

**URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Meeting Minutes – January 22, 2020 at 6:00 P.M.**  
**Council Chambers**

**COMMISSIONERS:**

Jim Coulter (Chair)  
Blair McIntire (Vice Chair)  
Loree Arthur  
Jennifer Aviles  
David Kellenbeck  
Vacant (City)  
Vacant (County)  
Vacant (County)

**City/Staff/Council Liaisons:**

Barry Eames (City Councilor)  
Lora Glover (PCD Director)  
Brad Clark, (Principal Planner)  
Donna Rupp (Associate Planner)  
Jason Maki, (Assistant Planner)

**Guests:**

Justin Garlitz, Garlitz Engineering

For the record. I'm Jim Coulter, I'm chairman of the Urban Area Planning Commission. I'd also like to note that we have a new vice chairman. That would be Mr. Blair McIntire here. The Urban Area Planning Commission will now come to order or the microphone, not microphone, but for the purposes of the minutes. I will be speaking until somebody else does. And so really we're going to staff or not staff, but fellow Commissioners. We are going to have to work really hard at that and I'll try to make sure we do that. That we get our names on the record before we speak. So thank you.

Roll call. Everybody's here including City Councilman, Barry Eames. So we have a quorum and we have a meeting and we're going. Okay. Public comment. This is an opportunity for the public to address the Commission on items not related to a public hearing or action item. 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 to individuals. The Commission may consider items brought up during this time later in our agenda during matters from Commission members and staff. Next prove of minutes. Are there any corrections?

I do have one page six of your packet. Middle of the page. Second motion. Instead of chair culture moved. It should be Commissioner Kellenbeck moved. I did not make a motion. I'm not supposed to make a motion so I didn't make a motion. Is that the only change. All right. Commissioner Kellenbeck.

I move that we approve the minutes of 1820.

Who is second.

I second.

Commissioner McIntire seconded the motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. Aye. Opposed none. Extensions none.

## MOTION/VOTE

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Vice Chair McIntire seconded the motion to approve the January 8, 2020, as submitted. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter, Vice Chair McIntire, Commissioners Kellenbeck, Aviles and Arthur. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.**

There are no findings of fact so we can get run on with the public hearing. Okay. I actually have two project numbers tonight. We have a tentative subdivision plan with major variance for Griffith Meadows subdivision. The project numbers for the tentative subdivision is one zero four dash zero zero one two nine dash one nine major variance project number is three zero one zero or dash zero zero one three four dash one nine so this application is for again tentative subdivision and major variants for Griffith Meadows subdivision.

We will begin the hearing with the staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicant and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed, and the matter will be discussed and acted on by the Urban Area Planning Commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Urban Area Planning Commission to hear this matter? Seeing none. Moving along, do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Seeing none. Are there any Commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding the application? Seeing none.

In this hearing, the decision of the Urban Area Planning Commission will be based upon specific criteria which are set forth in a development code. All testimony which apply in this case are noted in the staff report. If you would like a copy of the report, one will be provided to you. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Urban Area Planning Commission and the parties and opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the land use board of appeals based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff

Good evening. I'm Jason Maki, Assistant Planner in the Parks and Community Development Department and the project we're going to be talking about tonight is Griffith meadow subdivision with major variants for Lot Width. The property is located at two four one three Leonard Road. You have Leonard Road to the North, Southwest Otter Court and Pin Tail Court Street stubs to the West and Southwest Alder Dale Drive on the Southeast corner there. A subdivision plan shows 12 lots. Nine single family residential lots and three duplex residential lots. The parcel size is 1.65 acres. It is in the R2 two zone. Minimum Lots size in R2 zone would be 5,000 square feet.

The developer's proposing to split the subdivision into two project phases. Phase one will consist of lots, one through nine, and all street extension to pin tail and Otter Courts. And then phase two will include lots 10 through 12 and frontage improvements along Leonard Road. Here you can see lots, one, two and three will be the lots proposed for duplexes and lots four through 12 are going to be single family. It's going to be lots four through 12. That will you part of the requested minimum Lots size variance. This graphic here is just representing a future street plan that's been reviewed by City staff and the City engineer.

