 90 years that we have personal record of. They are in the green belt and border our property that we live in farm on and were all part of the original land lot. The soil quality for these parcels is equal to the soil types and quality of the exclusive farm zoning directly cross the river from us that is excluded from any urban growth development, that would be on Upper and Lower River Roads. The only difference is the lot size therefore our properties aren't excluded. The other problem with this re-zoning is it leaves no buffer for our farm. As some of you know that is almost critical. I feel it is critical because our farming operation includes raising livestock as well as crops and right now if you were a neighbor of ours you would not like us very well because we are weaning calves. When you do that you separate the calves from the mother cows and they do not like it so they are going to protest. As you can only imagine it gets quite noisy. We feel like if we do not have a buffer zone with this type of operation, which has been established for so many years, that it is going to create conflict and we do not want to create conflict but that is in our concern. We raise all types of livestock as well as crops. The Leonard Road properties as well as our own have been part of the migratory pathway for geese. Thousands of geese land there morning and night throughout the year. The other concern is the maximum capacity of the Redwood Sewer

District and of the schools and of the traffic in the area that has always been horrendous. To close up, it is tragic to us and to all the people that walk around and enjoy our area. It is tragic that we are one of the last remaining true green zones, open zones, and that developing this property, cutting are open areas even smaller, is not just a problem for us in this generation but the following generations. Some of these kids have never seen animals before that go to the Redwood School right across the street and there is not replacing it. Thank you for your time.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you for participating.

Mr. Baker stated, my name is Kevin Baker, 893 West Harbeck, one of the properties directly subjected to the proposals. It is an acre plus flag lot off of Harbeck Road right behind Mr. and Mrs. Turner. Large lot, towards Williams Highway, along next to ours, open lot, behind the homes, off of Williams Highway, there is no buffer, there is no trees, there is no anything, it is wide open. Any proposed properties in a commercial zone that would be put on that corner lot behind the current corner home would be wide open across everybody's property, for anybody to see. It would be an eyesore literally right in the backyard of my home. I grew up in a place where it was wall-to-wall homes and when we came here and purchased the lot that we did it was the because of the size of the property. The homes farther down, the Maurer Meadows complex, was put down the side of our property. We are the last property before the housing tract. I have a young son, I have dogs, we like to play out there in the field, and I like my space. I really do not want to see the corner lot turned into some high-rise medical building that when I am out in my backyard I have to look up and see a couple of blocks down. I would prefer that stay residential zoning like it currently is and not be commercial. I am just not really interested in seeing that happen. Thank you.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, thank you sir. Would anybody else like to speak? Seeing none, we will close the public portion. Mr. Schauer maybe you could sum up some of the questions that came up before we deliberate?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, sounds like a good idea. I have been making notes of some of the questions here. Some of those that are property specific Lora has your contact information and we will stay after the meeting too to see if we can answer those questions about specific zoning and uses and what can continue.

I will try to answer the more general ones. I think the first major question was a question about taking property. This is about planning for future growth and land-use regulations and how people can develop their property. It is not about the City acquiring properties and building anything on them. That is not part of the proposal. If there is a change of zoning or the property comes into the urban growth boundary as planned and zoned for future urban development if those are already developed and you're continuing on the property as you always have you are grandfathered unless you do something new with the property that would require you to comply with those requirements. Take the example of the mobile home park. If that stayed and operated the way it is today then even if they came into the urban growth boundary or even into the city at some point then that property can continue as it is today. Outside of the current urban growth boundary, at this time, there are no plans to re-zone properties currently. If you are in the UGB expansion areas I would encourage you to pick up one of the handouts at the back of the room that has the heading that says Future Action Item. It is basically a discussion about rural to urban re-zoning of the UGB expansion areas. That will be a discussion that is coming up sometime this year. Again, the options range from looking at putting urban zoning in place to leaving some of those or many of those rural until somebody comes in and there is a need to convert those to urban zoning. Again, grandfathering provisions remain in place and you can continue to use those properties as you have before.

As far as agricultural use I would like to look at the specific property on Parkhill. If that is urban reserve land then those properties will retain their current rural residential zoning and can continue to be used in accordance with those. If it is in the urban reserve those will still be managed by Josephine County and you can do what you did before until those come into the urban growth boundary. Once they are in the urban growth boundary there will be the same types of issues that I just mentioned. They may be re-zoned to urban zoning in the near term or they may remain, depending on the direction Council looks at, maybe they won't change those from rural zoning to urban zoning until you came in and said I have my three acres and I would like to develop it in accordance with the urban zoning. If you already have an Ag operation on property and you are continuing that those, again, are grandfathered and can continue. I can answer any more specific questions about that a little bit later.

From a Public Safety standpoint the City only provides public safety service in two situations: 1) to properties that are inside the City of Grants Pass, and 2) to properties that are developing currently in the urban growth boundary if they subdivide or do a major development before they

are in the city then they would need to sign what is called a service and annexation agreement and at that time they would start paying a fee equal to city tax rate and we would begin providing public safety service to those properties. That is dependent on whether you are in the city or whether you take some action on your property that would basically take advantage of city services and connect to city services.

To clarify, again, this is not annexation. It might be a little bit confusing that we are having some of the conversations about the urban growth boundary and the urban reserve at the same time we have an annexation that pertains to different lands. In some cases they may have received notice about some of this. There is an annexation proposal on the November 4<sup>th</sup> ballot. If you are not in the city if you are not subject one of those annexation agreements you are not paying city taxes. The re-zoning does not change your taxes and coming into the urban growth boundary does not change your taxes. Typically properties in the urban growth boundary are eligible for future annexation into the city. The City is typically only looking at annexations in areas as new urban developments occurring in those areas. Annexation tends to follow development where it is occurring.

As far as some of the questions about the re-zones and what will be allowed to continue or putting things like accessory dwellings or new shops on the property. Those types of things typically if they are accessory to a permitted use those can occur. As far as any specific changes in what uses are or are not allowed we would be happy to look at that with anyone who has questions on that. Again, I mentioned the way the zoning is being phased in. Should there be some changes from residential to commercial where some of the residential it would be a different set of permitted uses. In the interim period the current zoning would still be in effect so you could always do any of the things that are permitted by the current zoning during the interim period.

