

MINUTES FOR THE CLIMATE & ENERGY ACTION PLAN ad hoc COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 17, 2016
Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

1. Call to Order

Councilor Rich Rosenthal called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Committee members Rich Rosenthal, Marni Koopman, Louise Shawkat, Greg Jones, Stuart Green, James McGinnis, Roxanne Beigel-Coryell, Jim Hartman, Cindy Bernard, Isaac Bevers, Sarah Lasoff, Bryan Sohl and Claudia Alick were present. Staff member Adam Hanks was present.

2. Approval of Minutes

Sohl/Jones m/s to approve the minutes of July 6, 2016, as presented. Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.

3. Public Forum

Ken Croker – shared thoughts from previous meeting and is concerned with how targets are being set and why, especially with the goal/target changing from one meeting to the next. Stated that he feels it is important for the targets to be based on science and feels that the committee's targets were based on fear of acceptance/approval by Council rather than by science.

Morgan Lindsay – stated her view that this is an urgent topic given the heat and air quality issues, which is toughest on the community's most vulnerable citizens. Reminded the committee that the Eugene target included an annual 7.8% reduction by 2050 and City operations carbon and fossil fuel neutral even earlier. She also supports the draft ordinance for goals/targets

Hannah Sohl – Requested the committee to pass the goals/target ordinance as soon as possible, get the ordinance discussion out of the way to be able to work on the plan to achieve it.

Robert Block-Brown – Appreciates the work of the committee and re-stated the urgency of moving the ordinance forward as quickly as possible then continuing to work on the plan. Suggested that the ordinance be made public for better understanding in the community of the criteria and the broad array of current GHG impacts/emissions in the community.

Allie Rosenbleuth – Supports the work of the commission and supports moving the ordinance forward as soon as possible.

Huelz Gutchen – Informed the committee that he thinks 7 megawatts of solar locally is possible, stated that the recent presentation from the City Electric Director shows that solar issues/programs should be in the Community Development Dept not in the Electric Dept and that the City needs solar trained employees.

4. Recap of Council Presentation

Chair Rosenthal provided a short recap of the July 19 committee presentation to the Council, adding that he thought it was well received and suggested that anyone who was interested to go to the City website and see the presentation materials and watch the presentation video if they were interested in the details.

Rosenthal also provided a brief update on the recent Council discussion/direction regarding the recent ballot measure that directs the City to approve an ordinance that requires the City to produce 10% of the community's electricity from local and clean sources by 2020. Rosenthal outlined the state ballot measure process and directed interested committee members to the August 16 Council meeting agenda and video for more information and informed them of the official Council vote for acceptance/approval of the ordinance on the September 6 Council meeting.

5. Discussion of Goals/Target Ordinance

Koopman advocated to the committee that the goal and target should be science based. Rosenthal asked for a definition of science based and Koopman stated that a science based goal/target is one that meets the per capita carbon reduction required to restore the carbon intensity of the atmosphere back to 350 parts per million (or less). Koopman added that the goal ordinance that has been worked on by others in the community contains a science based target and was based on the Eugene ordinance, which also doesn't exclude consumption based emissions from the goal/target.

Rosenthal referenced the staff memo in the meeting packet that identified two key questions for the committee relating to the goals/target ordinance issue. One question is whether to recommend that the goals/target ordinance be forwarded to staff with the intention of having the ordinance adopted by Council as soon as possible. The other option is to recommend that an action be developed in the plan to adopt the goals/targets via ordinance concurrent with the adoption of the plan.

Beigel-Coryell noted that she was one of the committee members who was originally opposed to including consumption in the goal/target, but now feels like it should be re-evaluated and made a motion to recommend the adoption of the draft goals/target ordinance as soon as possible.

Second made by Sohl.

Sohl explained that he feels that approving the ordinance first keeps the committee honest in response to community requests, tells the youth of the community that we hear them and also noted that the Council make up could change between now and when the plan is presented. Sohl also noted that he felt that Eugene in retrospect would have done the ordinance earlier rather than later if they could do it over again.

Koopman added that forwarding the ordinance for adoption now would assist the committee in being able to move forward and would help focus the committee.

McGinnis noted he was originally resistant to advocating for the ordinance before the plan was completed but now sees value in moving it forward, but still wonders if Council would be receptive given they would not have an understanding of the implications of the ordinance since the plan wouldn't be in front of them. He added that he feels there are adequate checks and balances in City and the ordinance puts a responsibility on the Council to communicate back to the public.

Shawkat added that she likes it being a challenge and is concerned with the potential Council changes.

