

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes – October 13, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS:

Eric Heesacker (Chair)
Mark Collier (Vice Chair) – Absent
Loree Arthur
Jennifer Aviles
Susan Tokarz-Krauss – Absent
L. Ward Nelson
Clint Scherf
Vacant

City/Staff/Council Liaisons:

Bradley Clark (Director)
Jason Maki (Associate Planner)

Guests:

Jon Bowman

Mark I think is out of town for 10 days.

[inaudible 00:01:03].

All right, it's 06:03 PM, I'm going to go ahead and start. Does anybody care?

[inaudible 00:01:16].

All right, I call this meeting to order. October 13, 2021, 06:03 PM. I'll start by calling roll. I'm Eric, I'm here. Commissioner Nelson?

Present.

Commissioner Scherf?

Present.

Commissioner Aviles?

Present.

Thank you for calling in, appreciate that. Commissioner Arthur?

Here.

We have a quorum. I don't see any necessary introductions. I don't see anybody here for public comment. You're only going to speak about your item, right sir? Okay. No public here for public comment. Is Commissioner Aviles the only person that's online? Okay. Approval of minutes. We'll start with the September 8th minutes. Does anybody want to make a motion or does anybody have an amendment?

Mr. Chair, I would move the approval of the minutes for September.

We have a motion to approve, is there a second?

Second, Arthur.

Arthur seconds. All those in favor of approving minutes say "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Anybody abstaining? All right, minutes pass. Five, zip.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the minutes for September 8, 2021. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss. The motion passed.

Meeting minutes for September 22nd, any amendments or is there a motion?

I would move approval of the minutes for September 22nd.

Second.

Commissioner Nelson made the motion to approve the minutes, Commissioner Arthur seconded. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Any abstentions?

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the minutes for September 22, 2021. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss. The motion passed.

All right. Next item is informational items, I think we'll do that at the end when we do matters from Commission members and staff, unless somebody has something that's eating at them right now. All right. As is my prerogative, I've been asked to please move the findings of fact up before the public hearings. So I will do that now. Findings of fact, item 7A, 201-00391-21 and 301-00142-21, OnePeak Medical, major site plan review and variance. Does anybody have anything they want to say about the findings of fact or is there a motion to approve?

I would move approval of the findings of facts for the OnePeak, wasn't it? OnePeak Medical?

OnePeak Medical, that's it.

Second.

We have a motion from Commissioner Nelson, a second by Commissioner Arthur to approve the findings of fact for OnePeak Medical. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Anybody abstaining? We have five, nothing approve the findings of fact for OnePeak Medical.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the findings of fact for OnePeak Medical major site plan review and variance. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss. The motion passed.

Item 7B, 401-00101-21, Buckmaster, Leonard Road zone map amendment. Any discussion about that or someone want to move for approval?

I would move approval of the Buckmaster.

Commissioner Nelson moves for approval.

Arthur, second.

Commissioner Arthur seconds. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Any abstentions? Findings of fact for the Buckmaster zone map amendment are approved.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the findings of fact for the Buckmaster zone map amendment. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss. The motion passed.

Item 7C, 105-00105-21 and 301-00143-21, tentative [PUD 00:05:11] and major variance at 1601 Hamilton Lane. Any discussion about findings of fact or a motion?

Mr. Chair, I would move the findings of facts.

Commissioner Nelson moves to approve findings of fact.

Arthur, second.

Commissioner Arthur seconds. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? Any abstentions? All right, the findings of fact for 1601 Hamilton Lane major variance and tentative subdivision PUD are approved.

MOTION/VOTE

**Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Arthur seconded the motion to approve the findings of fact for the 1601 Hamilton Lane major variance and tentative subdivision PUD. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.
The motion passed.**

Next item is our first public hearing, 6A, as we can see the applicant has requested a continuance. Since we're not opening a public hearing do we have to continue to a date certain, or can we continue... We do have to continue to a date certain. Staff, what do you want to tell us about this?