That is a lot of substance to cover in a short time but I know that went through a lot of those a big questions pretty quickly and I would be happy to talk with anyone individually. I have had a number of calls and talked to a number people at the open houses we had. I would be happy to do more of that and talk to you one-on-one to let you know what the implications are. I wanted to make sure that if you had questions or potential concerns about how those might affect you that those are on the record for consideration by the Planning Commission and their recommendations that will forward. Thank you and I will be here after the hearing.

Chair MacMillan asked, when you talk about an interim period of time is that specified?

Senior Planner Schauer asked, for the zoning? There are two items. One is when I am talking about the re-zoning of lands inside the current urban growth boundary. Once we have the master transportation plan updated during that period the current zoning will be in place and the opportunity to do the things under the new zoning would also be there subject to the extra traffic analysis if someone wanted to pursue that individually. Once that work is done then the new zoning would apply. Best guess is 18 months to get through that transportation plan process and it could be a little sooner or a little longer. The other half of the interim is the interim provisions in terms of the urban growth boundary expansion areas during which they will retain their rural zoning. At a minimum we need to get the transportation plan, the infrastructure plans, completed before the zoning could be applied so about that same time frame. Again, the policy options could be once those are done re-zoning everything to the urban zoning in the urban growth boundary expansion areas, not the urban reserves, or leaving the rural zoning in place in some or all of those areas for an indefinite period.

Commissioner Kellenbeck asked, could you explain a little better about the traffic and the traffic plan and why it is not being done now or done before we went into this process?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, as we went through the alternatives review starting back and we looked at a wide range of areas and narrowed down from every conceivable growth direction a lot of the analysis that was done and it went into hearings in 2012 and that same analysis was applicable for the work that came forward from 2013 even though it was dealing with smaller areas. As part of that we did do infrastructure analysis. We looked at major issues about what some of the service issues would be and what the comparative costs might be comparing one area to another but we cannot do the detailed modeling until we actually have the land-use in place. We looked at those and compared how one area was better than another in terms of those impacts. When it comes down to actually looking at developing a plan that has specific capital projects just like anything else there is more than one way to address those two so we have to have the land-use to plug into the model and look at what the demand on the systems are and then develop those alternatives based on the land-use alternatives. Under state law usually what happens if you are looking at changing your comprehensive land map or zoning map is you have to do traffic analysis that looks at a 20 year period. If there aren't provisions in

your transportation plan to take care that then an applicant may have to do extra mitigation. Typically if someone is coming in and they already have their zoning in place then they just have to do the analysis that says here is what the impacts will be when I open the doors or when the lots are developed in my subdivision. With state law we have to be able to get through that first step of being able to model things before we apply the zoning and basically zoning is what gives people the development right to start building under the new zoning. State law says for UGB expansion areas we can adopt the comprehensive plan provisions and then once we have our transportation system plan updated at that point we could re-zone the property but we cannot just re-zone everything before the transportation system plan is updated. We do it in the two-steps. We manage our urban growth boundary one way and some communities do it another way. At the earliest for those UGB expansion areas we could re-zone everything once the transportation plan was updated but we are not required to so we could phase that in over a longer time. If somebody had a farm operation they wanted to continue and might want to expand beyond what would be allowed in grandfathering then in that case if there is no urgency or immediate need for development then maybe those lands could remain zoned rural for some indefinite period until there was that demand. There are pros and cons to both approaches. For the areas inside the urban growth boundary that we are looking at the rezones on we would have to work the same way a property owner would. We cannot just re-zone those without having our transportation plan done. That is why we are phasing the approach. We are leaving the current zoning in place and while we do the modeling and the projects that are necessary if someone came in and wanted to take advantage of that zoning earlier they would essentially have to do the same kind of traffic analysis that is required for re-zone but they would not have to look at all those other issues that go along with the re-zone. Once the transportation plan is done we will have looked at the system-wide impacts and they would only have to look at the kind of things that a transportation plan does not look at (inaudible) as much detail in terms of what they would have to do on the day their business or subdivision opened. That is why it is staged the way it is.

Commissioner McVay asked, I believe Mrs. Buckmaster brought up buffer zones for farming and why isn't there a plan for that? Are you planning in the future to have buffer zones?

Senior Planner Schauer asked, why isn't there a buffer? Well, in the overall areas that we are looking at under state law we are required and there is a priority scheme for which lands you need to consider for inclusion in the urban growth boundary first and then second, third, and

fourth. In Josephine County we really only have two of those four categories. One of them is urban reserves which we do not have today and the others are what state law calls exception lands and that is anything that is not zoned farm or forest. We do not have marginal lands so then the next thing we look at is resource lands that are zoned for farm or forest. Out in the Redwood area south of the river everything that we looked at is zoned rural residential. The only property that has been considered at any point since probably the very first round of looking at everything that has any resource zoning either farm or forest is on the east side next to Spalding Industrial Park. When we look at those areas and when we look at any area basically the only options we have that we are looking at are rural residential land, rural commercial land, and rural industrial land. Everything out in the Redwood area that we are looking at has rural residential zoning. Even though it is being farmed it is not zoned exclusive farm use. Most of the exclusive farm use is the land north of the river and if you go farther north of that it also has rural residential zoning. Right now the balance and the questions are most of the land up in that area has RR-1 zoning which used to be a one acre minimum lot size. There is sewer out in that area. When you get to the south and I think they are immediately adjacent to the RR-1 zoning there is some property that is zoned RR-5 that does not have sewer. When we look at what is contiguous we are looking at properties that are basically right by the urban growth boundary, where the Redwood school is, where the public safety station is, and originally we had looked at that area as urban reserve. The two property owners there said they were interested in having those lands inside the urban growth boundary rather than the reserve and the Council and board were asking that we try to accommodate property owner requests within those broad parameters. In that area those properties that are adjacent there were included in the urban growth boundary rather than the reserve. There are no specific buffering provisions in terms of either on the urban growth lands or the rural lands that require setback for rural residential. When you get into EFU land that is maybe a little bit different but we do not have anything proposed for buffering for rural residential land.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, [off mic] (inaudible).