Lasoff and Alick advocated her support of advancing the ordinance now.

Beyers added that he feels the Council can't make action decisions without a goal in place.

Bernard stated that she originally opposed the idea of the ordinance going before the plan, but now thinks the timing could work fine by moving it forward for staff to work on and prepare for Council consideration.

Jones added that this is really just a timing question, not whether or not the committee supports an ordinance for the goals/target and is in support of moving it forward now. Rosenthal agreed with Jones.

The committee voted on the motion and it passed unanimously.

The committee asked about the next steps for the ordinance. Hanks responded by explaining that both he and the City Attorney would need to review the draft ordinance document. Hanks also suggested that the committee formally endorse the draft ordinance that has been circulating around but never formally submitted as the working ordinance template.

Alick motioned that the draft that the committee had been sent from Rogue Climate should be accepted by the committee and used as the working ordinance template. McGinnis second. Jones clarified that the document would be the baseline not the finished document.

The committee voted on the motion and passed it unanimously.

6. Focus Group activity on initial draft actions list

Rosenthal turned this agenda item over to Jeff Golden, part of the Cascadia consultant project team. Golden stepped the committee through the planned activity and referenced the materials in the meeting packet. The committee then broke into their assigned focus area groups and worked on initial sorting and prioritizing of the initial strategies and actions, including adding additional actions.

7. Follow up for next meeting

At the conclusion of the multi-step process, Golden requested that the small groups meet again outside of the regular committee meetings to continue with the exercise if they hadn't finished and to submit final notes to Hanks by August 31 so that the process could be continued at the September 7 committee meeting. Rosenthal offered to assist in coordinating and distributing the informal meeting times for the various groups in case others wanted to participate in more than one focus area discussion.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Adam Hanks
Administration

ASHLAND HISTORIC COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes

August 3, 2016

Community Development/Engineering Services Building – 51 Winburn Way – Siskiyou Room

CALL TO ORDER:

Commission Chair, Shostrom called the meeting to order at 6:03 pm in the Siskiyou Room at the Community Development and Engineering Offices located at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR 97520.

Commissioners Present:	Council Liaison:
Shostrom	Carol Voisin
Skibby	
Leonard	Staff Present:
Ladygo	Mark Schexnayder; Staff Liaison
Emery	Regan Trapp; Secretary
Swink	
Giordano	
Whitford	
Commissioners Absent:	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Giordano motioned to approve minutes from July 6, 2016. Swink seconded. No one opposed. Whitford abstained.

- Shostrom stated that in the past, minutes were much more detailed. Molnar remarked that staff is trying to make minutes brief and capturing just the most important details, such as recommendations and motions. Molnar, went on to say that when actions are controversial, we do try to capture key comments related to the standards.

PUBLIC FORUM:

There was no one in the audience wishing to speak.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT:

Voisin gave the Council Liaison report. Items discussed were:

- Study session:
 - Council received the downtown parking proposal and there will be opportunities for public input soon. The ad-hoc committee for downtown parking will end soon and a new committee will be formed related to urban design. Cycling safety will be of the utmost concern.
 - There is a plan being reviewed to allow Martoli's to place tables and chairs in front of City Hall. They will put a rail up to separate the area from pedestrian traffic.
 - There will be an open house on September 15th at 7PM in the Community Room to review and discuss plans for City Hall. Public input is encouraged.
- Council regular meeting:
 - Parks purchases: Parks purchased a dump truck and the Hitt Road property above Lithia Park.
 - Grandview guardrail was discussed.
 - Fair housing ordinance was passed.
 - Food & beverage tax will be going on the ballot for consideration. The public will be able to vote on how they want the money to be used.

PLANNING ACTION REVIEW:

PLANNING ACTION: PA-2016-01385

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 50 East Main St.

OWNER/APPLICANT: Ted DeLong/Oregon Shakespeare Festival

DESCRIPTION: A request for Site Design Review approval for exterior changes to a contributing property in the Downtown Historic District. The proposal is to construct a 150 square foot addition to the existing deck located at the rear of the building located at 50 East Main Street. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** Commercial - Downtown; **ZONING:** C-1-D; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 09BB; **TAX LOT:** 40000.

There was no ex parte contact or conflict of interest indicated by the Commission.

Schexnayder gave the staff report for PA-2016-01385.

Shostrom opened the public hearing to the applicants.

