

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes – May 24, 2023, at 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS:

Eric Heesacker
Mark Collier (Chair)
Loree Arthur
Lois MacMillan
Susan Tokarz-Krauss
L. Ward Nelson (Vice Chair)
Scott Lindberg

City/Staff/Council Liaisons:

Bradley Clark (Director)
Mark Trinidad – (Principal Planner)
Jason Maki (Associate Planner)
Donna Rupp (Associate Planner)
Gabby Sinagra (Assistant Planner)
Amber Neeck (Housing & Neighborhood Specialist)

Guests:

Justin Gerlitz, Gerlitz Engineering Consultants
Neil Burgess, Engineer with Jo. Co. Public Works
Donna Lee Brooks
Terry Nelson
Mason Hartford
Bonnie McDonald
Jay and Barbara Conley
Doug Walker
Joel Peterson
Mike McKittrick
Nina A. Halt
Barb Street
Mark Linnemeyer

1. Roll

Good evening, it's 6:00 PM.

Listen up.

I see no one on MS Teams logged in just yet. It is 6:00 PM so feel free to kick off when you wish.

Thank You. I'm Vice Chair Nelson. I will be chairing tonight's meeting as Mark is excused, Commissioner Collier. And so, I hope you folks go easy on me because this will be the first time. And we're going to start off with the roll call. We'll start over at our right with... Are you busy over there, Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss?

Not too busy but I am here.

Okay.

MacMillan here.

Lindberg.

Arthur here.

Heesacker here.

And I'm Vice Chair Nelson here.

2. Introductions

Next is the... If there's any introductions. I don't believe we have any?
Just one. I think Commissioner Arthur has been reappointed to the UAPC.

Congratulations.

3. Public Comment

And now is our opportunity for public comment. This is an opportunity for you folks to address the commission on items not related to the public hearing or any action items that we have before us. The intent is to provide information that is pertinent to the city's jurisdiction. Each speaker will be given three minutes to address the commission as one body, not as individuals. The commission may consider items brought up during this time later in our agenda during matters from commission members and staff. Is anyone wishing to address the commission on any item other than what's on our agenda? Seeing none, we'll move on.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. May 10, 2023

Do I have an approval of the minutes for the May 10th meeting?

I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes of May 10th, 2023.

Thank you. That is Commissioner MacMillan. Do I have a second? And a second from Commissioner Lindberg. All in favor signified by saying aye.

Aye.

Aye. Those opposed? Seeing none. We'll move on.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner MacMillan moved, and Commissioner Lindberg seconded the motion to approve the minutes of May 10, 2023, as presented. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Nelson, Commissioners Arthur, Heesacker, Tokarz-Krauss, Lindberg, and MacMillan. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Chair Collier. The motion passed.

5. Findings of Fact

a. None

We had no Findings of Facts from the last meeting?

6. Public Hearing

a. 401-00103-23 & 403-00103-23 ~ Request for Zone Map Amendment and Annexation for Glen Crest Cottages, AllCare Community Foundation – Staff Report Okay, so at this time we'll start our public hearing, and it is a public hearing open to consider an application filed by... It's a zone map amendment actually for annexation for Glencrest Cottages AllCare Community Foundation. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant. Statements by people in favor of the application. Statements by people in opposition of the application and an opportunity for additional comment by applicant and staff. After that has occurred the public comment portion will be closed, and the matter will be discussed and act upon by this commission. Objections to jurisdiction. Is there anyone president who wishes to object? Who wishes to challenge the authority of the commission to hear this matter? Seeing none. If someone objects... Oh, yeah, I don't have to do that. Okay. Conflicts of interest.

Do any commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest?

Yeah, this is Heesacker. I'm going to go ahead and recuse from this hearing. In my role at the county as transportation planner, I had enough involvement in this proposal that I think it's in the best interest of everybody if I recuse during the public hearing.

Very good. Have a nice evening. Are there any commissioners who wish to disclose discussions other than what we just heard from Commissioner Heesacker? Did I say that right?

Yes sir.

Yeah. Contacts, biases, or other parte information they've received prior to the meeting regarding this application? Seeing none. Let me make sure I've got all things read for the record. Okay, got to keep going, don't I? In this hearing, the decision of the commission will be based upon specific criteria which are set forth in the development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the report, please write a note to city staff and one will be provided. It is important to remember if you failed to raise an issue with enough detail to forward the commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, you'll not be able to appeal to the city council based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with the staff report.

Thank you, Vice Chair, members of the Planning Commission, and members of the public. Actually, Donna Rupp the associate planner responsible for the report in today's presentation. I'm subbing in for her, be it that she's out of town. Again, this is a zone map amendment for property located at 220 Glencrest Way. The project number for this is 401-00103-23. It's a zone map amendment for 220 Glencrest Way. The applicant as stated before, is the AllCare Community Foundation. And a summary of the request is that the UAPC recommend approval of a zone map amendment to change the subject parcel's underlying zone map designation from the county designation of RR-5 to city R1-10 and its relationship to council goals. This facilitates sustainable manageable growth.

Speaking in broad terms, what is the city's comprehensive plan? The comprehensive plan is the foundation of land use planning in the state of Oregon. It's set forth by 19 statewide land use planning goals. State goals are achieved through the comprehensive plan and zoning and the comprehensive plan overlooks 20 years of development or oversees 20. It has an over horizon of 20 years ahead. And zoning implements the comprehensive plan. As far as the site details, in this inlet or this picture of the site here. The one in yellow. It's on a northwest corner of Cloverlawn Drive in Glencrest Way. Right now, five acres. Currently, it's just outside the city limits and the way you can tell is that these orange line is the current city limits. And currently the property is just sits outside those current city limits. However, it's within the city's urban growth boundary and that boundary line is in purple here. So, although it's just outside the city limits, it's within the city's urban growth boundary. As far as surrounding uses to the east and south are similar type residential R-1 and R-2. And there's a small pocket of neighborhood commercial just south-east of the property. And the rest of the remaining surrounding uses are in RR-5 are county zoning.

The comprehensive plan designation as you see here on this map, is depicted in blue and its currently low density residential which is includes the subject parcel itself. So, the

property itself is already within the city's comprehensive plan already as low density residential or LR. The corresponding zoning required under LR are either R1-12, R1-10, or R1-8. The other properties within... Or the other land use designations within the comprehensive plan adjacent to this subject parcel is medium density residential or MR. And currently this zoning designations are R1-6 and R-2.

The proposed city zoning for this subject parcel is R1-110. Again, this is consistent and within the city's current comprehensive land use designation of LR. As far as background and discussion, the criteria analysis that you'll be making your decision is based off in the development code under section 4.033 under zone map amendments. This proposed project is classified as a minor amendment to the comprehensive land use plan because as previously stated, the property is already designated as LR. And the only thing that's required tonight is to adopt the zoning of R1-110. The criteria outlined in 4.033 include seven. They include one that uses consistent with the proposed zoning. Two, the proposed zone is consistent with the comprehensive plan designation. Three, it has adequate urban services. Four, it's consistent with the transportation system plan and it's a city's transportation system plan. Five, natural features are conducive to the proposed zoning. Six, it's consistent with all overlay districts. And seven, timing is appropriate with available services and needs for the zone.

I'll highlight three of these seven, but all seven of them have been satisfied in terms of the staff report. But again, I'll highlight three of the seven to move forward in this presentation to you. Under criteria three, advocate urban services. The project has recently awarded city American Rescue Act program funds to extend both the public water and sewer to and across the frontage of the proposed parcel. Again, these ARPA funds were awarded to the project as early as March and April. And this will provide the installation of the basic urban services needed, namely water and sewer. These water and sewer lightness sections are considered a benefit for future development in and around the area. And then removes the needs for wells and septic. If the zone map amendment and annexation are approved and future housing is developed, Cloverlawn and Glencrest Way street frontages improvements will be required to comply with the city's minimum street design standards including sidewalks.

Criteria four, consistent with the city's transportation system plan. So, the proposed zone change is consistent with the functions and capacities under the TSP. And the TSP is the long-range transportation plan. And recently UAPC and the city council adopted a recent amendment to that TSP. Cloverlawn Drive is considered a collector street which is intended to carry between 3000 and 10,000 vehicles per day. Including some through traffic. Information provided by the County Public Works after the staff report was completed indicated that in 2020 a traffic count was taken at the average daily trip or ADT count for that time just was just north of 3,600 and within an 85th percentile of... Just under 35 miles per hour.