We do not have a confirmed rescheduled date, so I think we have no... We do not. So there is no date certain.

Okay. So we'll... Yeah, so we'll have to re-notice that application. I was misunderstood. I thought that we had a date nailed down, but yeah without a date certain then we'll have to re-notice for a completely new time and send out a new public notice on that one.

Understood, thank you very much. Do we know how much time is left ticking on the clock for that one? How many days?

Well, when the applicant requests the continuance, then that 120 day gets suspended, so we should be okay.

Oh, I didn't know that, it gets suspended. Oh.

If the applicant.

Nice.

Yeah. Yeah, so as long as we have it in writing, which we do from the applicants, in this case representative Justin Gerlitz, then we should be fine.

Okay. I agree, sounds great. All right, 6A went awful quick, we're moving on now to public hearing 6B, 201-0036-21 and 301-00145-21 Bowman's Choice Auto, Rogue River Highway, major variance and discretionary architectural review. It's a type three urban planning procedure, the location is 899 Rogue River Highway. And I'm going to go ahead and open the public hearing. Bear with me a second, I have to read all this stuff. At this time, I will open the public hearing to consider an application filed by John Bowman, Bowman's Automotive. This application is for a major variance. I think actually three variance requests, three major variance requests and site plan review for an auto repair?

And sales.

Auto repair and sales. I'm sorry, I'm not supposed to address you like that, my apologies.

[inaudible 00:08:16].

I'll continue reading. We will begin the hearing with a staff report followed by a presentation by the applicant, statements by persons in favor of the application, statements by persons in opposition to the application, and an opportunity for additional comments by the applicants and staff. After that has occurred, the public comment portion will be closed and the matter will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Planning Commission to hear this matter? Nobody is challenging. Do any commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Nobody's raising their hands. Commissioner Aviles?

Nope.

Thank you. Are there any commissioners who wish to disclose discussions, contacts, biases, or other ex parte information they have received prior to this meeting regarding the application? Nobody here, Commissioner Aviles?

No. I guess I'll share I live on Rogue River Highway. I don't know actually in relation where I live to this address, but I'll share that.

All right, we appreciate your disclosure. Thank you very much. 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 that on a note to city staff and one will be provided. It is important to remember if you fail to raise an issue with enough detail to afford the Commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the issue, you will not be able to appeal to the City Council based on that issue. The hearing will now proceed with a report from staff.

Good evening, Commissioners. Just to double check, Commissioner Aviles, are you able to see the shared screen for the presentation?

Yeah, I can see the PowerPoint, Bowman's Choice Auto.

Great. So the project numbers we're going to be discussing tonight are 201-00369-21 and 301-00145-21. It's for a commercial project, Bowman's Choice Auto. The approval will include a

major site plan review [inaudible 00:10:44] three variance requests, and discretionary architectural review of commercial design standards.

Trying to troubleshoot something real quick here. There we go. So just a little brief background. Staff received an application at the beginning of the year for a major site plan review for the same project. The project was ultimately approved by hearings officer decision on June 23rd of this year. And part of the reason why we're here tonight is, there's two conditions of approval as part of that project approval, which are in contention. The first is A list condition 1A, which is elevations... A revised site plan needs to include elevations which meet the criteria found in article 20 of the Grants Pass Development Code. And A list condition 2, which is provide two copies and a PDF of landscaping and irrigation plans in conformance with several sections of Article 23.

So based on those conditions and working through the applicant as part of the A list conditions, the applicant has requested three major variance requests. The first one is related to front and exterior landscaping standards. The second is parking lot landscape screening, and the third is landscaping adjacent to the building. The second request was for discretionary architectural review of commercial design standards. And the third, which we'll discuss in a little bit more detail at the end is for major site plan review.