A little different than the half street improvement along the Eastern edge of the property. A requested revision for the tentative plan. A condition of approval will just be indicating on the tentative plan, the different phases. Lots of one through nine will be identified as phase one and lots 10 through 12 will be identified as phase two. And then just including a street profile for the small extension of Alder Dale Drive which you can find on page 17 of your packet. The major variances for the minimum Lot Width lots four through 12 and the applicant has requested a variance for reduced Lot Width schedule 12 dash two requires lots in the R2 zone to meet a minimum Lot Width a 50 feet and the applicant is proposing to create nine lots with 44 foot Lot widths due to the current road layout which has three different street plugs, a budding the property causing the applicant to propose a reduced Lot Width variants that will maximize the residential development of the parent parcel.

The applicant's full response can be found on page 29 of your packet. Staff has found that the applicant has met the criteria required to approve a variance for reduced Lot Width based on previously established roadway layout and Lot configuration with. After receiving the staff report from last week the applicant proposed some revisions and we've addressed those here and what we would recommend as the revision. The first one condition A2 for the A list condition two subsection D and also on the D list condition for phase two is we're just proposing to remove that condition that's recently revised language submitted as part of the City engineer's comments. It's recently changed. We're just going to remove that condition and use the old language that is also in the staff report. It's been sort of listed twice. One with the old language, one with the new language, we're going to remove the new language and keep the old language.

Condition A6 is just really clarifying that what's required as part of phase one. Condition A9 and D9 subsection F is just doesn't apply specifically to this project. We're just proposing to remove that condition. Condition A10 subsection E just proposing that to move that condition to the B list. As I understand it a project approval or a development permit needs to be issued before some of those details can be determined. It would be more appropriate to have that condition at the B and E list for the appropriate phases. And then the final four, you see there, they're just explicitly calling out within the headers of each list of conditions, whether it's phase one or phase two.

And it's staff's recommendation that the planning Commission approve the major variants and also staff's recommendation that the planning Commission approved the tentative plan for Griffith meadow subdivision with the conditions listed in the staff report. Any questions for me?

Commissioner Aviles.

Thank you, Jason. Questions? So phase one is, unit one through nine. Okay. And those are zoned at R2. What's the density for that zoning?

Let me see. The maximum units per acre?

Yeah.

Is that your question? I want to say it's 12.4 units per acre.

Units one through nine are single family homes.

One through three are proposed to be duplexes with the possibility of Lot one being a triplex and then lots four through 12 are proposed to be single family.

And when would phase two occur?

The applicant has requested that the language within the staff report reflect what the language is in the development code. It does give up to five years. For phase two to be completed.

Thank you.

I may not have been loud enough. This is Commissioner Coulter. Commissioner Aviles was the one that asked that question for the record. Anybody else have questions? No. Okay. If you would, Mr. Maki, would you go back to, I think it's the first slide. Yeah, that one. I thought it was that. I think you've got a mistake there on acres 1.65 acres. My understand is it should be 1.96. Want to make sure your testimony is correct? Well, unless you know something, I don't, the applicants. Noted that it's 1.96 acres also.

Yeah, it's looking that it should be 1.6 acres.

Yes. Duly noted that it is 1.96 acres and other areas now that I'm looking at it just for housekeeping, page 13 in our package. Second to the last paragraph, third sentence starts with create six lots. I know that should read nine lots. I only mentioned that for housekeeping purposes. You see that.

Page 19?

Page 13 nothing monumental is just a housekeeping issue.

Nine lots. Correct.

Okay, great. Nine lots. It is

And all of the lots do meet the minimum 5,000 right? 5000 Square feet.

Correct.

That was Commissioner Arthur who just asked that question. Anybody else? Okay. Thank you for your presentation. Moving along, will the applicant. Please come forward and make their presentation.

Good evening Commissioners. Justin Garlitz, Garlitz engineering consultants. I'm here on behalf of the applicant, Eastwood homes, homes in development. Jason did a pretty good summary so I'll skip through the beginning here pretty quick. But yeah, we're looking at 12 Lot residential subdivision. It is going to be built in two phases and one of the main reasons for that is all these roads that we have to construct and furnishes we're trying to defer and keep the existing home that's on the site as a rental during the development process and then eventually develop three lots that it sits on right now. It is located in R2 two zone. It will be built by the same developer and builder, which I think is important on most of these developments because they'll have the same character. I believe he was actually involved in the one adjacent to it in the past as well.

