

URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes – July 27, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers

COMMISSIONERS:

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

City/Staff/Council Liaisons:

Bradley Clark (Director)
Jason Maki (Associate Planner)
Donna Rupp (Associate Planner)
Ryan Nolan (Contract Principal Planner)
Gabby Sinagra (Assistant Planner)

Guests:

Nathan Emerson, CSA Planning
Greg McOwen, RCC

1. Public Hearing: a. 401-00102-22/403-00101-22 ~ RCC Zone Map Amendment and Annexation
~ PC Staff Report

Hearing was continued from our last meeting. There's no need to open it, but I do need to read the procedures. At this time, the public hearing will continue. We will begin the hearing with the Staff Report followed by public comment, and then the manner will be discussed and acted upon by the Commission. Objections to jurisdiction, is there anyone present who wishes to challenge the authority of the Commission to consider this matter? Nobody so signifies. Abstentions, conflicts of interest, do any Commissioners wish to abstain from participating in this hearing or declare a potential conflict of interest? Nobody's doing so. In this hearing, the decision of the Commission will be based upon specific criteria. All testimony and evidence must be directed towards those criteria. The criteria which apply in this case are noted in the Staff Report. 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 the Land Use Board of Appeals based on the issue. We will now keep this hearing going with the Staff Report.

Good evening, Commissioners, just ensure I'm sharing my screen here. I might be having a little bit of an issue with the sharing of the screen. But tonight's project is Rogue Community College Zone Map Amendment and Annexation. My name is Jason. I'm an associate planner with the Community Development Department. And for the record, the project numbers are 401-00102-22 and 403-00101-22.

The proposal that the applicant is requesting approval of a zone map amendment and annexation into the city limits. The applicant proposes to change the subject parcels underlying zone map designation from R-4-2 to R-4-1. And just a note, the UAPC does not make recommendation to City Council for annexation applications and will make a recommendation only on the zone map amendment. We do have two concurrent applications, but for tonight's hearing, the Commission will just be making a recommendation for the zone map amendment application.

So little background. The current comprehensive plan designation for the subject parcels is high density residential, which allows for the R-4-1, R-4-2, and R-5 zone map designations. So, the proposal does not require a comprehensive plan amendment, just only a zone map amendment. The primary reason for this request is the existing zoning district of the subject parcels, which are R-4-2 does not allow for schools as a primary use, which is the existing development and

future development of the parcels. The proposed zoning district of R-4 1 does allow for schools as a primary use and would be a more appropriate zoning district for the existing use and development.

There's seven lots total, which you can see in the picture on the left, kind of highlighted in blue. Again, the current base zoning is R-4-2, and the proposed base zoning is R-4-1.

Just a little bit of insight into the existing utilities. The existing development is served by water through private laterals, through a private offsite pump station. And sewer is provided through a 10-inch sewer main. There is no direct connection to city storm drain main. And access is provided from the north by Redwood Highway and from the south, a privately maintained street. Zone map amendments are approved under the criterion found in section 4.033 of the Grants Pass Development Code. Staff did find that the proposal meets all seven criteria found in that section. Staff would like to highlight two specific criteria, which are as follows: criterion one, the proposed use, if any, is consistent with the proposed zoning district. The existing use of the subject parcels is categorized under the school's land use type found in schedule 12-2 of the Grants Pass Development Code. As per the Development Code schedule 12-2 school uses are permitted as primary use in the R-4-1 zoning district, which is the zone being requested. So again, going back to one of the earlier slides, the proposed zone is a more appropriate zone for the existing land use. And criterion four, it's specific to transportation, but it really applies to all utilities. The criterion reads, "Demonstration that the proposed amendment is consistent with the functions, capacities and performance standards of transportation facilities identified in the Master Transportation Plan." Staff did find that the criteria was satisfied.

The proposed zone change is not expected to increase the potential intensity of uses or demands on urban services. RCC is expected to continue to occupy and to be the primary land use on the site. Thus, the expected demands on functions, capacities, and performance standards of the transportation facilities are found to be similar before and after the zone change. And any future development approved through a site plan review will be required to meet the applicable standards of the Development Code at the time of review, including traffic impact analysis that may be required. So, in the future, if expansion occurs, those proposals will be reviewed and approved under the code standard at the time. Ending, any questions for me? That's staff's presentation.

Any questions of staff? There are none in house. Any of you Commissioners online? Any questions of staff?

No.

No.

I'm going to turn it over to the applicant. Come on up to the microphone please. Introduce yourself and go right ahead.