David Wilkerson of ORW Architecture, and Ted DeLong, General Manager of Oregon Shakespeare Festival addressed the Commission regarding their application. Mr. Wilkerson stated that it's a fairly straightforward application and was first applied for to prevent water intrusion into Harvey's Place. Mr. Wilkerson went on to say, that since the first application, this has morphed into something a little bigger as they take into consideration size of the deck and the water intrusion issue. They will keep the existing deck, making only small repairs in certain places where the deck needs some reinforcements and new framing. He pointed out that the goal of the expansion is to match the existing deck built in the 1990's.

Shostrom closed the public hearing and opened to the Commission for comments.

Giordano motioned to approve PA-2016-01385 as presented. Whitford seconded. No one opposed.

PLANNING ACTION #: 2016-00309

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 150 N. Pioneer St.

PROPERTY OWNERS: Stan Potocki

APPLICANT: City of Ashland

DESCRIPTION: A request for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zone Change for the properties located at 150 and 162 North Pioneer Street. The current Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Low Density Multi-Family Residential and the Zoning is R-2. With the current request, the Comprehensive Plan Map designation would be changed to Commercial and the Zoning to C-1. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: Existing:** Low Density Multi-Family Residential, **Proposed:** Commercial; **ZONING: Existing:** R-2, **Proposed:** C-1; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 09BA; **TAX LOT #:** 11800 & 11900

Skibby indicated that he spoke with the owner while he was taking pictures of the property and the owner gave him a tour of the house. He declared that it would not affect his decision making on this application.

Mr. Molnar, Community Development Director, gave the staff report for PA-2016-00309.

Mr. Molnar, discussed the background and process of this application and stated that zone changes do not come about often. He went on to say that the City's land use ordinance allows the City Council to initiate the zone change by a majority vote. Mr. Molnar said that the Mayor had requested the City Council take a look at this application. At that point, the City Council directed staff to process the application for the zone change. This is not applicant initiated, it has been initiated by the City Of Ashland and will still have to go through the full approval process. Mr. Molnar explained that the Historic Commission would make a recommendation tonight and then it would go to the Planning Commission for their recommendation, ultimately to be decided by the City Council. Mr. Molnar gave a history on the property and said that this isn't the first time this property has been up for re-zoning. He discussed that the basis for doing a zone change often comes down to one of two issues. One, that it needs to be re-zoned to conform to the City's

comprehensive plan to accommodate residential growth or two, over time certain circumstances change in an area that might warrant re-zoning. Mr. Molnar described the neighborhood around the properties in detail and went on to speak about the congestion of the area. He pointed out that one of the biggest implications of re-zoning this property is that Commercial zoning designation allows for residential use in conjunction with a commercial use, but it doesn't mandate that you have to have the residential use on the property. With commercial zoning, comes flexibility to choose what kind of use you want. Mr. Molnar directed attention to the fact that the neighbor to the north of this property owns an antique shop and they share a mutual access easement of the driveway. This neighbor has shown interest and may be agreeable to this application.

Skibby wanted clarification if both, 150 and 162 N. Pioneer were the properties in question for the re-zoning. Mr. Molnar stated that, yes, both properties would be looked at for re-zoning since they are connected and that the Commission could visit the idea of re-zoning both addresses. Mr. Molnar explained that both properties were properly noticed and procedures were taken to notify everyone in the neighborhood.

Mr. Molnar impressed upon the fact that if the properties were to be re-zoned that they would be held to a higher standard because they are commercial and historic contributing. If they made exterior changes that require a building permit they would go through a full Commercial Site Review.

Emery asked about solar and Mr. Molnar stated that C-1 zones have to maintain a 16 foot height requirement. C-1-D zones are exempt from solar altogether.

Shostrom asked if the point of this re-zoning was the de-valuation of the owner's property and Mr. Molnar emphasized that staff does not look at re-zoning a property due to de-valuation or to provide greater economic value. They have to look at it from a land – use perspective. They discussed examples of some properties in the past that had been up for re-zoning.

Shostrom opened the public hearing for comments from the audience.

Marilyn Stewart, property owner at 142 B Street, Ashland, OR addressed the commission regarding this planning action. Ms. Stewart's property abuts 162 N. Pioneer and stated that this potential zone change is a huge deal to her. She directed attention to the fact that a zone is there for a reason and if we go changing them, then where does that stop? The zone line is where it is for a reason and if the line moves then it will be abutting residences. Ms. Stewart doesn't see why the need for a zone change and thinks if approved, will open the door for more of these instances. Ms. Stewart remarked that problems with homeless in parking lot, noise with Gil's and Ruby's, and parking lot construction were all factors when the owner bought the property at 150 N. Pioneer. With this zone change, she feels the Railroad district is vulnerable to change, too quickly and feels the livability of the street scape will suffer.