So this is kind of an expansion of that on top of it. And as requested, we will have a formal variance request for Lot width, a Lot Width only. As you can see here, the property is kind of situated in between different levels of development. The lots to the West were fully developed. Just to note, this Lot on the corner right here is actually a wetland and detention pond for that subdivision. So it is also developed as part of this subdivision here. It's situated off at Leonard Road. It's got two roads stepped into it here in a not shown on here. There was a recent development just to the South that I'm assuming you probably saw here in the Commission for run none and it's a duplex development, so it's a pretty dense development as well. One other thing to note is this is part of the, I think it's South down estates subdivision. It's a large pond area and as we get into future development plan and that was part of the limitation of how far we can go to the East with development in the future.

These are just a few pictures looking at the property so you could feel for it. This is a Pin Tail Court the end of the streets blocked off right now at the cold sack and look out onto the property here and see that it's basically just a big pasture in the backyard of an existing house. This is Otter Court, same situation past year. And this looks into the back of the accessory structures that'll be removed as part of the first phase. Looking at it from Leonard Roads. This is looking back to the South. This is the existing house that'll remain until that second phase is complete. And then Leonard Road, as you can see here is unimproved currently with two lanes in both directions. So pretty, pretty simple area.

This is looking in from the South. So this is that new development that's to the South side. This is where the street comes into the property. And the property line right now basically is dead center in this existing street. So they had stubbed it to the properties, to the North, knowing that it'll be developed in some way, but kind of unsure of what that looked like. This is our overall tentative plan. This line here in yellow is the phasing line. And one of the things I think is important to note on this is we're asking for a variance for a Lot Width, and why are we doing that? One of the main reasons is these two streets were predetermined. The street to the South was predetermined and the right of way dedication and Leonard Road is required and that left us with a fixed area between these blocks of streets.

And when you take that area and you divide it by the minimum Lots size, which is 5,000 square feet, we were unable to get more lots. The number of lots that we could get here. Right now we've got five here and we've got six here. We meet the minimum Lots standard for size. We meet the minimum solar setback, the solar Lots standards, but we couldn't fit that many lots in that little block without getting this variance request approved, which is the six feet less than the standard.

The other reason on lots with two and three. There was one thing that staff asked us when we turned in this application as well. Why not those lots, but we didn't have enough area left between Otter Court and Pin Tail to get that extra Lot Without asking for a Lots size variance requests, we didn't want to go that direction. So to offset that the applicant is looking to build duplexes and possibly a triplex on Lot one to make up for that density that we couldn't get. One of the goals with any development we do nowadays is really trying to hit density targets. It's good for everybody, the community, the developer, and we didn't quite get to the maximum density here, but we're getting closer to it because of that variance request.

This is just an overview showing some contour lines in the utility plan. The lot's very level. It has just a few feet of fall from one end to the other. A very narrow. We're going to be improving both streets inside of the development with full utilities. So that'll allow them the property to the East, which is on the bottom of the page here to extend off of those in the future. Very level, no cuts and fills estimated, no significant grading and very little vegetation out there right now. Other than that pasture release on

the photos. Issue development plan wise, as we came into the property, we looked at the surrounding conditions. We've got one fairly nice house that's situated here. That backs up to the pond. We anticipate that in the future that house won't be torn down.

So we accommodated that there is a garage that we assume will have to be moved or relocated when that occurs, if it occurs. The pond that borders this East boundary is a limiting factor where we can't get a road through there, we can't get more lots off of there. So to us it made the most sense to jog that road and come down the center of these two lots which allows us to get kind of a normal Lot configuration, extended two roads into this new road and come through the Leonard Road. So overall it seemed like this would be most beneficial for a future developer as well.

Tree plan wise we always have to show what trees we're removing and how many trees we have to plant to get back to the standards. The only trees that we're actually going to take out are just a couple on Lot 10 and that's all that's on site right now. And then the trees in black here, the different shapes represent what we might need to do to meet that tree standard. Variance wise. Just to touch on that again we kind of felt this was the bare minimum request and it's always, one of the things we look at with the variance is minimizing the impact of the variance. And so you look at, well, does it have an impact on the neighboring property owners? In this case it wouldn't because the setbacks are staying the same. We still have a five foot setback.

We've got residential houses adjacent to it that are kind of living in the same general environment with that five foot setback. Lots sizes are still at least 5,000 square feet and some of them are bigger. So our standards are met, slower, Lots standards are met. So we felt that the request was, it was kind of the minimum that we could possibly do 44 feet from 50 feet to six foot narrowing on those lots. Still we can build a kind of a normal house on that. And we felt that it was the best way to accommodate getting the density on the development.