Chair Fitzgerald asked, are there any other questions for Tom on this? Seeing none we will turn it over to the Commission to deliberate. I already closed it Lois.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I think as we get into this and we deliberate a little bit the urban reserve is a new dog in the fight if you will for lack of a better term. I think it deserves a little

chewing on. As I look at it and I look at planning you have a bell curve and on one end it is flat and there is no planning. On the other hand there is infinite planning which is bad. They are both equally bad or you go into infinity with planning. Both are equally bad. Where is the optimal curve? Is it 20 years? Is it 30, 40, or 50 for Grants Pass? This curve went all the way to another. We could have went 10 to 30 years with the urban reserve and the decision was 10. My point is when we're doing this and we are looking at planning it is not perfect. It is not a perfect science. That is why they call it planning. As we look at the urban reserve and I know when the OEA came in and said the forecast is now completely different the recession and everything has brought down what we think the projected growth is going to be that changed things and that changed significantly the size of our UGB. A question you could ask is if we just had a UGB before at 20 years why have an urban reserve? I think that is a fair question. Doesn't mean we shouldn't doesn't mean we should at this point. The urban reserve - a question that could be asked is does some of these properties that would have been in the UGB that are now in the urban reserve are they open to no man's land? Are there going to be conflicts or situations where people cannot sell because it is not UGB. It is almost there but it is not there. You can say it will be, but no, as the one gentleman said, we're all going to be gone in 30 to 40 years and that planning can be good but it doesn't have, as I see the urban reserve, the same teeth. Even though they are similar they're way different in ways than the urban growth boundary. As we kick this around I think the urban reserve has worthiness because what I want is, you know, what is best for our city in terms of long-term planning. What is best for our citizens in regard to that for the Josephine County citizens and those of Grants Pass. Our recommendation that we make to the City Council I want to make sure that even if we chew on it they see what we're chewing on, they even see what I'm saying right now, and they consider that in their deliberation. We need to give them the very best possible recommendation we can. I am not trying to preach to you guys because you know that. I want to bring that up as we get into our debate. I do have some concerns about the urban reserve. At this point I am not for or against it. I'm still on the fence. I do have some concerns and I would like to know what you guys think. What do you think about my concerns?

Commissioner Arthur stated, I would like to comment about the period we spent discussing how far out to even consider going seven years ago when we started this project. One of the things we ran to were many places where, while we had our urban growth boundary from 30 years ago 1983, that the County in the meantime allowed development up against our borders that prevented us from having really good buildable lands to expand into. They did not have the

infrastructure roads and so on that were suitable. Part of wanting to have an urban reserve is to prevent that from happening again so when the time comes another 20 or 30 years down the road that there actually is someplace left that has not been already carved up and constructed and needs to be redone.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, so in your mind the reserve does that?

Commissioner Arthur stated, yes.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, can I ask you how?

Commissioner Arthur asked, how?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, because the urban reserve is allowed to be developed under the County zoning, the way it is, and the County jurisdiction so it can continue. If it is RR-5 and they want to do a five acre parcel subdivision they can and it will be under the (inaudible) it is not going to be curb, gutters, sidewalks, landscape strips, and trees –

Commissioner Arthur stated, but I do not think we have the new IGA yet.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, it is not going to change. It is going to be allowed and the reserve will be developed under the County zoning. That is exactly what we have. The only thing we are changing in the reserve effectively is we are letting those people know that they are next on the list. It does not prevent anything. It does not cure what we really were talking about all those years in the nineties about if a person had a large parcel and they want to have five acre parcels in there it was put in with septic and wells. That is still going to be the case. I guess for me what we were looking for is not answered in the reserve. It is not answered at all in the reserve in my mind.

Commissioner Arthur stated, except for people –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, to the people it lets them know they are next on the list but it does not prevent any of the mishaps that we were talking about that caused –

Commissioner Arthur stated, all year long we get people coming in and saying we bought out here expecting we would be out in the county forever. This says no you will not be.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, but it does not do what you brought up which is the fact you have County allowing development right up against the urban growth boundary which it will again. It will not prevent that.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, if you are outside the UGB and the County allows somebody to just put in a subdivision because it is a rural designation, in the property we were just talking about, the Buckmaster property, within walking distance there are many houses and within walking distance of their property there is the school. When I taught at Redwood I could see the property right out the window. It is a rural designation. Right now it is not a farm designation. That has to be clear. If the person next to them decides to build what they want to build they can do that under the present situation. I just want that to be said.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, that will not change.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, that will not change. I guess I am coming from Idaho. This plan has been put together for six and a half years. There have been so many people and players at the table. You guys were on the committee that was all-inclusive that everybody talked about every part of the city and every little piece. We have been seeing this for six years. This is not just presented at the last minute. I just want to be very clear there. There is no public taking. This is looking at the future in 20 years of where our growth will be. We cannot, as I am understanding it and answering your questions, on those borders, what is it called again, outside the UGB?

Chair Fitzgerald asked, reserves? The properties that will be in reserves?

Commissioner MacMillan stated, yes thank you. We still (inaudible) control that. I get that. I am coming from Idaho when we had people and designated farmland and there were not controls at all. You had farmland and then if the farmer wasn't doing very well right next to him somebody would sell their property and put in a residential. Now farmland was being taken, but in this situation it is already zoned on R-1. It is not farmland that we are talking about just to answer your question. This plan –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, it is not zoned R-1 it is zoned RR-1 and the R stands for Rural and the other R stands for Residential so it is not R.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, it is not farmland that is much different. With that said I am in favor of this six and half year plan. We went through this two years ago when I was chair with the joint hearing. It has been a really long process and I just want to guarantee you that every player has been at the table. I am in favor of this.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I am too. I think the elephant in the room I am asking for is why don't we put it all in the UGB? Why have a reserve –

Commissioner Arthur stated, we do not need it.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I am not finished –

Commissioner Arthur stated, we do not need it right now.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I am not finished yet.