And then in the addendum, Donna had provided the comment from the county under her addendum or under her exhibit addendum for this project. And based off ODOT or the state's Department of Transportation web data, there have been three incidents reported at the intersection of Cloverlawn and Glencrest Way between the years of 2013 and 2020. Two were injuries and one was a property damage. And namely criteria seven, timing is appropriate with available services and needs for the zone. There is a deficit of existing land housing and billable lands within all of the city's urban growth boundaries of which this is one of them. And the timing of this zone map amendment if approved and adopted will allow for the project to move forward to be annexed to the city and developed for future housing.

Under public comments, Staff has received 14 individual comments prior to the staff report being published on May 17th. An additional eight more were received by the deadline on May 22nd. Again, in the addendum includes those additional comments summarizing the top concerns amongst the comments which were all opposed to this project. Namely, traffic's safety, particularly the blind curve, increased use in speeding around Cloverlawn, neighborhood safety, the distance from social services presumably from the new proposed housing and that the proposed project was not in character of the neighborhood. Keep in mind that the majority of these comments are regarding the future or proposed future development and that's not the decision before you at hand. This is simply a hearing regarding the zone map amendment. The additional eight comments are also available again in the staff addendum. Call to action, there is 120-day deadline, which is August 3rd to make a decision. The recommendation from staff from the report recommends that the UAPC recommend approval to the city council for project 401-00103-23 amendment for 220 Glencrest Way. Alternatives would be recommend denial, but you must identify and list new criterion or continue the public hearing to a date certain time. That concludes staff's report. Happy to answer any questions. Then also, the applicant is here to present as well.

Are there any questions at this time? Commissioner Lindberg.

Lindberg here. So as a new planning commissioner, can you explain to me why we're dealing with just a zone change on a single parcel and not the entire RR-5? The entire neighborhood that's currently under county zoning. Why we're not doing it all at one time?

Why we're only doing five acres of-

Yeah, why we're only doing the subject parcel and not the entire... There you go. That entire area.

Well, I guess the basic answer is that-

I can try to take that. Brad Clark, Community Development Director. So, there's two ways to initiate a project like this. A rezone project. One is, as you say, for the city to initiate. That is not the case here. The other option is for a property owner to initiate. So, the code says you can do either one. City can initiate and in this case the property owner initiates it. So, we just obviously go with whatever their application is and whatever property they control.

Thank you.

Any other questions for staff? Seeing none?

Oh, I have one more.

Oh.

Sorry.

Continue on.

Lindberg again. And is there a reason why the... Actually, it's not a question, so skip me.

All right. Any other questions? Seeing none. Would the applicant please come forward and make their presentation. And make sure you state your name and address for the record please.

Good evening, Commissioners. Justin Gerlitz, Gerlitz Engineering Consultants. Here tonight on behalf of the applicant, which is the AllCare Foundation or now the Mid-Rogue Foundation. Thank you for your presentation. I'll try to go over some of the things you said quickly so we don't repeat too much. But tonight, we're here on behalf of the current property owner and the intention is to dedicate half of their five-acre property to the AllCare Foundation. Because of that, we need to partition it and because of the current zoning being RR-5, the map zoning, we have to do this process first before we initiate the partition and then subsequently initiate development of the property.

As mentioned, the property's located on the corner of Glen Crest Way and Cloverlawn. And I'll change it to the laser pointer here. So, here's the Cloverlawn, Glen Crest Way intersection. Crestview Loop goes to the south and this is located at one of those corners in Cloverlawn that you're probably all familiar with. Glen Crest Way is currently improved to a single paved lane under what was probably done as a county rural restricted road project. As part of this project, we'll be improving that and then subsequently converting that portion into a city street section. Cloverlawn as mentioned is a collector roadway, improved to county standards, so two travel lanes with some small shoulders but no city improvements as is Crestview Loop that is a local street. Improved to county standards. And then beyond that in the surrounding neighborhood we've got a mixture of residential land uses. Some were denser than others. This subdivision that this sits within was originally developed as a rural subdivision. So that's such a five acre lots, whereas to the south and the east, we've got smaller lots that were done under RR-1, RR-2 rural subdivision.

As mentioned by Mark, the comprehensive plan has already been adjusted for this parcel and the surrounding parcels. So, this is just truly a zone map amendment and not a comprehensive plan amendment as is anything in the urban growth boundary as it develops. Here's just a few views of the roadway out front. Just to familiarize yourselves with the property. This is looking south on Cloverlawn to that first curve with Glen Crest on the right. This is looking to the west on Cloverlawn with Glen Crest in the distance right here and Crestview Loop petting off to the left. And this is just a zoomed in version of what Glen Crest looks like today. And again, it's a single paved road that will be improved as part of the project as it moves forward. Just a view but looking back to the north.

Included with your application, we created some mapping. This is the existing zoning map. You could see the RR-5 cluster with R1-10 to the north. R1-12 to the south and the east with a pocket of RR-1 to the east. Directly east of the property. The reason we chose R1-10 is because of that cluster to the north. We anticipate that moving downward as these other properties develop over time and change their zoning. And this is the comprehensive plan map. So, you can see here all of these LRs represent the residential underlying zoning, which surrounds it with an MR being the more medium density residential to the southeast and the east with that little pocket of neighborhood commercial on the corner.

This is what it would look like when rezoned. And again, we anticipate the rest of this RR-5 property changing over time. As mentioned, one of the items on a zone map amendment is, does it have adequate infrastructure? And they were fortunate to have

been awarded the ARPA grant for sewer and water improvements. Part of that included a master plan waterline loop that's going to tie into an adjacent subdivision that's just about ready to start construction over here. And what that's going to do is create this master plan water system that ultimately will serve all of this area to the south as it develops in the future. So, it was a pretty substantial upgrade that's going to occur as part of the project from a water system perspective. And then in addition to that, sewer will be brought up in front of the development area on both sides in Cloverlawn and Glen Crest Way at the time of development of the project.

Although we're not here tonight for the actual development, I do like to give some context on why we're doing this project. So, there's a couple of just layouts that we've done with an architect. This being one of them. These buildings will be cottages nature. We're proposing right now them to be attached more like a duplex structure as you can see. And we're planning on keeping a lot of the area, especially this steeper hillside area up here in a natural condition. Right now, it's generally forested with hardwoods and some sub-conifers.

This is another concept that has been developed conceptually as well. Again, along the same lines with these cottage type buildings and a community building down near the roadway. And then here's just a couple of exhibits of the type of building that we're looking to build on there. As part of this future partition after this step, this is the proposed lot that will exist after that occurs. So, this would be the future development parcel. The remaining parcel to the west. The west half of this property is planned to stay as is. It just includes a single-family residence right now and the current owners that are dedicating this half plan to stay there for the time being. Because it is one lot, we do have to change the zone map for the whole thing prior to doing the partition. Down on Glen Crest Way, this is the current roadway. If you follow my cursor right there, that comes out towards the corner at Cloverlawn. This gray area is the proposed pavement widening that we're planning to do as part of this project. All this will have to go through formal review and design after the zone map amendment. But again, just like to put things into context for you and the folks that are here tonight.

One thing that's just a note here for clarification is this little piece, so this is Glen Crest up here and there's a piece of right of way that exists at the corner right there. Right now, it just has a gravel driveway on it. One of the things that we continuously looking at is how to make this intersection function safer than it currently does. Widening this to two lanes is going to be a first step because the cars, instead of coming where they could possibly conflict with one another, they'll be able to turn off of Cloverlawn and get back onto Cloverlawn without that occurring. We will be putting in curb gutter and sidewalk along the frontage on Glen Crest Way. And then working with the city and the county on improvements to Cloverlawn or potential deferral of improvements. On Crest View Loop, our plan is to move the stop bar, which is way back here, up closer to this improved intersection so everyone has good sight distance and hopefully this thing will function better than it does today.

One of the things I also wanted to mention is utilities are going to be covered pretty clearly with this ARPA grant request. Traffic-wise, Eric, thankful for providing the numbers that you found for the traffic counts. When we look at these zone map amendments, you have to look at the whole parcel. We're only developing the east half and we're going to do it in a limited fashion. As the zone map change, we have to look at what could be there. With the application, we did provide some average daily trip calculations, if it was to develop to more of a normal city density. With that at the most, it would be a 5% increase on Cloverlawn Drive with that traffic count. I just wanted to point that out because I thought it was important. With the current project that's

proposed, it'll be less than half of that, so it's going to be a pretty small increase in traffic to the overall system.

Thankfully for this gracious dedication of property by the current owner, we're hoping to alleviate a small portion of our housing challenges that we have. This project is ultimately intended to serve veterans and their families. It has a specific purpose. That's our goal here in the end of this whole process. Having already obtained that ARPA infrastructure grant, it will also benefit the whole southeast community of Grants Pass as well. Based on that, we're looking for a recommendation for approval of the Glen Crest zone map amendment to city council and we'll take any questions that you might have.