So looking at the location, the property's located at 899 Rogue River Highway and the lot abuts Florence Lane to the east and Rogue River Highway to the north, and the zoning for the lot is general commercial. So a few pictures here, this is standing on the corner of Rogue River Highway and Florence Lane looking south down Florence Lane. And this is just a little bit south down Florence looking up north back up towards Rogue River Highway, so you can get a sense that Florence Lane has existing unimproved frontage. Just a couple things to point out, off in the distance here you can see there's this retaining wall, that's going to be important as we move forward.

And so this is standing on Rogue River Highway at the west, northwest corner of the lot, looking south down at the lot and down Rogue River Highway. As you can see, there's an existing planter strip with some mature trees, and shrubs, and living ground cover.

And this is another vantage point from Rogue River Highway looking to the west.

So the applicant is proposing to remove an existing 984 square foot structure and to construct a new commercial building approximately 2,000 square feet in size and the proposal includes several modifications to the site, including relocating the approach, changes to the existing elevations of the building design, significant changes to landscaping and to the parking lot design. Applicant is proposing to place a mechanic shop with associated car sales lot, what staff has determined to be a repair, maintenance commercial use.

So looking at the first variance request, Section 23-032, subsection 2, requires front and exterior yards to be landscaped. You can see from the illustration on the right there that this line here indicates the property line, this section. Here, let me turn on... Well, unfortunately I may not be able to do that easily, put the pointer on there. But if you can see the cursor, the right of way is here to the right and then extending back from the property line on to the property there is a, in this case, a 10 foot setback from that exterior or front yard property line that requires landscaping to be placed within that area.

And so in relation to the proposed site plan, I've highlighted in yellow the portion of the property that we're talking about that would, according to the code, require landscaping to be placed. So the red line here indicates the property line, this top illustration is of the Rogue River frontage. So in green there, you can see the landscape planter strip that we saw in the previous picture, which has the mature trees in it. Then there's kind of a significant grade change that extends past the edge of the sidewalk, and then the property line runs here. This is within the boundary of the lot, which is where the required landscaping is to be placed and you can see a similar illustration here on the lower picture, in yellow indicating where the required landscaping is to be placed, just adjacent to the property line.

So sometimes it's a little difficult to just visualize exactly what the requirement is. This site plan here is from a previously proposed project at a different location in town, similar in nature. And this would be a landscape design for front and exterior side yards that would be approved. So as you can see, there's two frontages and the yellow indicates where the applicant is proposing to place the required front and exterior side yard landscaping, just adjacent to the property lines. So this is an example of what a site plan would be that just meets the standard of the code.

So the second variance request requires that parking abutting a property line shall be screened by a three foot landscape strip, according to Schedule 23-5, which in this case would require an 18 inch hedge screen screening the parking from the right of way. So as you can see from the picture here, the site plan proposes parking to abut this curb here, which is essentially where the property line is. And as you can see, there's this cut, significant change in elevation from the parking area up to the grade of the sidewalk. Staff concurs that this is a unique variable to the site, so if the applicant was to place the hedge screen here adjacent to the parking area, it would be lower than the grade of the sidewalk.

And it's a little difficult to visualize because the picture is 2D, but the distance from the property line to the edge of the sidewalk, if we were just looking at it in one dimension, is about 13 feet and the height difference between the lowest grade of the parking lot and the highest grade of the sidewalk is approximate six feet just to give you a sense of scale of this picture here.

And so the third variance request is asking for relief from a section of code that requires landscaping adjacent to a building. And so that section of code reads, where a building face does not abut a landscaped yard or public sidewalk, landscape beds or planters at least five feet deep shall be incorporated adjacent to the building. So in this case, the applicant is proposing a five foot wide landscaped strip adjacent to the north elevation of the building. And so the code would require that this portion of the building here, which would be facing towards the east and this portion here would also be required to have a five foot planter strip adjacent to that portion of the building.

So part of this proposal includes discretionary architectural review of commercial design standards, so that the applicant is seeking discretion for two sections of code, 20.405, which is building entrances, and 20.450, which gives standards for parapets.