Commissioner Arthur stated, well that is the answer.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, we need it in 30 years maybe. Why not? What keeps us? Are we looking at just the population? My point is if we are going to do it let's do it all the way. Let's not just kind of do it halfway. I know my City Councilor is shaking his head at me and I understand that but I am asking a question.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, let me answer that. The criteria that was done, the population element and the lands inventory, etc., that generated the amount of lands that were required, that is what took six and a half years of our work to do was getting all of those pieces together and that sort of is the matrix by which the amount of land that we talk about being put into the UGB. That is why it shrunk down when the population element changed. However, that does not necessarily indicate reserves. I think that is the part that you are talking about was the reserves. The UGB issue we have, the amount of lands going in the UGB, we needed those lands to offset the

population element and the growth potential and of course answer the fact of the different types of land that we needed. That is why it took all of that time.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, so by saying what I said, which was a little absurd to put it out there I realize that, let's go back to that. You guys worked that hard and that is true but that should not necessarily be the driving point. If the population growth had been where it is now, the projected growth, I do not think we would have this conversation. I think we would be up to what is within the UGB and there would be no reserve element. The reason I say that is it would not be there because you would have had the population forecast that we have now. Let's say that was in place six and a half years ago. That is what you would have went with. Now that it has changed, does it really matter when it changed? I don't think the urban reserve is long term going to accomplish what we want. I think it looks good and maybe it will, but I'm not sure about it. I'm not sold on it.

Commissioner Arthur stated, (inaudible) downsize our acreage based upon the changed population element. Why would we ask DLCD to approve a larger amount that we can't justify?

Commissioner MacMillan stated, I was in total favor of two years ago when they had the higher population formula and we had a much bigger urban growth boundary. I still think that two and a half years ago when we had that plan before us was better than this one before us. Right now we are voting on the one before us. Politically –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we are not voting on that. We are voting on these measures tonight.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, I know.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, let's be very clear in what we are voting on. We are voting on these, not anything else, we are not deciding should that amount of land come in or anything else, we are talking about the ones that are here tonight, nothing else.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, that is right, but I am just saying they have the new population estimate, we have it before us, I think it works.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, Lois, just one thing, I understand you completely. Do you understand where I am coming from though? You don't understand? Ask a question because I want to know if I can clarify.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, I just don't get it.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, that is fine. Tom wants to put some comments in and I think maybe he will shed some light on some of this. The issue, please, is not about whether we should have an urban growth boundary or not. What we are talking about here tonight are these measures. That is these we have in front of us on our docket tonight. [Recorder's Note: Chair Fitzgerald listed the previously stated item numbers again] These are what we are talking about. These are our subject.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, I just want to provide a little background and some of the requirements around why things are the way they are and the reason why it is presented to you. Urban growth boundaries have to be a 20 period. It can't be more or less. That is all driven by the population forecast. That is what the updates to the population, housing, economic, and urbanization elements are about. We cannot go beyond what the population forecast is for 20 years. Urban reserves you can do a minimum of an additional 10 years looking out 30 years or you can do up to 50 years so an additional 30 years. When we looked at the new forecast we sat down with the City Council and County Commissioners and laid out four alternatives: 1) keep working off old forecast, 2) work off new forecast and just do an urban growth boundary, 3) work off new forecast and do an urban growth boundary and 10 year urban reserve, and 4) do the same as that except we have the option of doing infrastructure planning that accounts for the urban reserve or not. Essentially with the new forecast the rates are quite a bit slower. I guess if you look at erring on the side of caution you could say if things are slower than we forecast then we are going to be here for a while. If it picked up and they are faster then we are going to need to be in those urban reserves sooner than we forecast. Initially the Council's decision was to look at only doing an urban reserve without that 30 year look at the infrastructure. They had a meeting with the Board of Commissioners and had some discussions and decided they wanted to do that infrastructure look for the 30 year period as well. What that helps us do is look at not only sizing within those areas but on the areas that lead up to the urban growth boundary we are able to look at the land-use modeling for those urban reserve areas. If we do not do that then we size things so that it goes to the UGB expansion area and

we have the potential that when it is time to go in urban reserves things are undersized and they do not account for what it takes to expand into the reserves. This lets us split it into two phases but make sure the infrastructure is sized so that we don't have to go back and redo those plans when we (inaudible) the reserves. That is one of the biggest issues around that –

Vice Chair Coulter asked, so what you are saying is because the land-use model was in effect based on the higher population growth it is pretty easy to extrapolate to a 10 year urban reserve based a lot on that modeling?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, that is right. The plans will be based on the 30 year boundary for infrastructure rather than the 20 year boundary. If we did a 20 year plan and we sized the sewer line at 8 inches then we came back and redid that and looked at the urban reserve areas and that said we need a ten inch line then we do not have to go back and replace the whole eight inch line that we extended out to the end of the UGB and –

Vice Chair Coulter asked, were those factors, infrastructure, big in the decision not to go 20 years out? Why not further? I guess I should ask that question.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, we did not have that discussion but I think part of it was that we could utilize that we had done with the work that was done before. It gets us out to something that is close to but even a little smaller than what the original proposed UGB was without going out and taking in a larger area than was considered before. It probably is a safe margin that our growth rate is not going to be so far off that we are looking at infrastructure plans that are such a long look out.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, so with your modeling, what I was talking about initially with the bell curve, you feel that is close to optimum looking at 30 years?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, those were the discussions we had and that is the direction so what I am bringing to you is a proposal that has gone through vetting to look at that time period.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I know you are not going to put your opinion on the record. Thank you.

Commissioner Arthur asked, on the Exhibit 6, on the additional revisions from DLCD, first of all I did not know, this is news to me, that on page 2 of 3 the first heading, Priority of Land in Urban Reserves are very much battered around H1 and H2 for the industrial area, the only place we have left that is near the freeway. The Steering Committee basically favored including the H1 area. It was in and out. We did feel that there definitely was the ability on that for selecting based on need and being able to bypass some of the far out west locations that might have been alternatives because it did meet the primary criteria for industrial land of accessibility to interstate highway. I am wondering whether we can include in our recommendation that rather than throw it out completely, since it can be done the way it is proposed here, that we put it back in again. Not H2, just H1, whatever portions are talked about here so we don't lose the capability of having some additional industrial land. I think that is something I would like to have discussed.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, do any commissioners want to weigh in on Loree's idea?