Go ahead Mr., I'm sorry, commissioner MacMillan. Oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Lindberg.

Lindberg.

I got the names right here.

That's all right. Is the infrastructure grant from ARPA, is that tied to this development?

The grant was intended for lower to moderate income, 120% of average median income or less for the people that will benefit from the housing development on the project.

If the development does not occur, the grant moves somewhere else or the-

Yes. I think right now AllCare Foundation has full intention of developing this two and a half acres for that purpose in whatever fashion we have to move forward with. Right now, the intention is for the Veterans Housing Project.

Okay, thank you.

Any other questions? Commissioner MacMillan?

Macmillan, under criteria three though without that grant, it still meets criteria three, correct?

Yes. We have the ability to extend infrastructure to that project across the frontages, yes.

Any other questions? Thank you.

Thank you.

I don't think we have an appellant, do we? No. I would like to keep the public comments to three minutes. If you have written material, please submit it so it can become part of the record. Make sure that light is on, on that microphone when you're speaking so that you can be heard. State your name and address for the record as well. If it's other than Smith and Jones, please spell the name so we can get it accurately in the record.

Anyone would like to speak at this time, come on forward. In fact, if you line up that'll make it go faster.

Make sure that's on. And name and address for the record please.

I'm Neil Burgess, county engineer with Josephine County Public Works. 201 River Heights Way, Grants Pass. I'm here to ask support from the Urban Area Planning Commission to recommend a traffic impact and analysis of the Glen Crest Way intersection with Cloverlawn Drive and Crestview Loop as a condition for a future development application accessing Glen Crest Way that may result from approval of this zone change application. As city staff did not require TIA with this application based upon the amount of residential units. However, this proposal abuts Cloverlawn drive, Glen Crest Way and to a lesser extent Crestview Loop. These roads are under county jurisdiction. There's a direct impact to these county facilities.

There's a threshold in the city planning code where if a certain number of trips are generated, then a TIA can be required. The application suggests a maximum of 188 trips per the report. That's if the whole site developed the exact number of trips, whether it's 198 or 201 or 401 it is not pertinent. What matters is that any increase in trips exceeds the capacity of Glen Crest Way. Glen Crest Way has a maximum capacity of five lots with the owner maintained restricted rural road residential classification. And this is under the Rural Planning Code.

In this case there is an exception of six lots for the 1983 Glen Crest estate subdivision plan. Any increase in trips modifies the original planning intent and requires a reclassification of Glen Crest Way. This reclassification and associated improvement to city standards provides an access for the requirement of a TIA. The practical matter for the TIA is that the intersection has poor sight distance for turning movements from Cloverlawn Drive westbound onto Crestview Loop and Glen Crest Way. Currently, you must drive into the curve past the intersection to see around the corner to the north before making the commitment to perform abut curve, left turn movement onto Glen Crest Way or Crestview Loop. Any new development with access to Glen Crest Way would exceed its capacity and aggravate this existing safety condition of the intersection. You can read through the public comments with most concerned with traffic safety at this intersection.

This has already been mentioned but to the higher volume and a higher speed intersection with accident history, the ADT is approximately 3600 ADT with recent applications for development that could push the ADT on Cloverlawn Drive to over 4000. The posted speed is 45 miles per hour the highest in the city, aside from a portion of Vine Street and the Parkway.

What I'm looking for in the TIA is to have guidance from a professional traffic engineer for safety and operational functionality for the intersection to accommodate reclassified Glen Crest Way to city street improvements. Anticipate improvements to realign Glen Crest Way to line up with Cloverlawn Drive. Justin touched on this with some of his proposals. Additional right of way was dedicated with partish plad 2003-83 to facilitate shifting Glen Crest Way to the south to square up the intersection. The current intersection has alignment site distance and unbalanced leg volumes that will need to be evaluated for intersection control to accommodate the new Glen Crest Way. The TIA can help identify stop control warrants, intersection influence areas of queuing and storage with adjacent commercial and residential accesses, conflict analysis with unbalanced traffic legs and other mitigation measures for safety and functionality.

As county engineer, I superintend work down upon county roads and I intend to require TIA as a condition of the engineering plan approval to obtain an encroachment permit to work upon a county road being Cloverlawn Drive for the new Glen Crest Way access. In summary, I'm asking for support of the Urban Area Planning Commission to recommend a traffic impact analysis of the Glen Crest Way intersection with Cloverlawn

Drive and Crestview Loop as a condition for future development applications accessing Glen Crest Way that may result from approval of this zone change application.

Thank you. The hearing is still open. Is there anyone that wishes to speak in opposition or in favor of this? Okay, come on forward. So, we have opposition.

Do we need to start the timer?

No, we do.

How many people are wishing to get up to speak? Yeah, could we time for three minutes please? Thank you. State your name and address for the record.

My name is Donna Lee Brooks. I live at 551 Crestview Loop, Grants Pass 97527. I came here to speak tonight to voice my opposition to the AllCare proposal to change the zoning of 220 Glen Crest Way from what it is now at RR5 to the R110 and exit into the city limits. The proposed project has shown in the application 12 units or 16 units as cottage clusters of multifamily rental housing. The application is unclear exactly how many units will be developed and what type of multifamily housing it will be. It's imperative that the neighbors know and understand what the proposal is, and the council understands what the proposal is to properly be able to evaluate it. It's going to have a huge impact on the livability and the safety of our community. We met with Doug Walker back in April and had some conversations with him about this development and he told us the proposal would be 10 tiny homes, two three-bedroom units and three two-bedroom units and that's quite a bit different.

You can see, there's been many different proposals and it's really hard to understand what the impact's going to be and how to analyze it if we don't know what they're going to be doing. I think other considerations that should be taken into account for this type of multifamily development, especially if we're talking about housing homeless veterans is it doesn't have any proximity to services. We're very far away from the hospital. It's over three miles and that's a really difficult walk down Cloverlawn Drive. Transportation, closest bus stop is on Rogue River Drive and Highway 99. Grocery stores, Safeway is over two miles away. It's a really long walk for folks that don't have transportation. Pharmacy is over two miles away over by Safeway. There's no parks in the vicinity whatsoever. Access to so social services are really imperative for this population. There is no access to social services and no access to mass transportation for these tenants, clients, whatever. There're other locations that would be more suitable to a development of this sort and I believe that a more dense development would suit and make an impact on this population that we're trying to serve in the city. To do that development in the city limit, this city owns land that is surplus land on Ramsey and Nebraska. That would be a perfect location to do a HUD 202 development, HUD 811 development. You could layer it with VASH vouchers. Wraparound supportive services, it's close to all needed services for these tenants, these clients. It's really important that we think about where we site projects like this in that location at Glen Crest is completely unsuitable to this type of development. Thank you.

Thank you. Next. Anyone wishes to speak in favor? Anyone wishes to speak against? Please come forward. State your name and address for the record.

My name is Terry Nelson. I live at 374 Glen Crest Way. There are water wells that serve the upper parcels that's to be annexed that are at the bottom of the hill. They have buried water lines and buried power lines. We may be in a situation where we get contaminated wells. I don't know what the situation would be there, but we've had no anybody tell us about what they're going to do with that other than they're going to keep it. The inclusion of this property into the community, I've read some of the development code, does not match any of the community surrounding. The other part is I'm all for the vets. I'm a vet, my brother served as a marine in Vietnam.

We're not against any of that type of situation, but what are we going to get for housing down there? Is there going to be any policing? I mean, how's that going to develop? Are we going to get rehab people? Nobody really knows what's going to happen there. The surrounding community has a lot of children in the area including people right next door. Are we going to get possible sex offenders? We don't have any idea at this point what's going to happen with that parcel down there. We do know one thing; it certainly does not fit in the community around this.

Okay, thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak in favor or against. Please come forward. State your name and address.

Hi, my name is Mason Hartford. I live at 218 Crestview Loop. I am all for helping the vets. I have two sons, both were in the military, both partial disabled. Agree that we need to do something to help them out, but this is not the area to do it in. The road as you see to the left, if you're coming from out of town and you're trying to turn onto Glen Crest, which I do quite often, most people cut to the gas station and the store parking lot because you can't see around that corner. What that doesn't show, there is a row of trees that also follows that road. That's on someone's property, you can't ask them to cut their trees down. Like I said, every time we come from the schools out there, and this is going to be multi-families, they're going to have kids that are going to school, and they'll be going to Hidden Valley High School. That road will be traveled. They have to cut across that intersection. It's not safe for them saying that there's only been four incidents. I've only lived in this neighborhood probably five or six years and I know of five incidents where people have ran into that mechanic shop parking lot. They may not all been filed according to what they say. That's a horrible intersection. This is not a good fit, and I don't approve of it. Thank you.