Overall. We think this, it's a narrow long lot, but it was predetermined and set up for this. We're kind of just extending what's been set up for us by others. It provides some good info for this area. Obviously the Redwood areas where a Lot of the construction's occurring and we feel that with variance request and some careful home selection, this thing would fit nice in the neighborhood and be good for everybody. So based on that we're looking for approval of the Griffith metal subdivisions and major variants tonight and be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Yes Arthur.

Curious as to why you're not planning all of them as duplex lots.

He'd like to sell. Duplex, a Lot of people these days are buying and holding a duplex. There's not a Lot of build to sell duplexes happening in the community. So I think ideally he'd probably build them all a single family, but again, we felt those larger lots were a little bit big for just building a single family home. So there'll be a couple that are probably kept as rentals and then the rest are going to be single family for sale.

That was Commissioner Arthur that asked that question. Commissioner McIntire.

Justin, a question. How are these long, narrow lots like that. How is that going to affect the square foot price on the building itself?

I think they're about 110 feet deep, a normal Lot in the red area in this zone. It's usually 50 by a hundred. These are 44 by about 110, I think. And I'm just looking at these tiny numbers. So your house will kind of basically just stretch a little longer and I think we'll get it.

Your cost is going to go up there.

The costs for the house?

To build it will go up.

I don't think so. It'll just be, instead of being more square, it'll be more rectangular and it's still going to be, you take a 50 foot house, it's normally a 40 foot wide house. This'll be a 36 foot wide house and just be a little bit deeper.

Commissioner Aviles.

I just had a question looking at page 16 of these cities report it indicated that plan did not propose to remove any existing trees. But I thought I heard you say that you guys were going to take out some trees.

There's two small trees right here on Lot 10. They won't come out for phase one and maybe that's what they're referring to is during phase one they won't come out. It would just be phase two when the lots are actually built on.

Okay. And the City report also indicates that you'd be planting 15 new trees. How many of those would be planted during phase one?

A good majority of them will. Right now I think we're showing most of them planning. We have a couple of existing trees in the front yards of the Leonard Road furniture that'll remain. So most of them will be planted during phase one with a couple more during phase two.

Thank you.

Are there any other questions for Mr. Garlitz? Thank you, sir.

Thank you.

Is there anyone else from the applicant's team that would like to speak on the application? Okay. Is there anyone, we're going to open it up to public comments. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the application? Is there anybody that would like to speak against an opposition to the application? Seeing that there is no public comment, I'm taking Mr. Garlitz, that means that you have no rebuttal. All right. Okay. Before we go to deliberations, one last opportunity for Commissioners to ask questions. Okay. All right. That concludes the public portion of this application process.

Okay. The matter is now before, excuse me gentlemen, the matter is now before the Commissioners for consideration. Commissioner McIntire.

I like it. It's fairly straight forward way of getting the required housing into the small portion of land. It's okay. I'm a little concerned with the Lots size, but then again, this is just for Justin. But if you have a house, it's measures 40 by 40 on each side. You've got 160 feet. Yeah. 1600 square feet. But it's only 160 feet of perimeter that if you have a house, it's the same thing. It's 1600 square feet, but it's 80 by 20. You've got 200 feet of perimeter fence, which means your costs go up drastically. That much more roof, foundation, exterior wall, installation, everything. So I don't see how you can say there was no difference in the cost.

Is it a concern that you want to address as a Commissioner officially because it's not criteria.

No, it's not in the criteria, but at the same time I wish more and more builders would take these into consideration. I mean, our old farmers, our old ancestors had pretty good deal. Their houses were dead square in two stories high. And it made sense unless you can squander a Lot of energy with the ranch style.

Okay. Is there any other discussion on the application, Commissioner Arthur.

Curious about the Alder Dale? Is it Alder Dale Drive? Is that something that's on the transportation plan that you have to allow for or what down at the South end.

Allow for it to be extended? I'm sorry, I don't understand you.

Well, I don't understand why it's there because we don't see the entire future transportation plan. You know why it's coming off that corner.

Right. This is Brad Clark. I'm with planning. So I think typically local streets are not going to be shown in our actual master plan. This is a stub street that was constructed with a previous subdivision. And so for the most part, unless there's a really good reason not to, we want to encourage the extension of stub streets.

No, that's not the question I'm talking about the one that goes North and South, not the East West stubs. I understand roads.