In this top picture here, you can see the Florence Lane facing elevation, which is where the entrance is, and this shaded yellow portion on the bottom is the elevation that faces Rogue River Highway.

So looking in a little bit more detail at Section 20.405, building shall have sheltering elements to provide protection from the weather at primary or public entrances. Sheltering element shall

provide a covered area at least five feet deep. So here's just an example of an illustration showing a sheltering element and the depth of that is required to be five feet. In the case of the proposed elevations, it's indicated to be three feet.

And looking at Section 20.450, use of parapets. A building with a continuous roof pitch of less than five to 12 shall have a parapet that fully screens the roof. In this case, the elevations indicate the pitch of the roof to be 4'12, which would require a parapet and the applicant is seeking relief from that standard.

So I do want to just call out that in the packet, the original approval included an elevation which is different than what you see here. The applicant has shown an intent to get closer to the full standard, so the previous elevation didn't have the roof break, it wasn't indicating the required windows on the north facing elevation. So this revised elevation that you see here has gotten closer to the intent and standard of the code from the original submittal.

So looking at call to actions, staff recommends the Planning Commission deliberate on the three variance requests. Again, those are front and exterior yard landscaping standards, parking lot landscape screening standards, and landscape being adjacent to the building standards. If the Planning Commission was to approve any of those variances, the findings would reflect edits to the previous conditions of approval related to those code sections. And the same thing for discretionary architectural review, staff recommends the Planning Commission deliberate on the applicant's request for relief from sections 20.405 and 20.450. And if approved, condition A1A will be revised in the findings of fact to reflect the exemptions granted to commercial design standards.

If the Planning Commission approves the variance, all three of the variance requests and discretionary architectural review request, staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the major site plan review subject to the attached conditions of approval. However, if the Commission denies all of the variance requests and the discretionary architecture review requests, the previous hearing officer conditions of approval still stand. So he would have an approve project, it's just the changes to those conditions related to these requests would remain the same. Pending any questions, that's my presentation.

Any questions for staff? Commissioner Nelson?

I'm confused as to the pitch of the roof is 4'12 and that requires a, what'd you call the structure?

A parapet.

And for what purpose? And is that one of the variances because as I understand it, there isn't a parapet on the design, correct?

It's not technically a variance, it's just discretion to... Article 20 gives allowance for discretion to the Planning Commission to give relief to certain standards of Article 20. So in the case, because the pitch of the roof is less than five to 12, a parapet is required. The applicant is not proposing a parapet and would like to be granted relief from that standard.

Okay, would you go back? Because I was confused, because it sounded like you had three variances dealing with landscaping. Is that part of the landscaping?

No, it's a separate item.

So there's a request for three variances and a request for two measures of relief from Section...
So the parapet and the awning over the door are just relief and then the three variances.

Correct.

And can you give me the reason why it was decided that parapets were required on anything less than a five 12?

So anytime the Commission asks staff to reflect on the purpose for the code, it gets interesting when we were not present during the creation and the development of the code. Article 20 is admittedly a very robust commercial design section. There's a lot there, it was adopted by the City Council several years ago, neither Jason, nor I were present at the time. We'd be remiss to try to conjecture why they did that. I can tell you generally, if you imagine the general commercial corridors, as particularly I think in tourist economies, a very lightly pitched roofs, if you replicate that across the entire commercial corridor, especially entryway corridors, generally people find the higher pitched to be more attractive. The parapets tend to kind of screen that roof line and can provide for a more... The wall area that's facing those entryway corridors, you have more opportunity to do design elements rather than just looking at a very shallow pitched roof again, and again, and again.

So it's a thing with zoning ordinances and design ordinances, they're intended to sort of if all properties develop to those standards, is that meeting the vision of the community and the comprehensive plan. And so again, we don't... We're unable to give you the exact reason why this code was adopted with that, but those are just some thoughts as to why other communities have done it.

Does the current building have the parapet or is it just a sloped roof?

There is no proposed parapet, it's just a pitched roof with a 4'12.

On the existing building?