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to address the commission? Come forward. State your name and address for the record, please.

Joel Peterson, 380 Glen Crest Way. We love the idea of a veteran's village, but we stand against this proposal, this proposed development. Here are some of the reasons. The blind corner at Cloverlawn, Crestview Loop and Glen Crest Way is already a disaster. The fact that most of the residents cut through the parking lot of the market to avoid making a left across the oncoming traffic is enough reason not to add more housing. Our beloved, poor, disabled, or aged vets should not be subjected to this vehicular combat zone way out here this far from services. There's no sidewalk or safe way to walk towards town. I was almost hit walking my dog down to the Hamilton Trail that is the Fruitdale bike path I guess they call it, which is now just in preparation for 20 plus new homes, which will add more traffic to this corner by the way.

We're also concerned that the grant money for veterans is being used to bring in city water that will in the end, open up the remaining properties for development. So now

future developers get the benefit of what was intended for veterans. Usually, developers pay to bring in water. This proposed location is far from services that these vets need every day. Is this project for veterans benefit or for the developers and builders who will profit from the future development made possible by this project? Also, a concern is the expensive development cost to build in a densely treed, steep granite and sloping lot to access these little 500 to 700 square foot units. Why not save the taxpayer money and build this project close to the needed services where it's flat and has sworn water there and it's zoned for this type of project?

Please consider something like the two properties at 867 and 899 East Park Street between the fire station and the HUD senior housing. We think it's zoned for this type of project and has all the utilities and it's flat with not many trees. I think they're still for sale. Also consider the city owned property on Ramsey that was already mentioned. Also, I talked to most of my neighbors on Cloverlawn. The neighbors closest to this corner at this proposed development and they all are wondering the same thing. Why put these veterans out here so far from services and not to mention on such a busy, dangerous corner? They all thought it's a bad location for this type of development. To summarize, we think this is a great idea, but a bad location. Please find more appropriate location for this project. Respectfully, Joel Lore Peterson.

Thank you. Next, anybody? Are we speaking in favor or against?

Against. My name is Mike McKittrick. I live at 290 Crestview Loop.

What was the last name? I'm sorry.

McKittrick.

Can you spell that please?

M C K I T T R I C K.

My concerns is, I'm going to echo some of the people that have already spoken. As a neighbor in this area, we have no idea what the plans are going to be. That would be one thing I would caution about approving it or kicking this down the road is that we don't know what it's going to be and that causes me to have some pause. Secondly, their proposal puts 17 homes in a very small area. If those homes are multifamily homes, that could increase all the way to 34 people in a very small area. When you're looking at an area that's starting out at 2.5 acres, once you put roads in and stuff like that, that area becomes very densely populated with veterans.

Another thing is that some of the houses that I've heard, once again, I don't know what these proposed lot sizes are, but when you hear that they're 500, 600, 700 square feet, it's very small. I just don't think that that's what our veterans deserve and how that money should be spent. There're other alternatives. My last point is that turn, I heard the statistic that there's three accidents. If you haven't driven on it, drive on it. People rip around that, those curves very, very fast. And so right now there's the 90 degree turn and there's the traffic that comes from Crestview Loop and Crestview Way, but Crestview Way is a very small amount of people. And so, you're doubling it or tripling the amount of people that are going to be coming down that road. And I leave for work every single day and that is, it's a crapshoot.

Go drive it yourself. Go from both directions, come down, see what that's like when you're on that intersection and you will know that it is an unsafe intersection. And so,

when I've got kids, I've got a freshman and I've got a seventh grader, so that gives me pause.

I guess my last point is this, is that my wife and I bought that property a year and a half ago and the great thing was is that we were out of town a little bit, and our backyard had woods. In less than a year, by this proposal, the proposal puts a street in my backyard. So now instead of looking out, from a personal point of view, looking out of my backyard and seeing a nice, wooded area, now you're putting a street in my backyard. So, thank you.

Thank you. Anyone else?

This property should not be rezoned and annexed-

Excuse me, Ma'am, name, and address for the record please.

Sorry. Sorry. My name is Nina A. Halt, and I live at 200 Crestview Loop. This property should not be rezoned and/or annexed into the city of Grants Pass. This development, which I assume is the push for the changes, does not fit our area. And once this property is rezoned and annexed into the city, it leaves it open for any developer, regardless of whether they are able to complete it. The neighborhood does not support the Glen Crest Way Cottages. And I have signed paperwork that I've made, and I don't really know, we made copies for-

You can drop that off with the staff at the end.

Okay. How many, 51?

51 signatures.

So that proves that most of the, and we haven't even had time to go around to everybody to find out if they're for it or against it, but those signatures are not for it. I've been accused of being NIMBY, but I say, we have a right to want to have our neighborhood safe and to grow as it would naturally and not because you have to fill a mandate. If you are just fulfilling a mandate, you overlook all of the real issues which we have outlined in our exhibits and our testimonies.

We moved in here because it was low density and now that we have invested part of our lives and our money into homes in this community, you are changing the density for all of the residents of this area. I'm not saying just a couple, all of the residents in this area. There are no sidewalks, gutters, they can't take the curves out of the road and Cloverlawn is a no-build on the 2040 transportation study. Furthermore, you are creating a very dangerous situation for all concerned. If you've not driven Glen Crest Way road and tried to access it going north, you cannot possibly understand the danger that you feel when you're approaching that. And the dangers that this poses to current residents, those who drive on Cloverlawn and the veterans you are trying to house here.

Let's forget about the fact that this is labeled veterans. This property should not be rezoned to accommodate such a large amount of people. It is not congruent with the rest of the neighborhood in any way. Not to mention the fact that it would create an erosion problem, which hasn't even been discussed at all, and possibly cause the rest of the hillside to become unstable. A single-family house suits the property, even two single family houses suit the property, but it will not diminish our property values.

While I support our veterans, I think you are actually doing them a disservice if you go ahead with this proposed development, as they will be more isolated from services that are in town. And so, I just ask you, please don't put quotas ahead of the people that live in this area. It would not be fair. And I've lived on that street for almost 30 years and believe me, there are so many more accidents than are reported. I'm right on that corner. I hear crashes all the time.

Thank you. Anyone else? Make sure you come forward, or otherwise I'll close the hearing.

Hi.

Name and address for the record.

My name is Bonnie McDonald and I live on 2317 Southeast Windham Way. I'm in the Meadow Woods subdivision. We're adjacent to the forest and I was wondering if you've done any kind of environmental impact study on this, because living in a forest is a lot different than living in town. And the wildlife that is in that forest is, we have cougars, bear, coyote, deer, fox, turkeys, hawks, skunks, raccoons, lots of squirrels, rodents, snakes, spiders, ticks, and a lot of other things. These are the things they don't have in the city. So, these people would have to learn to adapt to that. And when you live in a forest, you have a responsibility to take care of the forest and also to protect the wildlife. So, there's a lot of problems living there for people that are used to city life. Like you can't leave your small pets out or unattended because they become food for the wildlife. You can't plant a garden because all the wildlife eat your garden and your flowers. You can't leave your trash bags out because the wildlife will open it up and distribute it around for you. You have to keep the brush cleared for fire prevention. Squirrels, if you leave your cars outside, I don't know if they're going to have covered parking for all the cars, but if you leave any of your cars out, the squirrels and the rodents climb up in them and they love to make a nest in there and they eat all the electrical. We had that problem already.

In the wintertime in the forest area, it gets very slippery in the wintertime. So even walking can be dangerous and just taking the trash bins out can be a real challenge for people, especially if they have health issues.

One carelessly thrown cigarette could start a fire and we could all lose our homes.

There's a lot of brush in that forest. It's very fragile, I should say. I've noticed where I live, the power goes out quite often. We happen to have a generator, which is nice, but the power goes out quite often and it's because people driving down Cloverlawn go too fast, they hit the power poles, knock them down, and then the powers out. And sometimes it's been out for over a day.

Internet and dish are iffy in a wooded area, so their entertainment might be limited. In the wintertime, when it's cold, is snowy and rainy, it can be very isolating. At least in town, you could walk to a restaurant and get a cup of coffee and socialize with people, but when they're out there all by themselves, it can be very isolating for them. And Cloverlawn is not safe to walk on or ride a bike on.

And my final concern is that if this becomes a low barrier neighborhood with high density population, will this become a high risk for fires that will cause all of us living there to lose our homeowner's insurance. I don't know if you're familiar with the fire risk maps that came out last year, and I know some people in my neighborhood that lost their

homeowner's insurance because they classified us in a high risk and we're in a neighborhood. So, I'm concerned about that.