That's the same situation. It's the same situation. It's also a stub street. It doesn't show, and maybe that's part of the confusion is it doesn't show up on the aerials because of the recent construction, but it's built as a stub street.

It's already there.

Yes. Yep.

Okay.

And we can pull up the picture of it if you'd like.



Hey, does anybody else have any more discussion, deliberation? Remember, that's what we're doing right now. Okay. And then I'm going to entertain a motion for the variance request first. Anybody would like to make a motion. Commissioner Kellenbeck.

I agree with analysis of the property and the need for the variance. And so I moved that we approved that variance.

Second by anybody. Commissioner Arthur gets the tie again. She's seconded it. Okay. So any further comments on the motion? Nope. Seeing none. All those in favor of the application signify by saying aye. Aye. Opposed? Abstention. Okay. The variance has been approved.

#### **MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the Griffith Meadows Subdivision Variance. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter, Vice Chair McIntire, Commissioners Kellenbeck, Aviles and Arthur. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None. The motion passed.**

Moving on to the I'll get it right here. The tentative subdivision plan. Is there any further discussion on that or deliberation? Okay. Would someone like to make a mo. Now? Principal planner Clark, do we need to go one by one or can we?

No, I don't think you need to do one by one, but I think if you want, we can certainly pull up the slide. Yeah. Because your motion should reference-

That's right.

Your divisions.

Your changes to the conditions of approval.

Unless one of the Commissioners has a difference with one of those then you might need to break that out. But if you're in agreement with all the proposed revisions to the staff report, I think you can just reference the.

That's a good point. And thank you for clarifying that. So then just before we go to that motion does anyone see the need that we need to go item by item? Okay, good. So I entertain that we make a motion on the tentative subdivision plan. Commissioner Kellenbeck.

I move that we approve the subdivision request as made with the condition stated in the staff report and as amended by staff in their presentation.

Second, Commissioner McIntire has seconded the motion. Any more discussion on the motion? All right. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, abstention. It's approved unanimously on both project numbers. Congratulations.

### **MOTION/VOTE**

**Commissioner Kellenbeck moved and Vice Chair McIntire seconded the motion to approve the Griffith Meadows Subdivision, with conditions stated in the staff report and as amended by staff for their presentation. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Coulter, Vice Chair McIntire, Commissioners Kellenbeck, Aviles and Arthur. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.  
The motion passed.**

We're going to move on. All right. Matters from Commission members. And staff. Staff, you have anything you're going to add to the meeting, bring up.

I don't think we have anything for you tonight.

Oh.

You want us to.

Of course we want something. Okay. Nothing from the staff. So there's it's Commissioner time, Commissioner Aviles you have anything?

Yes. So looking at the next scheduled meeting for February 12th is that the day that the window closes for applications to the Commission falls off? Is that the same day.

I think it's the 10th as I recall.

So the window closes on the 10th then on the 12th if there are any applicants, that would be when we are able to review the applications.

That's correct.

Excellent. Thank you.

Are you under the impression that we will be reviewing them?

It was mentioned, this is Commissioner Aviles. It was mentioned in the last meeting that there was a timeline and one of the dates in that timeline referenced something to the effect where we would get some sort of information or the opportunity to do something.

No, that's something, first of all, that would have to be discussed with staff and City Council. At this particular point in time. I don't know how much I'm sure that the planning director has considerable input into the process, but it is the City Council that makes the final vote.

I understand.

But not with our input at this particular time. I'm positive of that.

So just looking at, it's Commissioner Aviles again, page seven that top paragraph, it indicates that nominations closed on February 10th, a review will be on February 12th. So I guess who's doing the review on the 12th?

So this is Brad Clark again. And Mr. Chair, I don't know, this may be a recent change being new to the City myself. I don't know. But I think that what the City manager is ask us to do now is to send applicants to the various committees and Commissions of the City. So that you can take it a view of them. You're not voting per se. I mean you are making a recommendation to the Council, but they want, the Council would really like the various Commissions and committees to review them first and discuss them amongst yourselves. And then what we've been doing is providing if there's more than one ballots so that you can go ahead and vote who you would recommend that the Council appoint.

Very nice. Very nice.

Sorry if that wasn't made clear last time. But Commissioner,[crosstalk 00:40:09]

No it hasn't been so also with that I suppose it can follow obviously what the City Council's going to do, but we're going to need a text amendment. No, let me think about that. I'm not sure if you would look into that. We might need one. I'm not sure.