Commissioner MacMillan stated, there was so much contention two and a half years ago on that property you are talking about. I am really just looking at this as a whole and what is there. You may be right, I think you are right, but it is not before us so I am not willing to just add it in. I do not think we can, can we?

Commissioner Arthur stated, it is before us it is right here on this thing.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, I know but are you saying to –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, is in the reserve right now.

Commissioner Arthur stated, (inaudible) reserve, but it can't be in the reserve is what DLCD says. Is that correct? Yes.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, our staff recommendation to Council was that that area be in the urban growth boundary and the area up along I-5 be urban reserve and their vote was that was reversed so that area up along I-5 came in the urban growth boundary and that area became urban reserve. We have had that feedback from DLCD that the criteria for inclusion of resource land, that is the piece that has resource lands the only one, the criteria for inclusion in

the urban reserve are slightly different than inclusion in the urban growth boundary. There are draft findings in your report that we felt it could be justified as highest priority based on it being surrounded by exception lands. I spoke with Josh earlier about that and he said their interpretation of that is you cannot include part of an island. The fact that immediately to the east of that there is the remainder of farm resource and then there is one wood lot resource piece and then there is the County park that is wood lot resource. If you bring only a piece of that in then it is not a surrounded island because some of that other resource land is still out there wrapped around by rural residential. It becomes, for inclusion in the urban reserve, the third priority and based on the recommendation, the draft proposal from Council and the board, and the way the urbanization element is written is unless your recommendation is different then going forward we would do our best to make findings justifying that inclusion under third priority land in the urban reserve. If that went up and was supported then we are done. If that was not supported then that would come out of the urban reserve or Council would have to decide whether they wanted to take it out or put it back into the UGB. Part of the issue with the urban reserve is infrastructure planning. There are a lot of sewer and water issues in that vicinity that would be desirable for us to be able to look at the capacity of pump stations and extensions that would serve that area. It would be more challenging to not plan for that as part of the UGB or urban reserve and then come back and have to look at what we did in the short term. We think it is important that we be able to plan for that whether it is urban reserve or urban growth boundary.

Commissioner Arthur stated, it is kind of two-faced to have the City Council sit there and the County talk about we need more industry, we need more jobs, we need more places to do this and then not do it. When we were involved in the planning I did not know, I do not know if you did, of this particular quirk that we could not justify the need the same way for reserve as for UGB.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, the idea was when we talked about hypocritical we talked about taking resource land in one aspect and telling everybody resource land is hands-off you can't touch it and then turning around and saying to ourselves but we can use it. We felt that was part of the issue too. We did have other places we could use the employment lands so therefore it was not necessary for us to use that.

Commissioner Arthur stated, but it was pretty clear whenever it was, a year or two ago, when DLCD came down or it wasn't DLCD it was –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, it was LUBA that sits in on all of those meetings –

Commissioner Arthur stated, yes that came down and took the bus tour –

Senior Planner Schauer stated, that was the Commission. That was LCDC.

Commissioner Arthur stated, was that the Commission, yes, they came down and they took the bus tour and they saw we don't have any flat land next to the freeway left. Where are we going to go? We never ever proposed taking farmland out in Lower River Road area that is truly exclusive farm land.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, just to clarify one point. The identified need in the economic element and the urbanization element that need is justified whether it is UGB or urban reserve. What we have got right now is a proposal and a strategy that says we are proposing a boundary that is smaller than the maximum identified need. We could justify its inclusion. We could justify inclusion of more.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, the idea is it is in the reserve or we do the alternative which is basically take it out of reserve and then at a later date when the demand is there for the employment land then have the City Council bring it in at that time as part of the UGB like we have done in other things. We have done that before. I think the complication was that we took it out of the UGB and we put in the reserve and unfortunately there were some issues if we did that. The way it is right now is we can leave in the reserve and pass this on, this particular one, pass it on as a recommendation to either take it out of reserve and leave it out altogether and then when the time and need come bring it in to the existing UGB.

Commissioner Arthur stated, that is counter to the ability that we know is needed there to plan the infrastructure to reach it for the future. We know what is needed on that.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, if it is in a reserve it stays under its current zoning and we do not have that privilege. Unfortunately we cannot have our cake and eat it on that one. We have to either

leave it out and then when the need arises bring it in as part of the UGB knowing full well when we are talking about planning that is what we plan on doing. If not, then leave it as part of the reserve and make the justification in the findings to support that.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I have a question for you on that.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, Josh the DLCD rep has offered to provide any clarification.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, on that particular one we put in the urban reserve then the State came back and said no take it out or put it in the UGB. If it is not in the UGB are we short industrial land? Are we short employment land?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, we are low currently as proposed with it included.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I am concerned about what Loree was talking about. It comes up. We need employable land. We need this. If not there, where? We cannot answer that question tonight but I am bringing it up. We need employable land and we seem to be skirting around not getting it. I totally agree and understand Loree's point.

Commissioner Arthur asked, can Josh talk?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, if you do that you open it up. If the gentleman had spoken earlier as part of the conversation we could go back perhaps but we have closed the public portion. We do not have that privilege to be opening it up again for one and then close it back down. People have left and the public noticing deal is violated if we do something after that has happened.

Commissioner Arthur stated, I have a question and I do not know whether it is for Lora or Tom but also DLCD sent back the discussion about the accessory dwelling units which makes sense. I assume that this is worded the way it was because we do not yet have official code that does not mention some of the family and he is working off the old version, correct?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, yes the provisions that we had we agreed with their feedback and so that is proposed to strike that language about the ownership requirement. You are right, I think the single-family language will be forthcoming as a separate bundle.

Commissioner Arthur stated, I just wanted to be sure that it was not missed some where in our other review of it.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, is there anything else Loree on that? Does anyone else have anything? Loree your next one?