I love and support the veterans, but I don't believe this is a safe place for them, isolated in the forest. In the city, it would be better for them close to resources, supplies, and the support that they need. So, thank you for your time.

Thank you. Come on up. Anyone? Come on up.

Hi, my name is Barb Street. Street like a road, and my address is 296 Crestview Loop. And I'll just read my comments. I would like to state that I am wholeheartedly in favor of any projects that support veterans, and a lot of people have said that. But I am not in favor of this project because of all the previous reasons, but also mainly because of the extreme safety risk due to its location.

As has been mentioned, this intersection is extremely hazardous because of traffic coming from five directions and converging at this intersection. My greatest concern is the area of grave danger for traffic coming from the, I was going to say south, but I think it's the west on Cloverlawn, heading up towards Fruitdale, and that's where the blind spot is. When you are trying to come from Cloverlawn there and you're trying to go across the intersection to Glen Crest, that's the only way you can get across, is to go across that intersection.

And I did that with my car just a few days ago and even though I gunned it to get across, I was really in fear for my life. It was scary and it was just lucky that I wasn't in an accident, and that is the only way when you're coming from the west on Cloverlawn that the people can get over to Glen Crest. Not only are you risking being hit from oncoming traffic, but you're at risk from being hit from behind because you have 45 mile an hour traffic behind you coming along, and they're coming from a curve which is over by that Hamilton project.

This Glen Crest Way Cottage Village will increase traffic due not only to the veterans living there, but the employees, the visitors, and other staff using this site. And even though it's just a small increase in traffic, one accident is not and never is acceptable. For over 20 years, I've provided hearing services to veterans in White City outside of Medford and for Portland. And what was most important was to hear the veterans' stories of the sacrifices they made and the difficulties that they faced afterwards. This project is commendable; however, the location is going to put the veterans in danger. So, I guess the question to you is, what role do you want to play? Are you willing to chance placing them in harm's way? Once again, thanks.

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to address the commission? State your name and address for the record please.

Jay and Barbara Conley, 321 Glen Crest Way. My husband is a veteran, and we honor veterans. We live on Glen Crest Way, we've lived on Glen Crest Way for 33 years, and would like to paint a picture to show you why we live there. We choose to live there because it has the rural setting we were looking for, beauty and the peacefulness of nature, as well as the animals that come to visit-

Can you speak closer to the mic please?

Okay. As well as the animals that come to visit near us and we enjoy watching them. We enjoy our privacy, as do our neighbors, and the feeling that nature gives all of us. When

we are eventually annexed into the city, we are hopeful that this land will be utilized to its fullest potential. We are concerned that the proposed low-income housing project will discourage builders from building medium to higher range housing as they have done in Meadow Woods. We hope you will consider the concerns of all the people living in our close proximity in this proposed development. Thank you. Pinpoint part is nervous. Thank you.

Thank you. Anyone else wishes to address the commission?

My name is Mark Linnemeyer. I live at 2430 Cloverlawn Drive, Grants Pass, Oregon.

What was your last name, sir?

Linnemeyer.

You wanna pull that mic-

With an L. Oh yeah.

There you go.

Better?

Yeah.

My property is adjacent to the proposed location for the Glen Crest Cottages Project. Pushing this project to the furthest outskirts of town, far from supervision and services, makes no sense at all. I am in favor of providing affordable housing resources for veterans who are trying to get back on their feet. However, the appropriate location for this project is closer to the middle of town, where it is within safe and easy walking distance to essential services, and where it can be closely supervised and policed to maintain the safety and welfare of the veterans and all those in the vicinity of the project. The Glen Crest location would place these veterans, already an at-risk population, in a dangerous situation. Even with improving the road with sidewalks, there is no public transportation to and from the location. Pedestrians would be traveling this already hazardous corner in greater number and frequency, while vehicle traffic would also be increasing dramatically from this project and the surrounding developments. The increase in pedestrian and vehicle traffic would predictably lead to an increase in the number and severity of accidents.

The various plans so far presented for this project are more consistent with the urban setting in the middle of town. They're incongruent with the rural landscape of the Glen Crest neighborhood. All of us who live in this neighborhood have chosen to do so because we prefer the open spaces, woodlands, and distance between homes. We have trusted our neighborhood to be safe under the strict zoning laws which were established to preserve these rural qualities. Simply liberalizing the zoning laws does not suddenly make it appropriate to bring urban development into our backyards. When my children learned of the possibility of the city putting a low-income tiny home compound on our property line, they immediately thought of an encampment overrun with problems.

They couldn't help but imagine crime, trash, drugs, fires, and strange people wandering in the woods to our home. They were horrified. They said they wouldn't feel safe at home

anymore. And what could I honestly tell them to assure them otherwise? These are smart kids who have seen the disgusting conditions currently tolerated in our parks and other public spaces. Why should they believe me if I tell them this project would somehow be different, especially if it indeed is to be a low barrier facility?

Regardless of the high standards that AllCare claims will be maintained on the project site, I cannot imagine the tenants will be evicted into the street for violating the by-laws. This would be contrary to solving the homeless crisis. The more violations are tolerated, the more violations will occur, until the site becomes an encampment overrun with problems. It will likely still be regarded as a success by those who developed it, while those of us most affected will be left to live with the situation or move.

By signing your name to approve this project in order to solve a small part of the affordable housing crisis, you would be creating a long-term safety hazard that would be a disservice to veterans and would continue to plague our neighborhood for the foreseeable future. Thank you.

Thank you. Anyone else? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing.

Mr. Chair?

Chair. Oh, I'm sorry.

Applicant.

I can't close it yet.

Yeah.

All right. Does the applicant have any final comments? Sorry, I was just overlooking you.

Thank you, Justin Gerlitz again. I, as always, appreciate the neighbors to come in and share their concerns. Regardless of the outcome, it always helps us with the projects and planning these projects. I do always like to clarify the items that I can. I do understand that we're probably not going to take away everyone's concerns tonight, but there were a few items that were mentioned I think I can answer.

One is location. So, I'm very involved with all kinds of housing in Grants Pass, some of it more on the affordable side. And there's only a couple different organizations in Grants Pass that are able to do that. And one of the biggest challenges we have with affordability is the cost of infrastructure and the cost of land. The cost of buildings are somewhat fixed wherever you go in the city. They're very similar. It doesn't matter if you're on flatland or on the corner over here or in the southeast side of town.

So, one of the things that we constantly have to look for to keep buildings affordable, whether they're for workforce housing or veterans, is land that's typically no-cost or very low-cost and infrastructure that is available or able to be available. In this case, the owner of the property has been very gracious in donating half of this property for this project.

And then we were also very fortunate with this ARPA grant to get a grant for the infrastructure to bring it out there. On those ARPA grants, one thing to note on those is, that is money that the city's been provided. It was essentially Covid relief funding, but it was intentionally targeted towards infrastructure shortages for affordable type housing, which is one of the biggest challenges we have in our community when it comes to these

outlying areas. And that money expires, it expires pretty quickly, and it has to be spent and it has to be spent on these types of projects. So that in addition to the donated property is why it's at this location. And that's really the main reason.

There was some concerns about the water wells. There are some water wells on the southeast corner of this property. Those will be maintained. Any impacts to the piping for those wells would be mitigated. We don't know exactly where they're at, but we can confirm that they would be repaired and not taken out of service. When it comes to policing, as part of the annexation process of this zone map amendment, which is the combined part, that would bring it into the city, and it would bring police out to this area. So that could be looked at as a benefit. Development type, not matching the existing communities. One of the biggest challenges we have with Urban Growth Boundaries is right now on the surface, this didn't used to be in the Urban Growth Boundary of the city, but it has been brought into the Urban Growth Boundary. And because of that, it is the logical development path forward for the city to expand. Although there are larger rural type lots out here right now.

I think there's often concerns with the term affordable housing. This is definitely veterans-based housing, but it isn't just for single veterans. It isn't just for veterans that have issues. It's affordable housing. It's also going to be available for veteran's families, couples, retired folks. So, I think we want to make sure that we convey the message that it isn't just, this isn't a homeless camp, this isn't anything along those lines.

And then lastly, when it comes to the transportation component, obviously tonight, I think the overarching concern is traffic safety. We're aware of that, we're aware of that when we started the project and when we saw the comments from the written comments from the neighbors, most of which are probably here tonight. This zone map amendment again is just the first step. The development itself is typically where we evaluate the traffic safety in much greater detail, which we anticipate will be done. And these curves out there, we're doing a project down the street, also has to, we have to do improvements to that curve. I don't know why they were built that way, but they were. And so now we have to make sure we accommodate them accordingly and make as safe condition as possible there. So, I don't want anyone to think here in the room tonight that that's going to go unannounced or we're going to sweep it under the rug. It is definitely going to be evaluated, and it will be evaluated when the project details become what more refined. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any additional questions commission might have.