My name is Nathan Emerson. I'm a-

Push the button on the base of your microphone.

Oh, okay.

It lights up red. Now you should be lit. No. Staff will assist.

There we go.

How about now? I got to move it up. Got it. You think for somebody who does public speaking once in a while, that I'd figure it out. My name is Nathan Emerson. I'm a planner at CSA Planning, which is located at 4497 Brown Ridge Terrace in Medford, Oregon. I'm here on behalf of Rogue Community College tonight, along with Greg McOwen also of RCC. I don't have a whole lot to add to the Staff Report. I think that represents the application. I guess the only thing, I would add a little bit of context, perhaps. In our initial application or pre-application for the annexation, we weren't proposing a zone change at that time. Staff then pointed out that if we were next under the current zoning, that primary use of school use would not be allowed. And they recommended that we move forward with the zone change in conjunction with the annexation. We agreed, that's a good idea. We don't want to come into the city as a nonconform use or in violation of the zoning code. And so that's why we're here, those particular items tonight.

So, with that, we respectfully request that you recommend approval of the zone change to City Council. And I'm happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

Any questions to this gentleman? Online people? Any questions?

No.

No.

No.

Sir, did you want to add anything?

I don't.

All right. It sounds like we're all good. Unless there's any objections I'm going to go ahead and close the public hearing. Public hearing is closed. Do we have a motion?

Yes, we do. It seems pretty straightforward. So, I'm going to recommend approval of the RCC zone map amendment and annexation. Do you need me to read the numbers?

No, you don't need to read numbers, but you do need to clarify that we are recommending forwarding approval.

Boarding approval.

To Council.

To Council.

Just the zone map amendment.

Correct.

So, we've made a joint motion Collier and Heesaker. Do we have a second?

I'm scared to second.

With Commissioner Nelson seconding. Any discussion?

Would you repeat the motion? Was that just for the annexation?

I will repeat the motion. We can't recommend anything for the annexation. So, we're recommending forwarding approval to Council of the zone map amendment. That's the motion.

And there's no discussion on this motion. It's been seconded. All those in favor, say aye.

Aye.

Anyone opposed? Anybody abstaining? Motion carries, unanimous decision.

MOTION/VOTE

Chair Heesacker and Vice Chair Collier moved, and Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion to recommend forwarding approval to Council of the RCC Zone Map Amendment.

The vote resulted as follows: "AYES": Chair Heesacker, Vice Chair Collier, Commissioners Arthur, Aviles Coulter, Tokarz-Krauss, Scherf, and Nelson. "NAYS": None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

The motion passed.

Thank you, gentlemen, very much for showing up. Commissioner Tokarz-Krauss, we don't need you for anything else tonight. You may proceed on your way and thank you so much for calling in.

Absolutely. Thank you.

Until next time.

Bye-bye.

Bye. Item 7A, Matters from Commission Members and Staff. Staff you want to talk to us about-

Susan Tokarz-Krauss is now exiting.

You want to tell us something about land use application site visit.

Just really quickly. Mark, I should say Commissioner Collier and I attended a training session a couple weeks ago online. This was hosted by the Oregon American Planning Association Chapter. One of the speakers there was a land use attorney, I can't remember her name right now. But one of the pieces of information that she shared during her training, I thought might just be helpful to bring up here. And it has to do with site visits. And this is a topic that we haven't really talked a lot about here. And in part, because it hasn't really been an issue, but I thought it was timely.

So basically, if you have a quasi-judicial hearing, which is anything that is specific to a land use item on a specific piece of property. So, we're not talking about legislative hearings, which are code amendments, actually tonight's zone map amendments are not. But any pretty much anything else you do, variances, subdivisions, any kind of other special permits that are on a particular piece of property, those are quasi-judicial. So, in a quasi-judicial hearing, you are highly recommended not to do site visits on your own. Now, this is a kind of a weird, she was a little bit wishy-washy. I don't know how you felt Vice Chair Collier, but I don't know, I thought there's some little bit of interpretation. I did talk to our city attorney and he more or less agreed.

It's not a good idea for you as an individual Commissioner to go to a site on your own and check it out.