Commissioner Arthur stated, I was a little confused by one of the maps you put up. There are so many here I will just ask the question. In this version is Crestview in or out? Because the one you had up there for quite awhile –

Senior Planner Schauer stated, Crestview Loop is in the current urban growth boundary. There were failing septic systems –

Commissioner Arthur stated, I know.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, - quite a few years ago so the urban growth planners extended past an existing area that incorporated that so Crestview Loop is in. The area to the north of that is proposed for inclusion and the area to the south is proposed for inclusion (inaudible) portion UGB have portion of reserve.

Commissioner Arthur stated, I never was able to find, and both of your table of contents mention, Element 6 of population as looks like it should be separate from what the Rural Commission reviewed. The Josephine County Coordinated Population Forecast Update and then it says Comprehensive Plan Element 6 and I never found that.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, the exhibit is the same for both items so we are just proposing to incorporate the coordinated forecast (inaudible) and so it covers the unincorporated area in Cave Junction but it covers the Grants Pass portion too so rather than write them separately it is just incorporated as an addendum.

Commissioner Arthur stated, my concern was that out of all the lovely pictures about the number of people per household and where they work and all of that kind of stuff that the whole page and discussion got left out about the demographics of the household make up and the

number of married and unmarried and single family and child families and that. It was (inaudible) all the way through and now it is missing from this version. I know that ACS has the...you should be able to get those numbers from the community survey.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, what we did with those addenda is we did not go back and rewrite every one of the adopted elements. Those remain in effect with the numbers updated accordingly. All those demographic provisions are still there just the numbers are scaled back to match the new forecast. That is all still in the population and housing elements.

Commissioner Arthur asked, where can we see that?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, in the comprehensive plan, in the one that was adopted before that is all still in there. One of the questions we had with DLCD early on when we looked at a new forecast we said if we use this new forecast do we have to go back and redo every bit of analysis we did or can we rely on those assumptions and scale back the numbers. That was what we did was we were scaling back the numbers.

Commissioner Arthur stated, this is not an issue of scaling back the numbers it is an issue of demographically describing the current numbers that you are using.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, all of the provisions that were in there that dealt with that is still in the population and housing elements.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, are you okay with that? The information has stayed. It was only those things that needed to be changed were changed. Everything else stayed where was in there. It is in there it just is not restated.

Commissioner Arthur stated, (inaudible) however the actual numbers and ratios would be 10-12 years outdated now. What was the ACS survey? I forgot. 12 for 13 years outdated because we have 2000 population numbers in that particular discussion.

Senior Planner Schauer asked, what was the question?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, the numbers are outdated now by 10 –

**14-40500008.a.2. – Population Element 6 Update (Addendum 1)**

**MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner MacMillan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40500008.a.2. as presented. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

**14-40500008.a.3. – Housing Element 9 Update (Addendum1)**

**MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner MacMillan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40500008.a.3. as presented. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

Commissioner Arthur asked, is this where we can propose recommending that H1.1 be included back into the UGB not in the reserve?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, if it would be our pleasure to make a motion on that basis.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, I think that would come under the other items below. I don't think there is anything –

Commissioner Arthur asked, which one?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this is strictly about the additional findings regarding short term employment land supply. We do not need to do it here. I think what Tom is saying is we can do it later on down on number 13 which would be Urban Reserve Land Allocation and Maps. Is that where you want it?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, I guess it is probably appropriate to note that the second half of that economic element reflect that but the vote on the map in the urbanization elements will be specific to that. I do not think there is anything in the economic element. We can adjust that accordingly if you take that action on that item. Let me look for one moment here.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we are waiting while Tom checks on something but we are talking about number four whether we should talk about what Loree wanted to do about putting it back in as part of the UGB expansion rather than working on the additional findings to satisfy that report and leaving in the reserve. I think they can make the case with the additional findings. I would leave it alone myself.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, I think if that is your preference then you can just note that we need to adjust this accordingly if that is how you vote. Pages 86 and 87 discuss the issue so that is part of the second half of the document. I think the main issue on the map would be under the urbanization element and under the UGB and urban reserve boundary designation. I think the vote is if you vote that way on those then we would need to adjust the economic element accordingly.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, [off mic] I think we should just leave it out.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, leave it out how? What you mean by leave it out? Leave it the way it is? It is in the reserve now.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, [off mic] I do not think it needs to be in the reserve (inaudible) urban growth boundary.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, so leave it out and then have the City, when it needs that piece of property for employment land, then put it into the existing UGB by the way we did previously? Is that what you are saying?

Commissioner MacMillan stated, the reason I am saying that is my recollection is that area had problems with water and that is where there was the pushback –

Commissioner Arthur stated, [off mic] that is why we need the (inaudible).

Commissioner MacMillan stated, okay, well maybe, go ahead. Do you have an idea? I'm flexible.

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, I think we should vote to settle that whether we want to include that or not before we continue on. Let's just vote whether we want to include it or not at this point.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, let's just take a vote. Is it the consensus of the Commission to leave it out of the reserve and leave it out of everything as per the letter which would then allow the City to, when they need the employment land, be able to do the necessary work to get it brought in. Or do you want it to be left in the reserve as it is right now. Those are really the only two choices we have.

Commissioner Arthur stated, the other choice is to put it in the UGB.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we could make a recommendation to say that we prefer Council take another look at the whole matter. If that is what you want and then not do anything. Do not make a recommendation up or down on 14-40500008.a.4 the Economic Element at all and say that we want the City Council to review the letter from DLCDC and make the decision one way or the other. It is not our prerogative anyway.

Commissioner Arthur stated, with the primary reason being that it allows you to do the infrastructure planning for that while the other part is being developed.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, as we have demonstrated before and I know that you think that really matters on this because it will not. The fact that it is even in the reserve the fact is the staff and the City will know that they want to us to be where they are going to go so they will do the necessary planning I am sure to do that. The fact that it is not in the reserve but it is left out of the reserve that will allow I think them to be able to do it sooner that way than if it is in the reserve. I think they would be able to make a decision if they need those employment lands then let them decide that and go forward with it.

Commissioner MacMillan asked, [off mic] can I hear what other members think about this? I am hearing your (inaudible) and I am not sure where I am at. What do the other people think?

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, [off mic] I agree with Gerard, just leave it out.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I would like this to go on record. Vote it up or down in the UGB recommendation.