Any questions for the applicant? No?

I do, Tokarz-Krauss. I know this is the initial phase and you're taking good care to give steps. These good people have brought up comments skipping the first few steps, which are the change of zoning, the annexation, the next step that you just talked about is really what they're trying to address right at this point in time. A little early, but good for you to know so that you can put it into perspective in your initial research. Since obviously transportation issues is a huge concern and has been for a number of years. Did you come across anything where these people have approached the county, which it would be in their domain to resolve these significantly dangerous issues. I mean, that's not your job, but have you come across that because it would impact what you're going to be doing?

Yeah, I haven't come across anything formal between the city and the county and I know city and the county are here today, so if there's anything that might be able to share with

her, that'd be great. But it is something with development, it's always a how do you best tie into what's been constructed in the past. No matter if it's a single house or it's a giant subdivision or a commercial facility. And traffic safety's always something we look at. Right now, this intersection as we showed in our presentation, has a single leg going up Glen Crest, which is not really the safest condition because you can have opposing traffic. It has a driveway that's right next to Glen Crest right now that I fully anticipate will probably tie into Glen Crest so it's not the fifth leg of the intersection if you want to call it that.

And then the Crest View Loop where the Crest View Loop stop sign and stop bar is located right now is substantially south from what I considered the intersection. I think there's a lot of improvements that could be done here to make it safer and I think those will definitely be part of the proposal. But yes, again, zone map amendment is first, that's just putting a zone on the map. It's already the underlying urban residential zoning underneath. Partition to split this half of the project off is second, has to happen after the zone map is adopted and then the development proposal comes as a third step.

Okay. Commissioner, I believe that is Lindberg. Yeah.

That's me. Lindberg. Hey Justin, did Josephine County Public Works approach about requesting a TIA at this phase?

Not before tonight, no.

Okay. Thank you.

Any other questions? Okay. And then we go to, I believe the staff. Any final comments?

Would it be okay if Doug Walker would sit a minute?

Yeah.

So, to address, I don't really have a whole lot more to address than what Justin has already addressed.

Say your name and address please.

Doug Walker. I live at 1144 Southwest Lee Lane. I am a volunteer with Mid Rogue Foundation. We are the organization that's proposing this project. So, Justin covered most of the stuff that the neighbors brought up some of the concerns and issues. I think the only other thing I would touch on is that the people ... the intent here is for these people that will live there, they're under standard landlord tenant law. This is not a low barrier facility. This is not a facility aimed at homeless. It's just workforce, workforce value, workforce cost, housing aimed at veterans and the ... so the concerns about it being low barrier or homeless are not accurate. That's not our target audience for this.

Thank you. Any additional comments from the staff?

Sure. None from staff?

Not now. Okay.

I might add just a couple of clarifications. The term multi-family was brought up, there's a lot of different definitions out there. The state of Oregon and the city of Grants Pass do define multi-family as a single structure that has at least five dwelling units inside one structure. So just to clarify that, this as we've seen tonight, would not be defined as multi-family.

The Ramsey Nebraska site just wanted to touch on that because that was brought up by a couple of folks. It is true that there's a little over two acres at the corner of Ramsey and Nebraska near the hospital. The city has been for about a year and a half, two years in conversations with Chrisman Development. We actually have an agreement with them to build 60 to 66 units on that property. So, there is a commitment on that property.

And then finally, in terms of not knowing the use, I know some of the concerns that were mentioned tonight. There's uncertainty about the exact land use. You've heard the applicant clarify some of that. But just to clarify, there are many cities that do sometimes require a specific land use application with a rezone. However, the city of Grants Pass code doesn't actually mandate that. So that's why we accepted the application without a specific... There's a concept and we really encourage that, and they did provide the concept, but right now as written, the city's development code doesn't actually mandate the specific development with the rezone. I guess I'll stop there and then if you have ... there's different options that Mark presented in terms of your options before you tonight as far as approving or continuing.

I did have a question for staff in regards to, recently we went through the middle housing code that the state mandate, is that enforced on this area as well?

Yes. It would apply once.

The cluster housing concept-

Correct-

... And all of that?

Correct, correct, that's right.

And then so for the public, my understanding of that code is that there really will not be an opportunity for the comments when this project comes forward or is there?

There is up ahead in terms of the next, the city council piece for the annexation will come up ahead as a public hearing.

It's the annexation.

... There'll be public comment there-

So-

And in terms of when they do file the development permit, there'll be opportunity also to comment.

Yeah, the partition process, the city is required to give written notification on a partition, which as the applicant mentioned, they would need to do. So, there would be a mailer that would be sent out for that. You are correct vice chair though, in terms of the actual development itself under middle housing, the rules right now, we do give notice, but it's not to provide opportunity for significantly changing or commenting because we have to allow, if as long as they comply with all the minimum access landscaping height standards, then we are required to allow middle housing to proceed.

Thank you. I was just contemplating what we ... that had occurred, and it was a state action that caused that. So, it was forced upon all the large cities, and they included Grants Pass as a large city. So those are some of the things that we have to work under as a planning commission as well. This is a rezone correct that we're doing at this time, nothing to do with the project itself. An application was submitted for a rezone. We have to consider that just to make sure everything is clear. Okay. Did you have a question for the staff?

Commissioner MacMillan, can you go back to the slide that you had the options on for when we close the public hearing, we have that to look at. Thank you ...

Oh, I thought you were continuing. I'm sorry. You're pulling tricks on me already. All right, Commissioner Lindberg.

Lindberg. So, Mark, what's the things have changed since I was in the planning department. What's the minimum lot size again for R110 these days? Is it 9000 square feet?

Give me a minute. I have to look it up myself.

And then second thing to consider while you're looking that up is, since this is an applicant driven zone change, does this set precedent for the rest of the neighborhood or are the adjoining property owners if they want to consider a zone change to something else that's LR, are they able to request any of the zoning that is within LR and how do we decide what's proper and not have a bunch of spot zones?

Yes. Any property owner could request any of the three zone options that are in that LR designation. So, the appropriateness is really assessed with the application itself. We don't have a lot of guidance on that to be honest with you in the code. If it's low density residential in the comp plan and they come in with one of those three zones, generally speaking, they're going to get whichever one they're requesting. Especially given the middle housing code now, which allows for a number of different uses no matter what your zone is.

Anybody else?

Sorry, Commissioner Lindberg, R110, 9000 square feet for dwelling unit.

Okay, thank you.

And what was the question in regards to?

Oh, this is Lindberg. I wanted to know what the minimum lot size was because I'm just curious if this were a standard development potential, how many single-family homes might potentially fit on a five-acre lot and with the 9,000 square feet, it's quite a few. So just curious. Thank you.

All right. Okay. I think we can close the public hearing at this time, and we will move on with discussion from the commission and their considerations. If I could have a motion and then we can discuss that.

Chairman, do you want a motion first and then discussion-

... Put it on the table.

Okay. I want to be clear what the motion is, to recommendation to the city council for the zone map amendment. We can't make a recommendation for annexation, correct?

Okay. [inaudible 01:20:38] Annexation.

So, I make a motion for a zone map amendment. Is that 401-00103-23, and no?

That is the project number?

Yeah, that's a project. We're doing a zoning map amendment. So, you would be approving-

Where's my number?

Change to the map?

I did the right one. I did the correct one. I make a motion for 10, 401-00103-23.

Okay. Do I have a second?

Arthur second.

Okay, we have a motion and a second discussion. Yes. Commissioner Lindberg.

Yes. So, this is a relatively ... like Commissioner MacMillan said we're looking at just the zoning portion and I should have asked this of staff before this, but we can still ask staff questions at this stage, correct?

I believe you [inaudible 01:22:02]. No, you can't. You-

Oh, I can't.

You closed all that.

Oh, I thought we could ask staff questions at all times. So, I am a little concerned about the fact that we have a last-minute request from Josephine County for a traffic study

when throughout the record there is no mention of it. In fact, the city's traffic engineer specifically said that one is not required at this stage.

Would you like to make a friendly amendment to-

No, I would not. I want to make sure that that is not part of the amendment to include that as a condition of approval for zone change. That there is no traffic impact analysis as a condition of approval for zone change. Because nowhere on the record is it stated that one is needed.

Macmillan here, it's not part of the criteria. It was brought up that when it goes to the next step that the traffic analysis is not at this point. It has to be within the-

[inaudible 01:23:08]-

... Criteria of the zone map. When the next step happens, the applicant was very open to the fact that there should be a traffic impact and at that time that's when that will happen. But it can't happen now.

She's set up better than me.

Anybody else with question or comment?