Shostrom closed the public hearing and opened to the Commission for comments.

There was much discussion by the Commission in regards to what would happen long term on this property if it does go through a zone change and the repercussions felt on the neighborhood. Leonard brought up an option of building a substantial fence which would help mitigate outlying problems.

Giordano motioned to deny PA-2016-00309 as proposed. Whitford seconded. No one opposed.

Giordano requested that Voisin report back to the Commission the City Council's decision on this application.

By a unanimous vote, the Historic Commission recommended that the City Council not change the zoning designation for the property. The Commission noted the following concerns as the basis for their recommendation:

- The request represents a step toward a gradual encroachment of the “commercial” zoning district into the Historic Railroad District;
- This gradual encroachment will negatively impact the livability of the historic residential district to the north, as well as the residential properties in the immediate vicinity;
- The change from Multi-Family Residential to Commercial zoning will increase the value of the property (150 N. Pioneer), which will result in putting pressure to redevelop the property;
- Redevelopment of the property will likely result in changes to the existing historic, “contributing” residential building, and/or may lead to a future proposal to remove or demolish the structure; and
- Concerns over impacts related to 150 N. Pioneer’s proximity to the city public parking lot could best be addressed through mitigation, such as better fencing and landscaping, rather than a change in zoning. A change in the zoning designation will not resolve the impacts noted by the property owner.

NEW ITEMS:

- Review board schedule
- Project assignments for planning actions

OLD BUSINESS:

Whitford asked about the status of 135 Nutley and Mr. Molnar stated that they had to center a window and fix the stairs to the property. He went on to say that the owner added a belly band and a flower box and the project looks to be moving forward and progressing. Swink stated that the owner had said (in a review board meeting) that he was going to remove the footings under the stairs to narrow and change the orientation (of the stairs) and has not done that as of yet. Schexnayder stated that the actions of the owner at 135 Nutley were egregious and in the future will keep a better watch out for actions like this. Swink suggested a listing of recommendations be given to commissioners when they review building plans. Schexnayder stated that it’s unknown why the owner at 135 Nutley did not have come back to submit a modification with the Historic Commission. Schexnayder suggested having the Commission obtain the files at Review board so they can see the entire history as well as recommendations and findings for the action. Shostrom impressed upon the fact that sometimes the recommendations aren’t accurate and that they should have the chance to review them before they go to the Planning Commission. Shostrom suggested that Schexnayder email the recommendations to the entire Commission after he writes them, so that they can do any edits if necessary. Shostrom said that the recommendations that are given to the applicant should be clearly written on the plans and plans should be to scale. Schexnayder commented that he compares the Commission’s recommendation with what is submitted on the revised plans. Schexnayder stated that he will speak with Mr. Molnar about these suggestions. Shostrom would like to look at the entire review process of the Commission to see if there could be a way to catch these things before they get too far in the process.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

There were no items to discuss.

COMMISSION ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:

Voisin discussed the way minutes are taken with Shostrom. Voisin stated she heard Shostrom say that “minutes were too brief”. Shostrom remarked that yes, in the past they were much more detailed. Voisin stated that minutes are a record and are very important. Skibby agreed that yes, they are important and sometimes things get misconstrued if not enough detail is given. Schexnayder responded that staff’s direction has been for “action minutes” with more emphasis on motions and recommendation without all the discussion unless controversial.

Review Board Schedule

August 11 th	Terry, Bill
-------------------------	-------------

August 18 th	Terry, Tom, Andrew
August 25 th	Terry, Taylor, Sam
September 1 st	Terry, Taylor, Dale
September 8 th	Terry, Keith, Bill

Project Assignments for Planning Actions

PA-2014-01956	Lithia & First	All
PA-2014-00710/711	143/135 Nutley	Swink & Whitford
PA-2014-01283	172 Skidmore	Shostrom
PA-2014-02206	485 A Street	Ladygo
PA-2015-00178	156 Van Ness Ave	Shostrom
PA -2015-00374	160 Lithia Way	Emery
PA-2015-00878	35 S. Pioneer	Ladygo
PA-2015-01496	35 S. Second-Winchester Inn	Shostrom
PA-2015-01695	399 Beach	Skibby
PA-2015-01769	860 C	Ladygo
PA-2015-01517	209 Oak	Shostrom
PA-2015-02203	868 A Street	Whitford
PA-2016-00073	151 Pioneer	Swink
PA-2016-00275	574 Allison	Emery
PA-2016-00387	95 N. Main	Shostrom
PA-2016-00763	5 N. Main	Swink
PA-2016-00209	25 N. Main	Ladygo
PA-2016-00818	175 Pioneer	Shostrom & Skibby
PA-2016-00847	252 B Street	Whitford
PA-2016-00587	872 Siskiyou Blvd	Skibby
PA-2016-01027	276 B Street	Shostrom & Leonard
PA-2016-01385	50 E. Main	Giordano

ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

Next meeting is scheduled September 7, 2016 at 6:00 pm.