If you do, be sure that you disclose that at the front end of the hearing. And if you drive by it on your way into work, or you go by there all the time on your way to doing whatever you're doing, we're not talking about that. We're not talking about just sort of passing by it as a course of business. We're talking about if you affirmatively go to a site for the purpose of checking it out in order to prepare yourself for a hearing, that's generally a no-no under Oregon Revised Statute. So, like I say, I don't think that's been happening, and I haven't heard any complaints, but I just thought it was a timely thing to bring up. Now, if you happen to see something coming across the docket and you think it's particularly interesting, I mean, it might be controversial or something, and staff will try to do a better job at informing you if we're getting just a ton of complaints or opposition, you can, as a Commission, do a site visit together, but we would have to notice that, because you'd presumably have a quorum.

So again, doesn't usually come up. We try to do as good a job as we can to give you aerials, to give you the information in the Staff Report. But sometimes it really does help you to see it on the ground and make a decision. And like I say, it's not that we can't accommodate you, we can, we can do that, but we do need to notice it. And it's just one of those things. So, I just thought I'd bring that up. There was a lot of interesting pieces to that training, but I wanted to point that one out.

I don't like that, but I'm not going to debate that here and waste everybody's time. You and I can discuss it at some point.

Well, yeah. Yeah. I didn't make the rule.

Understood. This won't be a beat down. It'll be a discussion. Anybody else have anything they want to bring forward? Commissioner Nelson.

A clarification. You have to notice, but I don't believe you have to be a quorum. In other words, if you are two Commissioners that have specific things you want to go over or look at, then it must be noticed, I believe. That would definitely have to happen as well.

Just to clarify, are you saying that if two Commissioners decided you wanted to go together to do a site visit-

That would have to be noticed and I would recommend it.

Well, then tomorrow morning, we have to notice our 9:30 meeting with Commissioner Councilor Lovelace.

That's unlegislated.

I think, so now we're stepping off the discussion.

Yeah. Yeah. I think whether you're one person, two persons, three persons, the point of this training was that you shouldn't be going to the site to do that. Whether there's multiple of you or not. And if you do and you have a quorum, then we would notice it. Yeah.

Would we need to be escorted by staff?

We would because we would have to probably somehow record it. Some kind of a handheld device or whatever, and we would actually have to do minutes too.

Understood.

Yep.

Other comments on that?

Commissioner Aviles.

Go right ahead.

So just to make sure I'm hearing right, I'm going to run through a recent example. Is that okay?

Sure.

It was the five-unit development off of Carnahan. I live near there. And I remember during our session, I shared that I walked by, I knew the area, blah, blah, blah. I don't think that was a quasi-judicial item. I believe that was legislative because it might have had to do with a lot. But I guess you'd have to know if it was a... I'm sorry, I'm thinking out loud as I'm speaking, I guess we would have to remember whether or not that property was legislative or quasi-judicial to know if what I did then is what you're referring to. But what I'm hearing is this more of like an ex parte issue, showing up is something that would be considered ex parte and that's why it needs to be disclosed.

Yes. Yes, exactly. And I do remember the one you're talking about, Commissioner, and that was quasi-judicial. And again, if it happens, it happens. But I think the real intent behind this would be that if you happen to get onto the site and maybe a neighbor comes by and you just say, "Hey, what are you doing?" "Oh, we got a land use hearing coming up." And you start talking to them about this and that. And then the owner shows up and you want to talk to them about this then that, that's where it starts to get a little bit more messy. And granted, what's the likelihood of that? Pretty small. But the point of the law, and this is not an unusual law, I know that Washington and Idaho have the same thing, is to try to prevent that ex parte, as Commissioner Aviles just said, communication. It's different than a conflict of interest. We're not talking about conflict of interest here. We're talking about trying to prevent ex parte communication.

Thank you. Second question. Are there any materials from that training that can be shared with the Commission and/or the public?

Yes. I think there are some PowerPoint slides that we have, so we can certainly send those out.

Thank you.

Send that to all the Commission members, that'd be great. Thank you very much. Commissioner Aviles, nothing else?

No, sir.

Commissioner Arthur.

I don't have anything. Nothing.

Nobody in house has anything. This meeting is adjourned.

I'm sorry. I did have one more step up.

Ah.

I'm sorry.

I take back the adjourn-

I didn't know you were going to move that quick.

I retract. Go ahead, Director Clark.

So, I think it was about three meetings ago, you, Chair, refreshed the Commission on the Middle Housing Code. So, you made a recommendation to the City Council to approve the Middle Housing Code. The City Council had their hearing. They had about 20 developers show up at their meeting. They chose to remand that item back to you. There was a lot of discussion about the zoning transition overlay and a lot of confusion and conflating the two. I think we talked about that.

Yes, we did.