Oh, on the existing. The two buildings are very different, but it's a pitched roof I believe currently. I think we have a picture of it here.

It needs a new roof.

So you can kind of...

Okay, it's greater than...

Probably greater than five to 12.

Yeah.

Yeah, I would guess it's greater. [crosstalk 00:30:06]

Could you hold that picture for a second? Are all those roofs greater than 5'12 in that neighborhood?

I could speculate, but I'm not certain.

Doesn't look like it.

No, that neighborhood has been established since I was a child. That particular site we're looking at has been an automotive style since I was a child. Yeah, I don't think there's very much in that whole neighborhood that's conforming with this code.

That's helpful.

That's just my opinion.

Any other questions?

I had a further question, if I can take the floor now?

Go right ahead.

So just to clarify, so between the... You can leave that picture, that's a perfect picture. So between the established landscaping sidewalk off of Rouge River Highway, the elevation of that sidewalk versus the parking lot elevation, just to clarify you said that was roughly six feet in elevation difference?

Correct. Yeah.

Okay. So more of... Yeah, so basically the objection... or the object of screening along a frontage, usually you're talking about a 36 inch screening buffer, usually whether it's a wall or a landscaping. So I just want to clarify, that sidewalk is six feet different in elevation from the parking lot, so that would basically vertically exceed any 36 inch screening that would be required in that area. That was more of a statement. So my question would be, in this exhibit that you gave us with the green area highlighted as landscaping, do we have like... Visually, I'm looking at this saying, percentage wise it is more of a percentage of the overall lot than if I was to take a five foot strip on each frontage. Would you agree with that?

I guess I don't completely understand that.

So if I'm looking at this exhibit with all the green proposed landscaping and the existing, established landscaping on Rogue River Highway, I look at that versus the lot size and that's a certain percentage. So if I visually say, okay, I need a five foot strip around Rogue River Highway and I need a five foot strip along Florence, it seems like that would be less landscaping than they're proposing, I guess is my question. So if I'm looking at trying to weigh out whether a variance of taking landscaping from one side and putting it on the other, it looks like they're proposing more landscaping than what would be required for the two frontage streets. Is that an accurate guess?

Yeah. Without doing some calculations it's hard to know for certain, but certainly there's some landscaping be proposed in other areas.

Correct.

That would fill in. I just do want to call out the southern portion of landscaping is required due to a zone buffer, because the lots to the south are residential.

Yeah, it says on the site plan that there's a minimum of three foot required, but they're proposing four and a half feet.

Yeah, so there's definitely a portion of landscaping on this site that if we were to kind of allocate it in our minds to what we're talking about, there would be a portion that would fill that area.

Thank you for the clarification. That's it.

Any other questions of staff? Commissioner Aviles?

I had a question for the applicant, but I guess I can also ask staff. Give me just one second. It had to do with the condition around creating a connective route for pedestrians. I was wondering if the city had an idea of where that would be?

Basically, that requirement is just connecting building entrances to the right of way and to the parking area. So if we go to the site plan here... Well, let me try pulling this up.

So Commissioner Aviles, if you can see on this zoomed in portion of the site plan, you can see the pedestrian way indicated. There's been a few revision as staff has worked with the applicant as part of the A list condition of the original approval, so this site plan is meeting that condition that you're referencing.

Okay, great. Thank you so much.

Anything else, Commissioner Aviles?

Nope. Thank you.

Other commissioners, questions of staff?

I do have the one question. I assume that all of that slanted portion that runs along the sidewalk is the responsibility of ODOT to maintain, keep cleaned out, and that kind of thing? Everything outside the fence?

We have actually an agreement with ODOT that the city will maintain that. So our Parks crews... Well, technically we have a contract with Mountain View Landscape, so we subcontract that particular section out. So it is city responsibility to maintain the landscaping along Rouge River Highway, even though it's in ODOT right of way.