Tokarz-Krauss here, I just noted that during the conversation or about that the gentleman from the county regarding the transportation did raise his hand, but then he did not opt to speak when you were just making this clarification, Commissioner MacMillan. He signified that that was in fact where that seemed to belong, if I've got that correct with the thumbs up. So, I just want to make sure that that was pointed out for the record.

This is always hard in the land use process because you go through a growth management comprehensive planning stage. You have opportunities as public come in and talk about what their zoning is going to be in the future, looking at maps and so forth. And then you come down the road years later when the actual annexation or the rezones take place. It's very difficult. I understand. I think everybody here understands, but hopefully you can work with the engineer or whoever develops this property and see what comes out of that process. But at this time, we're taking on the annexation, or I'm sorry, the annexation and the rezone.

The zone. Only the zone. Only the zone. But MacMillan here, Commissioner MacMillan, 10 years ago when we looked at the urban growth boundary and we were moving boundaries and putting stuff where it was, I've been on commission since '96 and then was off a couple of times but was back on the commission when we made these lines. This is not outside of what we had planned a decade ago. It's called the urban growth boundary because there is going to be growth going out there. And furthermore, it meets the seven criteria that are put out on the first four, the zone map amendment. It also meets, which is not in the motion, the six criteria of the annexation, but that's up to the city council. This definitely meets all seven criteria.

So, we have a motion for the recommendation to the city council to prove the tax amendment for the zone. Do you want a roll call or do you want to do-

I call the question unless somebody else has something.

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

Aye.

Yeah, I think you have to roll call-

We want roll calls.

You got to do it.

You want [inaudible 01:26:01]-

... Individually.

All right, Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

I approve.

Commissioner MacMillan.

MacMillan, yes.

Commissioner Lindberg?

Yes.

And Commissioner Arthur?

Yes.

And I vote yes as well. Commissioner Nelson.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner MacMillan moved, and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to recommend to the city council to prove the tax amendment for the zone. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Vice Chair Nelson, Commissioners Arthur, Heesacker, Tokarz-Krauss, Lindberg, and MacMillan. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None.

Absent: Chair Collier.

The motion passed.

All right. We get our other commissioner back. We'll give you a few minutes here to ... God. We still have other business to attend to. So, if you could take your conversations outside, please... Ladies, ladies, ma'am? Ma'am? Hello? Hey, can you take conversations outside please? Thank you, Mr. Clark... All right.

7. Matters from Commission Members and Staff

We have matters from commission members and staff. Let's start with staff.

Well, can I make a comment?

You can certainly make comments.

As long as it's not about this item because it's-

Yeah, you can't make a comment about this. Yeah.

You can't make a about that item because everything related to this has to be available to the public.

Yeah.

Just to clarify.

Which is fine. Tell me if this is inappropriate or not. Two of the people in that room approached me earlier and I did tell them I could not discuss this with them. They were close friends of my husband's. We discussed other matters. They were here for quite some time. I wanted to clarify there was no discussion. No reason for me to recuse myself. Anyway, so that's all.

All right. Staff.

I have nothing read. Yeah, nothing from staff.

Okay. We did have one thing that we had a resignation, didn't we?

Yes. I'm sorry. So, Clint Sheriff, Commissioner Clint Sheriff resigned last week from the commission. So, we do have a vacant county seat that will go out.

A county vacancy, right?

Correct.

Any other from commission members to HOD in here?

This is a matter before the commission, so it does fall under that. In the past I made a just about expertise information. You had to have had conversations specific to whatever is before you. That we are in a small community, and I think we know people. We've had Justin before us, Malcolm Drake was on the commission when we did the 10-year plan. We're bound to know people within our community and it's just fine if we didn't discuss the plan itself. We don't need to announce it. That's very clear in the law, I think.

I certainly will echo that. Serving 20 some years on a county council in a county that I knew everybody, it is hard. And people call you, talk to you and so forth, and you just have to tell, you know. All right. Anybody else?

So, at our last meeting I promised you all-

Commissioner Heesacker.

Thank you, Commissioner Heesacker. At our last meeting, I promised you all a 30-minute presentation. And-

Did you bring it?

Tonight, I didn't bring it either, so no, I don't have anything except did everybody have fun at Boatnik.

All right. Anyone else? Seeing none. We're adjourned.

[inaudible 01:31:10].

I'm following you.

[inaudible 01:31:16]

Yeah, I'm going to take that. [inaudible 01:31:34] Doctors are still trying to figure me out.

**CITY OF GRANTS PASS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**ZONE MAP AMENDMENT AND ANNEXATION
FINDINGS OF FACT**

Procedure Type:	Type IV-B: Urban Area Planning Commission Recommendation with City Council Final Action
Project Number:	401-00103-23 and 403-00103-23
Project Type:	Zone Map Amendment and Annexation
Owner(s):	Drake Living Trust
Applicant:	AllCare Community Foundation
Representative:	Doug Walker
Property Address:	220 Glen Crest Way
Map and Tax Lot:	36-05-29-D0, TL 3401
Zoning:	Low Density Residential (RR-5 County; R-1-10 City)
Size:	5 acres
Planner Assigned:	Donna Rupp
Application Date:	March 29, 2023
Application Complete:	April 5, 2023
Date of Staff Report:	May 17, 2023
Date of UAPC Hearing:	May 24, 2023
Date of Findings of Fact	June 14, 2023
120 Day Deadline:	August 3, 2023

Note: ***Bold Italic Text*** indicates text added by the UAPC that was not contained in the staff report. ~~Strikeout Text~~ indicates deletions made by the UAPC.

I. PROPOSAL:

The Applicant is requesting approval of a Zone Map Amendment and Annexation into the City Limits. The Applicant proposes to change the subject parcel underlying Zone Map designation from Josephine (County) RR-5 to Grants Pass (City) R-1-10. (Note: The Urban Area Planning Commission does not make a recommendation to City Council for Annexation Applications and will make a recommendation on the Zone Map Amendment only.)

II. AUTHORITY:

Section 2.020: Schedule 2-1; Sections 2.062, 2.063, and 2.064 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code (GPDC) authorize the Urban Area Planning Commission to review the application at a duly noticed public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council. Section 2.066 grants the City Council the authority to approve, conditionally approve or deny a Type IV application after receiving the findings and evidence from the Planning Commission.

III. CRITERIA:

In order to recommend approval of the project as proposed, the project must be consistent with Section 4.033 (Amendments) and Section 5.053 (Annexation) of the Grants Pass Development Code. The Criteria are identified and analyzed in the Sections presented below.

IV. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Final action on the proposal will be considered by the City Council. As such, the Urban Area Planning Commission recommendation is not subject to appeal. Section 10.060 of the Development Code provides for an appeal of the City Council decision to the Oregon Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) within twenty-one (21) days of the final written decision, as provided in ORS 197.830.

V. PROCEDURE:

- A.** An application for a Zone Map Amendment and Annexation was received on March 29, 2023 and deemed complete on April 5, 2023. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.
- B.** Public notice of the May 24, 2023 hearing was mailed on May 3, 2023, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.
- C.** A public hearing was held on May 24, 2023 and the UAPC recommended approval of the Zone Map Amendment.

VI. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- A.** The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the Staff Report, which is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein.
- B.** The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on May 24, 2023, attached as Exhibit "B", summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.
- C.** The MS PowerPoint presentations given by staff and the applicant are attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated herein.
- D.** Neighbors in opposition of the proposed future development submitted a letter and petition with 54 signatures, attached as Exhibit "D" and are incorporated herein.

VII. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The UAPC found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and the staff report, the proposal meets the criteria in Section 4.033 of the Development Code based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.

VIII. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION:

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
 - a. Comprehensive Plan: Low Density Residential (LR)
 - b. Zone District: County RR-5; Proposed, City R-1-10
 - c. Special Purpose District: None
2. Size: 5 acres
3. Frontage: Cloverlawn Drive ~ Collector
Glen Crest Way ~ County Restricted Residential
4. Access: Glen Crest Way
5. Existing Public Utilities:
 - a. Water: Well. Nearest Main is 925 ft. to the north at Robertson Lane
 - b. Sewer: 8-inch main at intersection of Glen Crest Way and Cloverlawn Drive.
 - c. Storm: Open ditch in Cloverlawn Drive
6. Proposed Public Utilities: None (Zone Change and Annexation Only)
7. Topography: Areas of moderate to significant slopes
8. Natural Hazards: 15-25% Steep Slope Hazard Area
9. Natural Resources: Significant Stands of Trees
10. Existing Land Use: Residential

B. Background and Discussion:

Zone Map Amendment:

The proposal is for the approval of a Zone Map Amendment. The Applicant proposes the conversion of the Zone Map designation from RR-5 to R-1-10. According to Comprehensive Plan Policy #13.5.2(c), this application is classified as a Minor Amendment.

