

HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – February 17, 2023 at 9:00 AM

Committee Members

Doug Walker – Chair
Tom Bradbeer - Vice Chair
Holly Fifield (Absent)
Tammy D’Amico
Steve Gulliford
VACANT
Molly Nichols
Jason Elzy
Duward Brown (Absent)
Craig Dent
Josh Balloch (Absent)
Ralph “JR” Wheeler
Kathleen Foster

Staff/Council Liaisons:

Dwayne Yunker – Council Liaison
Amber Neeck – Housing and Neighborhood Specialist
Mark Trinidad – Principal Planner

Guests:

1. **Roll Call:**
 - a. Chair Doug Walker opened the meeting at 9:01 am and took roll.
2. **Introductions:**
 - a. **Dwayne Yunker – New council Liaison**
3. **Public Comment:** (opportunity for citizens to share information with the committee regarding items that are not on the agenda)
 - a. None
4. **Consent Agenda:**
 - a. Minutes: January 20, 2023

MOTION/VOTE

Member Dent moved, and Vice Chair Bradbeer seconded the motion to approve the minutes from January 20, 2023. The vote resulted as follows: “AYES”: Chair Walker, Vice Chair Bradbeer, Members D’Amico, Gulliford, Nichols, Elzy, Dent, Wheeler, and Foster. “NAYS”: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Members Fifield, Brown, and Balloch.
The motion passed.

5. **Action Items:**
 - a. Open Space and Landscaping Development Code Amendment – Donna Rupp
 - Donna presented a draft copy of amendments to Article 22 in regard to open space, landscaping, parking, and design standards that present barriers to development of multifamily housing. The committee provided ample feedback. Donna will be continuing her amendment work with feedback from the HAC and will return to present again in Spring of 2023.
 - Open Space guidelines and standards main takeaways
 - a. Reduce common open space requirements to 15% from previous 30%.
 - b. Include language on “high value recreation areas” open space that provides an option for further reducing common open space requirements.
 - c. Reduce private open space requirements.

- d. Increase number of units required to trigger open space requirements to 11 from 5.
 - e. Exemptions
 - i. Increase distance from parks that provide open space exemptions.
- b. Solar Setback Standards Overview – Gabriella Sinagra
 - Timeline
 - January 2021: Staff proposed to strike solar access codes in Article 22 of the GPDC.
 - April 2021: Council referred the matter to the HAC.
 - August 2021: Assistant Planner, Gabby Sinagra made a presentation to HAC on pathways forward to amend the existing code.
 - September 2022: The City partnered with Kendig Keast Collaborative for code writing services.
 - November 2022: A Solar Access Steering Committee was formed to act as an intermediary review body for the proposed draft amendment throughout the project schedule.
 - Partnership with KKC
 - Listening Sessions.
 - Solar Access Steering Committee.
 - Two drafts for review by the Committee and by Staff.
 - Focus
 - Flexibility.
 - Compatibility with densification.
 - a. Shift protection to rooftops instead of south-facing yards.
 - Clear and objective standards.
 - Easy administration.
 - What approach do we take?
 - Solar Setbacks vs. Solar Fences
 - Solar Fence: Hypothetical fence along the property lines of a lot. New structures are not allowed to shade adjacent lots to a greater extent than the fence would between 10am-2pm on the winter solstice.
 - Solar Setback: A setback ordinance applied to the northern property line of the developing lot based on the height of a proposed structure and the horizontal length of the shadow cast.
 - Solar Fence
 - PROS:
 - a. The intent of the fence is to protect rooftops.
 - i. Intrinsically is built to allow some levels of shading of the south facing yards or buildings.
 - b. Ultimately is less restrictive than the solar setback.
 - i. Allows for taller buildings and is more compatible with densification.
 - CONS:
 - a. Much more complex and costly methodology.
 - i. Requires the applicant to work with a surveyor.
 - ii. Requires an understanding of trigonometry to produce solar analysis.
 - b. Silence around administration.
 - i. The solar fence appears to be a relatively new concept and therefore there is little to no guidance on how these standards are administered or what difficulties they may impose.
 - Solar Setbacks

- PROS:
 - a. Easier administration.
 - i. No design professional or surveyor needed.
 - ii. Standardized formula that is simple to apply.
 - iii. A lot of data around how to apply the standards.
 - iv. Less staff time needed and less costly to applicant.
 - b. Equal application and more streamlined approach.
 - i. Unlike the solar fence which is done on a lot-by-lot basis, the setback standards apply equally across the board.
 - ii. Avoids any arbitrariness in how restrictions are applied.
 - iii. Flexibility can be built in.
- CONS:
 - a. Increased setbacks and height restrictions not compatible with density.
 - i. This is especially critical when we think of achieving infill development and missing middle housing.
- So Which Approach?
 - Ultimately, we decided to adopt Eugene's setback formula.
 - Least restrictive of the solar setback formulas towards building height:
 - a. Standards don't even start to kick in until the height of the building reaches 18 feet.
 - Utilizes Solar Zones:
 - a. Allows us to separate zones based on density.
 - i. Higher density zones are least restrictive.
 - Built in tables:
 - a. Does most of the computing for you.
- Linger Questions
 - *1. How do we accomplish the goal of rooftop protection with a solar setback formula that protects south-facing yards?*
 - a. Permissible levels of shading: Language in draft allows up to 50% shading of a south facing wall.
 - i. But how does an applicant demonstrate permissible levels of shading?
 - 1. There is a gap in the methodology and implementation for the idea behind permissible levels of shading.
 - 2. We don't yet have the data to modify the existing formula to achieve this.
 - *2. If permissible levels of shading is not achievable then how do we build in alternate compliance when a conflict arises?*
 - a. Our goal was to allow for greater flexibility in administration and to avoid imposing a variance request on the applicant.
 - b. What form of alternate compliance can we build into the code that maintains clear and objective standards?
- Moving Forward
 - Go before a UAPC workshop on March 8th.
 - In the project schedule with KKC we have one hearing before UAPC and one hearing before Council prior to adoption.
 - Solar Access Guide.

6. Matters from Committee Members and Staff

- a. Point in Time

- b. Warming Shelter

7. Future Agenda Building for Next Meeting

- a. Housing Trust Fund
- b. ARPA Infrastructure RFP Results
- c. Open Space Development Code
- d. Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities Overview

8. Adjournment

- a. Chair Walker adjourned the meeting at 10:51 am.

Next scheduled meeting: March 17, 2023, in the City Council Chambers.

Minutes prepared by Amber Neeck, City of Grants Pass Community Development.