Okay. I did go out to see it because I couldn't believe that it's been all these years and I never noticed it was sitting down in a gully like that. I thought that would be a terrible thing to have to

maintain, keep trash out of, and all that kind of stuff if there were bushes in there. At least it's clear and can stand a chance at being kept reasonably nice the way it is, I think.

Any other questions for staff? Mr. Bowman, the applicant, you're welcome to come up and make whatever statements you want to.

[inaudible 00:36:53] Yeah, I want to say thank you, Jason. [inaudible 00:36:57]

I'm sorry, state your name and address for the record.

[inaudible 00:37:02].

Thank you, sir.

Is that red light on that? Not that one, to the right. Yeah.

It is now.

All right, great.

Just wanted to emphasize that at this point as far as everything that we have done so far that would get this approved as presented, I'm basically out of resources at this point. And it's a quirky little car lot that could be... I have a vision that it will be great and I think if it's approved as the way it is, if we could go forward and get this going. So that's about all I have because Jason did a great job of presenting it and the roadblocks that we've run into with the whole elevations and landscape, the biggest concern was the landscape along Florence that it would just be totally hindering of basically car sales and the landscape strips would be... The car lot is my display area and I can't do and do a little boutique and say, no you have to have four feet of your sales floor with a planter box on the inside of somebody's boutique.

And the way that's structured makes for the best visibility for auto sales and also the visibility possible that, that lot could actually bring. I mean, she said herself that she didn't even know it was there. Yeah, we're just trying to improve that little strip of Rogue River Highway. That's about all I have.

Any questions of the applicant? Commissioner Nelson?

The awning I had a question about. You went with three feet versus five, is there a reason?

Oh, on the awnings? That was just the building design, it was just the way it was designed. At this point, with the time that it's taken to get to this point, the price of the building has doubled since I got my first quote on the building and that's just because of COVID, and materials, and that type of thing. It's been about two years now since I got that first quote. I went from \$80,000.00 to \$168,000.00 and just that's part of the design on how they designed it. So as far as doing a variance or asking to have that redone, basically I'm running out of money so I won't be able to do that.

Other questions of the applicant? Commissioner Aviles?

No, no questions.

All right, sir. You can have a seat. Any other questions of staff? I'm getting ready to close the public hearing. All right, the public hearing is closed. We need a motion before we can have discussion and I think what we should do is what we typically do here, is entertain the variances first. So does anybody have any motion about the variances.

I would move all three variances for approval.

We have a motion to approve all three variances.

I'll second that, Scherf.

Commissioner Scherf seconds that. Is there any discussion? Commissioner Aviles?

No discussion.

Okay, I keep calling on you because I can't see you, if you're raising your hand or not, so sorry about that. Nobody has any discussion, we will vote on this motion to approve all three variances. All those in favor signify by saying, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? We have five approval votes for the variance, all three variances.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Nelson moved and Commissioner Scherf seconded the motion to approve all three variances for Bowman's Choice Auto. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss. The motion passed.

All right, now we're looking at the site plan and the site plan relief to Section 20. We need a motion.

I'll make a motion to approve the requested reliefs for commercial architectural design reliefs. Sorry if I said that wrong.

I think that'll do. So we have a motion to approve the site plan as modified for relief. Do we have a second?

Nelson, second.

Nelson seconds. Discussion? Commissioner Aviles, once again I can't see you, do you have any discussion about this?

No. I don't.

Okay, thank you very much. No discussion. All those in favor of this motion signify by saying, "Aye."

Aye.

Anybody opposed? No abstentions? All right, your site plan relief has been approved, sir. Congratulations.

MOTION/VOTE

Commissioner Scherf moved and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to approve Bowman's Choice Auto commercial architectural design reliefs. The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles, Nelson and Scherf. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: Vice Chair Collier and Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss.

The motion passed.

All right, heading back to the agenda. We are left with matters from commission members and staff. Commissioner Aviles, I'll start with you. Do you have anything you want to tell us?

No, I don't think so. Sorry, I'm not in person. I'll be there next time.