Commissioner MacMillan asked, [off mic] in or out? What were you thinking?

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I'm thinking in.

Chair Fitzgerald asked, so you would like to see it put in the UGB and not left the way it is? [unknown speaker off mic commented] So you are saying leave it out altogether and let them do the necessary work to get it put in when they need that employment land? Mr. McVay?

Commissioner McVay stated, [off mic] (inaudible) additional findings (inaudible).

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we have the majority. Does that help you Lois?

#### **MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner MacMillan moved and Commissioner Regan seconded to recommend to City Council to leave Area H1.1 out of the reserve as a result of the DLCD letter. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Commissioners MacMillan, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. "NAYS": Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioner Arthur. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

Senior Planner Schauer asked, so the motion passed to take H1.1 out of the urban reserve and not include it in the UGB or urban reserve?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, leave it alone and let the City Council decide if they need employment lands like was brought up in Josh's letter where they talk about if they need the land make the necessary movement to do it and bring it into the urban growth boundary at that time.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, with that vote I think that probably would be reflected in several of these individual items including the next item which would be the economic element. Was that motion for the economic element specifically to recommend H1.1 be taken out and to adopt the additional findings about the short term supply of employment land? Is that correct?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, no, the idea is to take it out of the reserve and leave it out and if the City needs the employment land let them then bring it into the urban growth boundary themselves at that time.

Senior Planner Schauer asked, so that was not a specific vote on the economic element then? Next will be a vote on the economic element.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, I was supposed to read this it says in my notes from Tom –

Senior Planner Schauer asked, can you vote on #4 first?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we just did.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, no that was sort of a vote on that specific issue so that it will be reflected in several votes.

#### **14-40500008.a.4. – Economic Element 8 Update (Addendum 1)**

#### **MOTION**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner Regan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40500008.a.4. reflecting the change of removing H1.1 from the reserve and with the additional findings regarding the short-term supply of employment land.**

Chair Fitzgerald asked, is that what you said? That was not what I heard. I heard you wanted and left out and now you are talking about the additional findings to put in.

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, no the additional findings have to do with employment land supply.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, it is not specific to that property. It is a mix of short-term supply versus long-term supply.

#### VOTE

**The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

Chair Fitzgerald asked, do you want me to read this now?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, yes.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, for 14-40500008.a.5 – Urbanization Element 14 Update (Addendum 1), the urbanization element update includes several of the individual items below. The Planning Commission will deliberate and vote on those items separately and then will deliberate and vote on the urbanization element which would need to incorporate the results of those votes.

**14-40500008.a.6. – Amendment to Grants Pass Comprehensive Element 13 (Policies): UGB and Urban Reserve Criteria and Procedures; Internal Consistency with Efficiency Measures**

#### MOTION

**Commissioner MacMillan moved and Commissioner Kellenbeck seconded to recommend approval of 14-40500008.a.6. as presented.**

Vice Chair Coulter asked, if I am not a supporter of the urban reserve, I have been in the weeds so much, it seems to me I would still vote up on this. I see down here where I think I would be voting against it.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, it is about incorporating future local provisions for dealing with how the urban reserve is adopted or amended and then the boundary itself will be a separate item.

Vice Chair Coulter stated, that answers my question.

## VOTE

The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. "NAYS": Chair None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.

### **14-40500008.b. – Development Code Text Amendments and Efficiency Measures**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, for this one we need to recommend approval as presented with the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and Exhibit 6.

## MOTION/VOTE

Vice Chair Coulter moved and Commissioner Kellenbeck seconded to recommend approval of 14-40500008.b. with the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and 6. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Coulter and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. "NAYS": Chair Fitzgerald. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.

### **14-40500008.c. – Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs)**

#### **14-40500008.c.1. – Interim IGA for UGB Expansion Areas**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, how do you see this one?

Senior Planner Schauer asked, do you have any comments or anything you want to weigh in on for this one?

Chair Fitzgerald asked, nothing? Just leave it alone? We are just leaving it alone so it will be nothing on that.

#### **14-40500008.c.2. – IGA for Urban Reserve Areas**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, there is nothing on this next one either. Is this the one you wanted to weigh in on Mr. Coulter?

Vice Chair Coulter stated, I do not have a problem with the IGA. The IGA is with the City and the Council. That is their business.

Mr. Kellenbeck stated, my question to Tom is say we extend water or extend sewer and we approach pretty close proximity to one of these urban reserve areas. Are we going to weigh in on that?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, I do not expect that we would be extending sewer or water. There are some issues with existing service area for Redwood Sewer. For the most part there are some areas in the northerly area that I think are just within the service area. What will happen is if Josephine County receives a land-use application within the urban reserves they will provide notification to us. When we have those infrastructure plans updated we will look at those and will provide comment back. We will recommend things like, let's say Redwood Avenue going west, if we have identified what the right-of-way section is we would suggest that any buildings be set back so they are not in the future right-of-way or not immediately adjacent to it. If we have identified alignments for water and sewer lines we would recommend they try to avoid those. In most of these we had talked about they are pretty parcelized based on existing zoning already so there is honestly not a lot of potential for further land division. As part of that there are provisions to look at future development so it is good for the property owner. They look at how they might urbanize in the future when it goes from rural to urban at some point and think through some of those things. There are some of those provisions in there.

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, I recommend approval as presented.

Commissioner Arthur asked, where does it say in here that they can't go smaller than two acres? I have not found it yet. I see one where it says .25.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, on page 240 there is a section that says Limitations on Rezoning as required by OAR 660-021-0040(3) "for exception areas and non resource land in the urban reserve this agreement prohibits zone amendments allowing more intensive uses etc.". It talks about resource land which will continue to –

Commissioner Arthur stated, we don't have any resource land.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, we have the proposal to include...Area H1.1 was resource land that would have be precluded to be re-zoned if it didn't meet the requirements, but mostly we're dealing with the exception area on non-resource land. Those couldn't be up-zoned.