The foundation of land use planning in Oregon is a set of 19 Statewide Land Use Planning Goals. The goals express the state's policies on land use and related topics, like citizen

involvement, housing, and natural resources.

Oregon's statewide goals are achieved through local comprehensive planning. State law requires each city and county to adopt a comprehensive plan and the zoning and land-division ordinances needed to put the plan into effect.

Both the Comprehensive Plan map and Zone map designations depict how land can be used and developed over time, using a set of “designations” and “zones” (shown as colors on the maps). Both show broad categories of uses, such as residential, mixed use, industrial, employment and open space. They also convey information about the scale of future development (the type and size of buildings).

The Comprehensive Plan Map depicts a long-term vision of how and where the City will grow and change over the next 20 years to accommodate expected population and job growth. The subject property’s Comprehensive Plan Map Designation is Low Density Residential (LR), which includes the R-1-8, R-1-10 and R-1-12 zoning designations as options.

Decisions about Comprehensive Plan designations directly guide and influence subsequent decisions about zoning. The City’s Zoning Map regulates how land can be used and what can be built on any given property today. Zones are more specific than the Comprehensive Plan designations and come with a set of rules (included in the City’s Development Code) that clarify what uses are allowed (e.g., residences, businesses, manufacturing), and how buildings may be developed or changed (e.g., maximum heights, parking requirements, and required setbacks from property lines).

The Comprehensive Plan Map and the Zoning Map are like a leader and a follower. The plan map is the leading map and the zone map is the following map. The zone map can “catch up” to the plan map, but it can’t go past it. This relationship between the Comprehensive Plan Map and the Zoning Map guides the potential zone map designation as the property owner seeks to change zoning districts within the same Comprehensive Plan designation. With the property designation listed as Low Density Residential (LR) in the Comprehensive Plan, the possible Zone Map Designations include R-1-8, R-1-10 and R-1-12. The Applicant has requested the R-1-10 Zoning Map Designation.

During a pre-application conference, the Applicant included potential development plans for residential development (“Cottage Cluster” housing) on the subject parcel. Any application for future development of housing would be a separate application and would include additional review criteria. At the time of this report the development standards for Cottage Cluster housing are the same within the three proposed zoning districts and are permitted uses in all three.

Annexation:

The Applicant seeks annexation of the Subject Property for development of a veterans affordable housing cottage development. After annexation, the Applicant plans to partition the 5 acres into two parcels, each at approximately 2.5 acres. The owners plan to donate the east parcel to the AllCare Community Foundation for use as the Glen Crest Veteran Village project. County zoning does not allow for this type of development or lot size in the RR5 zone, creating the need for annexation.

The City and Josephine County have signed the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for the Orderly Management of the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary Area, which regulates urbanization and establishes the regulatory process for development in the Urban Growth Boundary Area. The IGA was adopted under Resolution 14-6266. This agreement allows Annexation outright for this property and annexation is required for this project to move forward.

Public Comment:

The Community Development department received 14 public comments opposing the overall proposal and future development, ***with 8 more received between the time the staff report was published and the deadline for public comments on May 22, 2023.***

IX. FINDINGS IN CONFORMANCE WITH APPLICABLE CRITERIA:

A. For Zone Map Amendments, Section 4.033 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code requires that all of the following criteria be met:

CRITERION 1: The proposed use, if any, is consistent with the proposed Zoning District.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. The proposed use of the subject parcel is categorized under the “Residential” Land Use Type found in Schedule 12-2 of the Grants Pass Development Code. As per GPDC Schedule 12-2, “Residential” Uses are permitted as a primary use in the R-1-10 zoning district, which is the zone being requested.

CRITERION 2: The proposed Zoning District is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. The existing Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation is Low Density Residential (LR). As per GPDC Schedule 12-1, the proposed R-1-10 zone is allowed in lands designated LR. Staff agrees with the analysis provided by the Applicant and finds the proposal to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation.

CRITERION 3: A demonstration that existing or proposed levels of basic urban services can accommodate the proposed or potential development without adverse impacts upon the affected service area or without a change to adopted utility plans.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. The existing zone for the existing five (5) acre parcel is RR5, developed with a single-family residence making use of a well and septic system. After Annexation, the Applicant proposes to partition the parcel into two, 2.5 acre lots. The existing home will remain on the current infrastructure on the western 2.5-acre lot. The eastern 2.5-acre lot is proposed to be developed with 12-16 cottages pursuant to Oregon’s Middle Housing Code which allows for cottage development, which is not subject to the City’s maximum density criteria.

The project was recently awarded a public infrastructure grant through the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) program to extend both public water and sewer to, and across, the frontage of the project on both streets. Installation of these utilities will provide basic urban services without adverse impacts. The water and sewer line extensions are considered a benefit for future development in the area.

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

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. The proposed zone change is consistent with the functions, capacities, and performance standards of transportation facilities as identified in the 2040 Grants Pass Transportation System Plan (TSP). Specifically, the TSP classifies Cloverlawn Drive as a Collector. Per Table 3-1 of the TSP, Collector streets are intended to carry from 3,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day, including some through traffic. There are no recent traffic counts available in this section of Cloverlawn but the Public Works Department estimates current volumes in this segment of Cloverlawn fall well below the maximum threshold. ***Comments from the Josephine County Transportation Planner indicate that data was collected 23 months ago, 278 ft. east of the parcel's SE corner indicating Average Daily Trips of 3,623 with an 85th percentile speed of 34.9 mph.*** Figures 4-4 and 4-8 of the TSP show deficits in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in this area. Future development will need to bring both the Cloverlawn and Glen Crest Way street frontages into full compliance with the City's minimum street design standards.

Per the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) GIS web data, submitted by the Josephine County Traffic Planner, there have been three (3) traffic incidents reported at the intersection of Glen Crest Way and Cloverlawn Drive between 2013 and 2020. Two were injuries and one was property damage.

The maximum number of allowed units calculates to 21 units, based on the parcel size (after Right of Way dedications) of 4.37 acres, multiplied by the allowable density of 4.84 dwelling units per acre ($4.37 \times 4.84 = 21.15$). Using the standard weekday Average Daily Trip (ADT) rate of 9.43 trips per dwelling unit, the increased ADT would be just under 200 if the parcel were to be fully developed. The current proposal includes a maximum of 16 new cottages, plus the existing one dwelling unit, for a total of 17 units, rather than the allowable 21. Based on the current proposal, the City Traffic Engineer has indicated that a Traffic Impact Analysis will not be required.

CRITERION 5: The natural features of the site are conducive to the proposed Zoning District.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. The natural features on the proposed western parcel after the partition will not be impacted. The proposed eastern parcel does contain stands of trees and some areas of steep slopes. Future development may require a geotechnical report, but this requirement is common in areas of steep slope. The proposed development of the cottage development will be built at the bottom of the slope and a portion of this parcel will not be developed due to the slope. Based on existing and proposed future use, it is concluded that the natural features will remain as conducive to the proposed Zoning District (R-1-10) as they are to the present Zoning District (RR5).

CRITERION 6: The proposed zone is consistent with the requirements of all overlay districts that include the subject property.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. No overlay districts would be impacted by this rezone.

The subject parcels are located within the Grants Pass Irrigation District. Meeting applicable conditions of GPID will be the responsibility of the Applicant.

CRITERION 7: The timing of the zone change request is appropriate in terms of the efficient provision or upgrading of basic urban services versus the utilization of other buildable lands in similar zoning districts already provided with basic urban services.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESPONSE: Satisfied. The timing of the zone change is appropriate. Urban services are or can be made available to the site and are adequate for the Applicant's intended use. In general, there is a deficit of available, buildable lands in the southeast area of the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary which allow for construction of developments of the proposed type and also provide basic urban services.

The request for a zone change, and thus the timing, is being pursued by the Applicant to ensure that the Subject Property's existing land uses will be permitted when the Subject Property is annexed. Urban services will be installed after the property is annexed.

X. DECISION AND SUMMARY:

The Urban Area Planning Commission **APPROVED** to the City Council for the Zone Map Amendment. The vote was 5-0 with Commissioners Nelson, Arthur, MacMillian, Lindberg and Tokarz-Krauss in favor. Commissioner Collier was absent, and Commissioner Heesacker recused himself. There is one vacancy on the Planning Commission.

XI. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 14th day of June 2023.

L. Ward Nelson, UAPC Vice Chair

INDEX TO EXHIBITS:

1. Exhibit A – Staff Report
2. Exhibit B – UAPC Minutes
3. Exhibit C – MS PowerPoint Presentations
4. Exhibit D – Opposition letter and petition