All righty, thank you. Commissioner Scherf?

Nothing to add, thank you.

Commissioner Nelson?

Nada.

Commissioner Arthur?

No.

You guys are in luck, I have something and it will only take an hour. I'm kidding. So I have been asked by City Council to initiate the UAPC's normal gyrations over our goals for next year. I'm not expecting anybody to spit out any goals right now, but we have goals from last year. I'm hoping staff can forward those to all the commissioners in the next couple days. And I would expect that we'll have a discussion on those goals at our next meeting, which is October 27th. We can stand on the goals that we made last year, if we want, or we can come up with some new ones. And as is my duty as the Chair, I get to present our goals to the Council at some meeting I think in December. So this is why I'm itching to get these done. Yes sir, Commissioner Nelson.

Don't you have to wear a suit and tie?

Last year... No, I rode my bike over from work and I had on a t-shirt and long pants. I had my mask on and made a joke about not flossing and brushing for a year. It was great. Okay, that was all I had. Staff, what do you have for us?

So when are you going to take your picture? The strategic plan, the council for all 12 committees and commissions, they like updated photos. So whoever is here, is here, but we... You've got a month or so to do that, but I just wanted to remind you that for that process, and I don't know if the mayor, if you talked about that at your meeting last week, but that's... So we do need to get a photograph of the Commission.

Thank you for bringing that up. I did forget to tell you guys I had a meeting with the mayor last week. All the Commission Chairs, I think there were three of us that showed up, and you said there's 12 total commission? Yeah. So I went to that meeting, I don't remember her saying that. Are we talking selfies? Or do we need a group photo or what?

Well, I guess you could take selfies and we could Photoshop it all together.

Oh, so you could? Eight different backgrounds.

Typically, we have put you... Actually, I think last year we had everybody in masks.

I didn't do a photo last year.

I don't remember a photo last year either.

Oh, did we miss UAPC? Oh, wow. I'm surprised we got through without any hand slapping.

Let's see if we can do it again.

So you want to wear your nice suits or I mean, whatever and like I say, this is for the strategic plan and it's not until December, so I'm just pointing out we need to be thinking about that. We can talk about it again next meeting.

Can I ask you a question? I heard... I don't remember whether it was on the Council Workshop or meet, probably workshop, where they were talking about changing the inter-governmental agreement and obviously, the selection of commission people is one of the issues, but I didn't hear that actually mentioned. I don't think that particular aspect was. Is that included in the discussion, or negotiations, or whatever?

It is amending the inter-governmental agreement, in which discussions?

They were talking about working with the commissioners on changing the inter... I don't know if they're [inaudible 00:47:11] ending it or changing the inter-governmental agreement.

So I have some news on this as well from my meeting last week with the mayor. That was brought up. I did bring that up. The impression I got was that the City Manager, Cubic, is that his title, City Manager? That he was going to look into that. I don't know if changes are coming. I don't honestly know how that idea was even received, but I was told that it would be looked into. And it does involve a code change because the city code does say, and county commissioners

will select four. Director Clark sent me that code section a couple weeks ago, so it's at least going to be looked at. That's pretty much all I can tell you, not because it's a secret, because that's all I know.

Yeah, I think we may be talking about two slightly different things.

It would be fine if they actually got around to doing it in a timely manner, maybe.

Yeah, because the composition of this Commission, the Urban Area Planning Commission is specifically addressed in the development code and you're right, that's with the appointees from the County Commission and the appointees from the City. But I understood Commissioner Arthur's question about the inter-governmental agreement between the city and Josephine County going back to 1998, which addresses how we regulate the urban growth boundary for planning purposes. Is that...

Well, that too, but I was specifically interested in [inaudible 00:48:58] because my understand was that is one of the parts of the agreement too is [inaudible 00:49:04].