Commissioner Arthur stated, we have single-family dwellings here too I noticed.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, (inaudible) statute that is a requirement that if they are allowed to do it now we cannot preclude the first dwelling on a rural –

Commissioner Arthur stated, I am just talking about the word. Where does it say two acres though?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, that is not specifically addressed in here. As Lora noted that is County zoning. The RR-1 zoning district has a two acre minimum lot size.

Commissioner Arthur stated, but you just said that the proposed reserve agreement would not allow dividing smaller than two acres.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, it would not allow them to up-zone the property. If they already have, say, RR-5 zoning that would allow them to divide it once they could still do that. They can use the property in accordance with the existing zoning. We would review that type of land division in coordination with the County to talk about what the future urbanization would look like. We do not have very many areas, that I am aware of, that have RR-1 zoning that have enough land to be divided or maybe much more than one additional parcel.

Commissioner Arthur stated, but they can go down to .25 acres it says.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, yes we have a provision that allows clustering –

Commissioner Arthur stated, 2f.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, yes so that would allow, essentially, if they are in area where they can be already served by sewer and water like if they have frontage on a road that is halfway in the UGB already then they could maintain rural densities. Instead of taking, let's say, 20 acres and splitting that into four 5 acre parcels they could cluster those small lots at one area and basically reserve 18 acres undivided. It is pretty limited where that would actually be able to be used thought based on existing development patterns and infrastructure.

Commissioner Arthur stated, I do not know. I think it is odd that we have not seen any of this before. Did we see it before?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, yes this has been around since October. This is an October 24, 2013 draft.

Commissioner Arthur stated, I do not remember it. Do you?

Chair Fitzgerald stated, yes we were doing it here.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, so this one does not require recommendation but if you want to-

Chair Fitzgerald stated, you can weigh in on it but there is nothing for us to up or down on.

Senior Planner Schauer asked, do we have a motion?

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, I made a motion but there is no formal recommendation required.

Commissioner Arthur stated, it says no recommendation required.

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, we can make it if we want.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, we were just saying that we did not weigh in on it any more than we did on the other ones so let's just say fine there is nothing required of us unless we wanted to put in some comment, right?

Commissioner Kellenbeck stated, I will withdraw my motion and we'll move on.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, okay we will move on.

**14-40400001.a&b. – Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Amendment and Urban Reserve Boundary Designation**

**14-40400001.a. – UGB Amendment**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this is where there are the additional amendments from Exhibit 4.

**MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner MacMillan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40400001.a. as presented with the additional amendments from Exhibit 4.**

**The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. “NAYS”: None.**

**Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

**14-40100001.b. – Urban Reserve Boundary Designation**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this one has the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 also. So how do you like this one?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, the motion would also then need to reflect your earlier vote on taking area H1.1 out.

**MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner MacMillan moved and Commissioner Regan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40400001.b. as presented with the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and excluding Area H1.1. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. “NAYS”: Vice Chair**

**Coulter. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire.**

**The motion passed.**

**14-40200003 – Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments**

**14-40200003.a. – UGB Comprehensive Plan Amendments (UGB Expansion Areas)**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this one is again with the additional amendment from Exhibit 4. What is your pleasure on this?

**MOTION/VOTE**

Vice Chair Coulter moved and Commissioner Regan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40200003.a. as presented with the additional amendments from Exhibit 4. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.

**14-40200003.b. – Urban Reserve Land Use Allocations and Map**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this is with the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and this will also need the change on H1.1 to be put in the language.

**MOTION/VOTE**

Commissioner MacMillan moved and Commissioner Kellenbeck seconded to recommend approval of 14-40200003.b. as presented with additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and excluding H1.1. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Fitzgerald and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. “NAYS”: Vice Chair Coulter. Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.

**14-40200003.c. – Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendments and Overlay in Current UGB**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this will need the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and 6. Does this also need the H1.1?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, no this is pertaining to the –

Chair Fitzgerald stated, I understand that but we are taking out the reserve one. You don't want it in this one?

Senior Planner Schauer stated, this one does not affect H1.1 anyway.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, okay we will not bother with it. No H1.1 in this one.

#### **MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner MacMillan seconded to recommend approval of 14-40200003.c. as presented with additional amendments from Exhibits 4 and**

**6. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. "NAYS": None.**

**Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

#### **14-40500008.a.5. – Urbanization Element 14 Update (Addendum 2)**

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this one is reflecting the additional amendments from Exhibit 4 and Exhibit 6 for the individual items above which are part of the urbanization element. Criteria are satisfied based upon the findings in the staff report.

Senior Planner Schauer stated, this one needs H1.1 in there too and the additional findings.

Chair Fitzgerald stated, this one needs H1.1 and additional findings added into the language for that motion.

#### **MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner MacMillan moved and Vice Chair Coulter seconded to recommend approval of 14-40500008.a.5. as presented with additional amendments from Exhibits 4 and 6, the additional findings from the staff report, and with the exclusion of H1.1. The**

**vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, Regan, and McVay. "NAYS": None.**

**Abstain: None. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

**4. CONSENT AGENDA:**

- a. **MINUTES:** September 24, 2014
- b. **FINDINGS OF FACT:** None

**MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner MacMillan moved and Commissioner Kellenbeck seconded to approve the minutes from September 24, 2014 as submitted. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Fitzgerald, Vice Chair Coulter, and Commissioners MacMillan, Arthur, Kellenbeck, and McVay. "NAYS": None. Abstain: Commissioner Regan. Absent: Commissioner McIntire. The motion passed.**

**5. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE: None**

- a. **Items from the Public**

**6. ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

PCD Interim Director Glover stated, for our November hearing dates we talked last time that we are having an unusual schedule so please do keep the 18<sup>th</sup> of November open. It is a Tuesday night. We have an application that will be coming in that night. I think we will do one text amendment also that night and also a major site plan.

Commissioner MacMillan stated, I will not be here.

PCD Interim Director Glover stated, if we have any other absences let me know so we can make sure we have a quorum.

**7. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS: None**

**8. ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Fitzgerald adjourned the meeting at 8:30 P.M.



---

Gerard Fitzgerald, Chair  
Urban Area Planning Commission

10/22/2014  
Date

These minutes were prepared by contracted minute taker, Becca Quimby.