And you, Chair, made the announcement, basically, that it could be coming back. Where we're at now, is trying to determine where to go with that application. Because as you may recall, we're currently working under the State Model Code for middle housing. And we would, I think all of us collectively, Council, Commissioners, staff, want to get to a local code and not use the State Model Code. So, we're trying to get a resolution on this. So, I guess the question tonight, we'd just like clarity if this Commission in fact wants to see the middle housing back or if you're okay if the City Council picks it back up again where they left off.

So, for purposes of consensus, we've made our recommendation. I don't see a point in us dragging through that whole thing again. That's my vote. Okay. Nelson and Collier agree. Commissioner Aviles, Commissioner Arthur, how would you feel about taking a second look at the Middle Housing Code?

What exactly did they want to find out by sending it back to us?

I don't think we know that, but I'll let Director Clark speak to that.

No, that's correct. We don't. Their motion to remand was fairly unexplicit and ambiguous. Not in the sense of remanding it, but in terms of why. I think that if you go back and listen to that meeting, it's pretty clear that all of the public testimony really related to the zoning transition overlay and not the Middle Housing Code. And I think it just really caused some misunderstanding about the purpose of that hearing. And so, we're trying to separate those two topics out and move forward with just the middle housing. So, we actually don't have any specific direction from the Council as to why they would send just the middle housing back to the Zoning Commission or the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Arthur, that answer your question?

Yes. I did watch that, and I was puzzled at what was going on too.

Thank you. We'll take that back. You probably won't be seeing it again.

All right. Thanks for that. I was going to ask you about that. Thank you for remembering. This meeting is... Director Clark, what else do you have for us?

No.

This meeting is adjourned. Thank you, ladies.

Eric Heesacker, Chair
Urban Area Planning Commissioner

Date

**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:	401-00102-22 / 403-00101-22
Project Type:	Zone Map Amendment and Annexation
Owner(s):	Rogue Community College
Applicant:	Rogue Community College
Representative:	CSA Planning Ltd, Jay Harland
Property Address:	3345 Redwood Highway
Map and Tax Lot:	36-06-27-A0, TL's 1000 & 1001 36-06-27-AD, TL's 900, 1000, 1400, 1600 36-06-27-D0, TL's 101
Zoning:	High Density Residential (R-4-2)
Size:	Approximately 87 acres
Planner Assigned:	Jason Maki
Application Date:	May 27, 2022
Application Complete:	June 1, 2022
Date of Staff Report:	July 22, 2022
Hearing Date:	July 27, 2022
Date of Findings of Fact:	July 10, 2022
120 Day Deadline:	September 29, 2022

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

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 parcels' underlying Zone Map designation from R-4-2 to R-4-1. (Note: The UAPC does not make a recommendation to City Council for Annexation Applications, and will make a recommendation only on the Zone Map Amendment.)

II. AUTHORITY:

Section 2.020: Schedule 2-1; Sections 2.062, 2.063, and 2.064 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code authorize the Planning Commission to review the application at a duly noticed public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council. Section 2.066 Grants 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 the following Criteria:

Sections 4.033 (Amendments) of the Grants Pass Development Code.
Section 5.053 (Annexation) of the Grants Pass Development Code.

The Criteria are identified and analyzed in the remaining Sections below.

IV. APPEAL PROCEDURE:

Final action on the proposal will be considered by the City Council. As such, the 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 into the City Limits was submitted on May 27, 2022 and deemed complete on June 1, 2022. The application was processed in accordance with Section 2.050 of the Development Code.
- B.** Public notice of the July 27, 2022 hearing was posted on July 6, 2022 and published in the newspaper of record on July 15, 2022, in accordance with Section 2.053 of the Development Code.
- C.** A public hearing was held by the UAPC on July 27, 2022, to consider the proposal and make a recommendation to City Council. The UAPC made a recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed Zone Map Amendment.

VI. SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE:

- D.** The basic facts and criteria regarding this application are contained in the Staff Report, which is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein.
- E.** The minutes of the public hearing held by the Urban Area Planning Commission on July 27, 2022, attached as Exhibit "B", summarize the oral testimony presented and are hereby incorporated herein.
- F.** The PowerPoint given by staff is attached as Exhibit "C".

VII. FINDINGS OF FACT:

The Urban Area Planning Commission found that based upon the testimony given at the public hearing and the staff report, the proposal meets the criteria in Sections 6.060 and 17.413 of the Development Code based on the reasons stated in the findings included below.