Yeah. Yeah, I can tell you Councilor Faszler has brought up a couple of times now, he's expressed an interest in having that 1998 agreement looked at, and it's been brought up in connection with the urban growth boundary rezone project, and that is the logical time to do that. If the city's going to go ahead and zone all of the urban growth boundary as city zoning, do we really... That would affect the content of that agreement quite a bit, so those were kind of married up, but I think the reason it hasn't come before you is because the urban growth boundary rezone is kind of stalled.

One other question, if I can do it at this time. They were presented, I don't know, was it three or four sections of urban growth boundary expansion to be considered for the near future. But it seemed to me, I recall, it was in and out so many times I'm not real sure at this point that there were a few acres along the west side of the boundary, north of the river, and south of the railroad tracks, there were a few little parts that were not EFU that we tried to include, that adjoined existing zoning. And I can't remember now whether they actually ever got included or not, but the reason I thought about it was, and they weren't shown if they exist, they weren't shown in those samples, is would it, would adding those improve the warrant for the fourth bridge or not? Increase the... Because the whole topic was about TIA, right?

Right.

The traffic impact of all those things.

Right.

And then I thought about [inaudible 00:51:18] well, I don't know, it's such a small area and the real impact is not from the properties that adjoin that corridor, the Allen Creek, Lincoln corridor, it's the people way out at the ends that Jumpoff Joe and everything else that would be using that route instead of coming through town that make up the long range traffic. And I don't know how they do that.

Right. Well, that would have to be looked at by the traffic engineers as a part of the traffic impact analysis in terms of setting. And some of that's going to be guidance from ODOT with their modeling, with their [TPAL 00:51:58]. Salem is a traffic engineering and they kind of set some guidelines for how these are done. So in terms of how far out you go when you're examining the impacts and I doubt they would go off to Jumpoff Joe exit. I doubt they would go that far out.

The reason I mentioned that was, I told the story once before, I don't know if it was here or where, that when they were considering Allen Creek expansion or finishing off that portion of Allen Creek, and Joel went and interviewed the people who lived there, which of course you got a certain response from. And that day at my house there was a meeting going on of the university women group and they arrived... They were supposed to be there at 02:00 PM and some of them arrived a little early and the City Council meeting was still on, and they were talking about it, and they were all standing around looking, listening to that.

And oh, that's a wonderful idea and one of them lives on Jumpoff Joe and has to visit her 90 something year old mother three times a week at the facility there where the movie theater used to be, the drive-in movie, whatever it's name is this year. And she thought that was wonderful and another person lived way off down south on New Hope area and needs to come up to this part of town and they thought that was wonderful. And all the Council was talking about was just the people who lived on that street, on that portion of it, not the purpose of having a north, south corridor. I don't know if I'll ever live long enough to see a fourth bridge.

I don't think any of us will.

Yeah. I'm just wondering [crosstalk 00:53:59].

Some of us might.

What was that?

[crosstalk 00:54:11] I was saying some of us might live to see a fourth bridge.

Okay.

Sorry, you're right. You and Jason Maki just might do that.

Thank you.

Anything else for us staff?

No, the only thing I had related to that topic is that the Council did at their last workshop in talking about the urban growth boundary rezone, asked that the Allen Creek area, which we're prioritizing now as kind of the one area to focus on before bringing the application back to you for a hearing, would be looked at by the Housing Advisory Committee and you, in terms of the zoning that's being proposed. So last time we looked at all 540 acres and kind of across the whole and we didn't really zero in on any one area, so we'll be bringing that to you probably at... I was just looking at your schedule here, your October 27th meeting you do have two public hearings, so we probably will not do that. But the November 3rd meeting looks light enough that maybe we would bring that discussion to you. So that was it.

Jason, do you have anything for us?

I think my go to response is we have a lot going on in planning, so I'm sure there's various things, but nothing that's coming to mind specifically.

All right, thank you. Nobody else has anything? We are adjourned. Commissioner Arviles, thank you so much for attending remotely, we appreciate that.

Thank you.

Meeting adjourned: 6:55 p.m.

Next meeting: October 27, 2021



Eric Heesacker, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commissioner



Date

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