Sure. Yeah, we can check on that. Okay, good catch. Commissioner Aviles.

It's my impression and Councilor Amos might be able to clarify, when this kind of thing was discussed, one of the alternatives that was suggested was that the planning Commission or any of the others, I guess could submit questions to be asked. Because most of the questions you ask are ones like, can you make it to all the meetings and do you know how long they last and how much you have to read. And all that kind of stuff rather than pertaining to the business of that particular committee or Commission. It seems like that part got lost somewhere along the way. I don't know what became of it. Did I miss remember that very well.

Commissioner McIntire.

How does this affect the candidates who are appointed by the County?

I think this is only for the City.

This is only for the City place. Okay. This is clarification.

Yep. It is. Commissioner Coulter, I have a meeting set up to speak to the City manager. I have already had a meeting with the mayor. It's in being the new guy, being the chairman. I want to sit and talk with him and pick their brain a little bit and get some of their words of wisdom. This is something that I will discuss with the City manager and see how that goes. I will tell you that I will ask the City manager what the exact process is. Okay. And I know it's done in many other jurisdictions, counties where the chairman sits on the interview board.

Reason I'm going to make that suggestion is the chairman has the pulse of what's going on with the Urban Area Planning Commission and saying that kind of makes sense that the chairman's involved

somewhere there. Like I said, the chairman, I don't know exactly how that would be, whether the chairman can ask questions. It's something that I'm going to discuss with the City manager and see what he has to say about that. So it's obviously anything right now is very early if there's going to be any kind of change of course.

So it is also something that I am going to discuss with the County Commissioners on the County appointees. I personally would like to be involved as the chairman. Like I said, part of my responsibility I think is to know, I know our members there are things I'm going to instinctively know in that process. And so I think the chairman, no matter who it is, adds value to the process. That's my opinion right now. So Where did we leave off that, Commissioner Arthur do you?

Where are you going?

Oh, I'm fine. Commissioner Arthur.

One of the things that was discussed, this has been under discussion for a long time about selecting the committee and Commission people. But in our case, particularly unless you get somebody, like some of you who've been involved in the building industry in some way or real estate or something, people who apply sometimes don't understand that we are tightly governed by state law, by land use law. And that they really need to study and learn those things and that it's not just whether you like it because it's Brown and has three trees. I mean that kind of thing that you really need to deal with the criteria. And I thought that that was the kind of questions that were going to be asked of applicants. Not in huge depth but at least conceptually. And the City Council hasn't generally been asking that kind of question. They kind of had a general list. It sounded the same for all of the groups.

Any questions along that line? There are other questions that I believe is chairman Coulter that can be asked. You don't have to have a construction expert person, doesn't have to be a real estate or any of those things necessarily. A Lot of it is do you have a leader who has an understanding of like this kind of thing, the City and can grasp the concepts quickly. Can get in and dig into the develop mode code quickly.

I don't think we're talking about the same subject here.

We're talking about urban area planning.

I'm thinking of people who have passed through, who've come on in and said, Oh, this is like the lands Commission.

No, I understand that.

We can do this. And they get here and they find out, Oh, it isn't like that at all. It's totally different world.

Well, Would you let me finish my comment? What was going to finish that with is I don't want to necessarily restrict, one of the things I think we want to be careful of is restricting who is brought on to the Urban Area Planning Commission with too many qualifications. Does that make sense? So when I'm talking about, I'm going to give you an example and I'm going to give it as my brother, my brother was a businessman. He was involved with the strategic planning, vision committee, Metro area in Portland. So

he had some experience there. Yet no planning experience, knows just enough about construction to be dangerous. But he does, he was appointed to the Hillsborough planning Commission, ended up being the chairman for eight years. He had exceptional. So there are other things because you might have somebody that's technical, it's got all, it seems to have all the T's crossed and I's dotted and really doesn't have it up here in the mindset of what we're doing and can't grasp that concept well.

I hope that doesn't happen. So I did. I had a conversation with, it was not formal. It was a parking Lot conversation. I just happened to see her County Commissioner Morgan about this. And no, we don't want somebody that doesn't know anything. Obviously or they don't know what a topographic map is. Things like that. We also want to be careful to end up letting a really qualified person that wants to serve their community and has the ability to learn fast, think quick on their feet, and will end up being a valued asset to the community as a planning Commissioner. Does that make sense what I'm saying? Okay. So yeah, when your point is good.