VIII. GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Characteristics of the Property:

1. Land Use Designation:
 - a. Comprehensive Plan: High Density Residential (HRR)
 - b. Zone District: R-4-2
 - c. Special Purpose District: GP Irrigation District
2. Size: 87 +/- acres total
3. Frontage: Redwood Highway ~ State Highway
4. Access: Redwood Highway ~ State Highway
College Drive ~ Privately Maintained Street
5. Existing Public Utilities:
 - a. Water: Private laterals served by off-site pump station
 - b. Sewer: 10-inch main
 - c. Storm: No direct connection to City storm drain main
6. Proposed Public Utilities: None (Zone Change and Annexation Only)
7. Topography: Areas of moderate to significant slopes
8. Natural Hazards: Steep Slope Hazard Area
9. Natural Resources: Significant Stands of Trees
10. Existing Land Use: Rogue Community College: Redwood Campus

B. 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 R-4-2 to R-4-1. 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 High Density Residential (HRR), which includes both the R-4-2 and R-4-1 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. As the property is designated as High Density Residential (HRR) in the Comprehensive Plan the possible Zone Map Designations include R-4-1 and R-4-2 and R-5. The applicant has requested the R-4-1 Zoning Map Designation.

In past discussions the applicant has included potential development plans mentioning residential development (Student Housing) on the subject parcels. 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 student housing or group quarters are the same within both the proposed zoning (R-4-1) and the existing zoning (R-4-2). Both student housing and schools are permitted uses in the R-4-1 zoning district.

Annexation:

RCC seeks annexation of the Subject Property because it has nearly exhausted its allowable development capacity as regulated by the Josephine County and City's Urban Growth Management Agreement. Although RCC does not have a project shovel ready at this time, it is actively seeking funding to continue to grow and provide improved educational services to the community.

RCC therefore wants to be annexed into City limits to avoid any future project delays. Moreover, funding tends to be a competitive process and RCC does not want education facility enhancement opportunities to be missed due to the entitlement risks that will persist until the property is annexed to the City.

The City and Josephine County have an Urban Growth Management Agreement (“UGMA”) in place that regulates urbanization and establishes the regulatory process for development in the Urban Area. As part of the agreement, properties within the Urban Area have limits on development.

In 2018, City of Grants Pass Staff initially determined that additional development at RCC’s campus could not be permitted as “Category 1 Development” under the UGMA because the 25% development expansion threshold had been surpassed. Using the best available data, CSA calculated the extent of development pre and post UGMA and determined that RCC had 21,781 square feet of additional development capacity. The City ultimately agreed, and RCC has since received approval and constructed a new science center on the Redwood Campus.

Based on information provided by RCC, the campus has added over 19,000 square feet of building coverage since the calculations were completed in 2018. Most of the new square footage, approximately 17,500 square feet, is accounted for by the aforementioned science center. This leaves less than 3,000 square feet of development left. New developments on campus are likely to exceed this capacity. Upon annexation the development caps become null and void.

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 existing use of the subject parcels is categorized under the “Schools” Land Use Type found in Schedule 12-2 of the Grants Pass Development Code. As per GPDC Schedule 12-2, “School” Uses are permitted as a primary use in the R-4-1 zoning district, which is the zone being requested.

Although the proposed zoning district (R-4-1) allows the primary use of detached single dwelling units and the existing zoning district does not, it is the determination of the Planning Commission that the residential development potential of the subject parcels will remain unchanged if the Zone Map Amendment is to be approved. Both the R-4-1 and R-4-2 zoning districts share the same minimum and maximum density standards, 20.88 and 34.8 dwelling units per acre respectively.

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 High Density Residential (HRR). As per GPDC Schedule 12-1, the proposed R-4-1 zone is allowed in lands designated HRR. The Planning

Commission 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. Both the proposed zone and the existing zone are high density residential zones with the same maximum density of 34.8 dwelling units per acre. For the immediate future, the existing RCC educational use is expected to remain stable and not require increased levels of urban services. Therefore, the proposed zone change is not expected to increase the potential intensity of uses or demands on urban services.

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 not expected to increase the potential intensity of uses or demands on urban services. RCC is expected to continue to occupy and be the primary land use on the site. Thus, the expected demands on functions, capacities, and performance standards of transportation facilities are found to be similar before and after the zone change.

Any future development approved through a site plan review will be required to meet the applicable standards of the Development Code at the time of review, including Traffic Impact Analysis's that may be required.

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

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The Subject Property has significant stands of trees and some areas of moderate to significant slopes. Because both the proposed and existing zone are similar in intensity and use, it is concluded that the natural features will remain as conducive to the proposed Zoning District (R-4-1) as they are to the present Zoning District (R-4-2).