There used to be very strict requirements or qualifications or unqualifications, I don't know how you'd say it. When I came on they asked to have at least one of certain kinds of people involved somehow in the building real estate.

Diverse group is good.

Also, we're limited to no more than two of the same kind. And somewhere along the way that seems to have fallen off too because I ask about it.

Yeah, that would be.

And we were going to have three civil engineers at once and it apparently got lost somewhere, that particular requirement. Do you guys remember that? Yeah.

I think it's a worthy discussion point. We don't have it on our goals set for this year and I think we're locked in what our goals can be.

Oh, we're not locked in at all.

No.

They don't pay us. It's not going to cost them anything to have that discussion. No.

I'm locked in. I think for a presentation I have to make on Friday to the City Council.

Yeah. But that doesn't anything to do with your strategic goals. It's a procedural type manner. We could bring it up and talk about it sometimes it's not.

Absolutely.

So you're not limited to what the goal said to have something on your agenda sometime next year.

Well, yes, I agree with that. Something like that would be nice to have as a goal moving forward and we can add it. We can add it after the fact. Discuss it. Would you like to add it as an agenda item?

I'd prefer to find out what really happened and the intentions of the Council when they had all this discussion a few months ago about the communities and makeup and choosing and interviewing and all that kind of thing. It seems to have disappeared. That discussion

Councilor Eames, is that something that you could look into for us if you don't mind?

Yes.

So maybe let's table that for now. You're right. We need to be able to be more succinct in our. So on the slides I could add that or I could just add it as an item when I make my presentation. Okay, great. I'll do it. So I will talk about it at the strategic planning Commissioner Arthur. Are we finished yet. Thank you. I will bring it up, Commissioner Arthur. At that strategic planning meeting, it will be something I will mention Councilor Eames said I could do that. So I will. All right. Commissioner Kellenbeck.

No.

Commissioner McIntire?

Nope.

Okay. I got two things. This is one of the things I like to see when it's our turn to discuss things often this is I'm chairman Coulter speaking here, but this is often one of the things we can't wait to get out of here. Well, I've done the math. We have roughly 336 hours between planning Commission meetings. The reason I say that is this is a time that is good to have these kinds of discussions and it's built for that. So I encourage it. In fact, I encourage each Commissioner, they have things they want to say. Say it. I mean, we got be realistic, but I'm not going to shut it down because we want to get out of here. All right? So just so that's part of my philosophy and I think that's going to work in our favor if we use it to our advantage.

Number two in meeting with the mayor, I was unaware of this and maybe some of you are, I don't know. When we make the decision that we made tonight, we still cannot discuss it with this group of people, City Councilors, with our liaison. We cannot discuss tonight's hearing. The reason for that is in case it's appealed to the City Council because they're under clause eight judicial rules too if it's appealed. So like tonight for example, let's say one of us was discussing it with City Councilor Eames here, he could end up having an advantage ex parte contact before he goes into a hearing, an appeal hearing.

So I did not know that, but I thought, wow, that's good information. So saying that and we can talk to anybody else we want. And like I said, the only ones that we can be a City Council and the mayor. Other than that let's see. So I think we're safe when, if I remember right when the appeal process is by the time we have our next meeting and we do findings of fact, we would already know if there was an appeal. Am I correct? Doesn't appeal. What's the timeframe on the appeal? If I may ask? Eames.

We're going to check on that.

Okay.

Hold up. I Let you know in about one minute.

Yeah. I thought that was important because we want to make sure that we don't accidentally put the City Council in a bind. So we don't want to do that. If you don't find it now, I think unless otherwise you find something different.

Yeah. My recollection says it's 20 days. Your-

I thought yours is a Lot less.

Adoption of the, it could be 10 of the findings of fact. So it's your next meeting. You're going to have the findings of fact on your agenda for this current tonight and at that point it's technically final, the decision and becomes appealable. But yeah, we can send an email out to the Commission members just to confirm.

Okay. So super, I appreciate that. I have nothing else. Thank you very much. This meeting is adjourned now that I made all the.

**Meeting adjourned:**

**Next Meeting: February 26, 2020**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Coulter, Chair  
Urban Area Planning Commission

2/12/2020  
Date

Minutes transcribed by www.rev.com and given a cursory review/edit by Julia Wright, City of Grants Pass Administration.