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 available to the site and are adequate for the applicant's intended use.

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. The Subject Property is already substantially developed and is already provisioned with basic urban services. Therefore, it is concluded that the timing of this zone change is appropriate.

B. For Annexations, Section 5.053 of the City of Grants Pass Development Code requires that all of the following criteria be met:

CRITERION 1: The proposed property is located within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary Area and the area is contiguous with the existing City boundary.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. As shown in the attached map, the Subject Parcels are located within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary Area and are contiguous with Map and Tax Lot 36-06-27-AD-800, which is located within the existing City boundary.

CRITERION 2: The proposed property is developed or will be developed consistent with City standards.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The property is substantially developed with the Redwood Campus of Rogue Community College and has more than 200,000 square feet of existing development. The "Schools" land use type found in Schedule 12-2 allows schools as a secondary use in the R-4-2 zoning district. It is because of this that the applicant is pursuing a Zone Map Amendment to change the Zoning to R-4-1. If the Zone Map Amendment were to be approved the existing use would be permitted as an allowable primary use.

Any future development would occur under the standards of the GPDC and would therefore conform to City standards.

CRITERION 3: The proposal is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan at such a time as the State has acknowledged that plan, or the proposal is consistent with LCDC Goals, prior to an acknowledgment of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. The proposal is consistent with the City's adopted and State recognized Comprehensive Plan.

CRITERION 4: The proposal is consistent with this Code.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. As adopted herein above and below for Criterion related to GPCD Article 5, the Application is consistent with the requirements of this code. Therefore, it is concluded that this Criterion is met.

CRITERION 5: The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Oregon Revised Statutes.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied. GPCD is the acknowledged land use ordinance for the City of Grants Pass. Article 5 of the GPCD regulates annexations and is in congruence with the provisions with Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 222, which includes provisions allowing for annexations via consent.

CRITERION 6: The City of Grants Pass has sufficient capacity to provide the property with basic urban services, such as municipal water, sanitary sewer, fire protection, and police protection.

Planning Commission Response: Satisfied.

Sanitary Sewer: The RCC Campus is part of the existing City of Grants Pass Sewer Service Area. A 10" non-reinforced concrete gravity sewer main runs to the RCC Campus near the midpoint of the easterly lot line of Map and Tax Lot 36-06W-27A-1000. An 8" Polyvinyl Chloride gravity main splits from this line once it enters the campus and runs south, providing service to the more southerly portion of campus. No development is proposed as part of this application, any future development will be reviewed under the applicable standards at the time of application. It is concluded that basic urban services in the form of Sanitary Sewer are provided to the Subject Property.

Municipal Water: The RCC Campus is connected to the City water system through a recently constructed private water pump station which provides service to the campus via an 16" and 8" water lines. It is expected that the recently installed pump station will provide adequate water service for the foreseeable future. No development is proposed as part of this application, any future development will be reviewed under the applicable standards at the time of application. Therefore, it is concluded that basic urban services in the form of Municipal Water are provided to the Subject Property.

Storm Drainage: The RCC Redwood Campus is sufficiently sized with additional open space areas to accommodate future storm drainage requirements consistent with City of Grants Pass storm drainage requirements. Essentially, the site is large enough with available locations to treat and detain stormwater from future development of new impervious surfaces to run-off rates and locations that are comparable to the current conditions at the site, under the "design-year" storm. No development is proposed as part of this application, any future development will be reviewed under the applicable standards at the time of application. Therefore, it is concluded that basic urban services in the form of Storm Drainage are provided to the Subject Property.

Fire Protection: As presented in the applicant's submitted application, the College contracts with the Rural Metro Fire Department for fire protection services. The City of Grants Pass Fire Rescue Division presently serves as backup. Upon annexation, these roles will be reversed and the City will be the primary response agency. Therefore, it is concluded that basic urban services in the form of Fire Protection are provided to the Subject Property.

Police Protection: As presented in the applicant's submitted application, the College maintains a contract with a private security firm that provides security officers at the Redwood Campus. The security force consists of unarmed, non-sworn personnel. RCC Security at the Redwood Campus is reachable 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. RCC plans to continue this contract security service for the foreseeable future. The College also maintains a cooperative relationship with the Josephine County Sheriff's Office and the City of Grants Pass Department of Public Safety.

X. FINDINGS APPROVED BY THE URBAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION this 10th day of July, 2022.

Eric Heesacker, Chair