There being no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm

Respectfully submitted by Regan Trapp

CITY OF ASHLAND

ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES AUGUST 9, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Melanie Mindlin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

Commissioners Present:

Troy J. Brown, Jr.
Michael Dawkins
Debbie Miller
Melanie Mindlin
Haywood Norton
Roger Pearce
Lynn Thompson

Staff Present:

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director
Derek Severson, Associate Planner
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor

Absent Members:

None

Council Liaison:

Greg Lemhouse, absent

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Bill Molnar announced a housing forum sponsored by the Ashland Housing & Human Services Commission and the Interfaith Community will take place August 10 at 6 p.m. He also noted the space needs study being conducted by the city to evaluate potential opportunities to reconstruct or relocate city hall. He stated an open house will be scheduled for September and the findings will be presented to the city council in October.

Commissioner Mindlin announced she will be absent from the September 13 regular meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes.

1. July 12, 2016 Regular Meeting.

Commissioners Brown/Thompson m/s to approve the Consent Agenda. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed 6-0. Commissioner Mindlin abstained.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one came forward to speak.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Adoption of Findings for PA-2016-01029, 1365 Tolman Creek Rd.

No ex parte contact was reported.

Commissioners Miller/Pearce m/s to approve the Findings for PA-2016-01029. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed 6-0. Commissioner Mindlin abstained.

TYPE III PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PLANNING ACTION #: PA-2016-00309

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 150 N. Pioneer St.

PROPERTY OWNERS: Stan Potocki

APPLICANT: City of Ashland

DESCRIPTION: A request for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zone Change for the properties located at 150 and 162 North Pioneer Street. The current Comprehensive Plan Map designation is Low Density Multi-Family Residential and the Zoning is R-2. With the current request, the Comprehensive Plan Map designation would be changed to Commercial and the Zoning to C-1. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: Existing: Low Density Multi-Family Residential, Proposed: Commercial; ZONING: Existing: R-2, Proposed: C-1; ASSESSOR'S MAP: 39 1E 09BA; TAX LOT: 11800.

Staff Report

Community Development Director Bill Molnar provided some background information on the request. He explained in 1988 the city adopted a downtown plan that identified options for additional parking supply. The Pioneer/Lithia property was one of the options and the city acquired it and began construction on the parking lot in 1989. The neighboring property owner, Stan Potocki, has been in discussion with the city since that time and has been documenting the impacts of the parking lot. Mr. Potocki presented his data to the mayor and city council and they directed staff to initiate an evaluation of the zone change and prepare the Type III land use application. Mr. Molnar stated the commission is directed to forward a recommendation and the city council will make the final decision. He noted the Historic Commission has already reviewed the request and recommended denial of the zone change.

Mr. Molnar explained the main difference between the C-1 and R-2 zones are the uses that are permitted outright, which includes office, retail, restaurants, and hotels. This property is also on the edge of Ashland's Downtown Historic District and the Railroad Historic District. Mr. Molnar stated the question of adequate supply does not apply in this case as the city is meeting its 20 year requirement for both employment and residential lands; the main question is whether the zone change is necessary to meet the changes that have happened to the area. Mr. Molnar stated the city parking lot will ultimately connect to the parking for the Plaza West buildings and noted all of the other city parking lots are either adjacent to commercial property or separated from residential properties by a right of way. He commented that there has been a lot of development in the area and the most recent traffic generation counts show a 50% increase from 1992.

Mr. Molnar explained the current use of Mr. Potoki's property is office use on the ground floor with an apartment above and a separate residence at the back of the lot. He suggested the commission consider the adjacent property in their deliberations since the two lots share a driveway. He explained the R-2 zone does allow for a 100% commercial use with a conditional use permit (CUP), however this has never been approved in the past. He stated a commercial zoning designation would provide some flexibility from having a residential use on the property.

Associate Planner Derek Severson displayed several slides of the site and surrounding area. He pointed out the Lithia/Pioneer parking lot has 64 spaces however when the Plaza West development is built out it will add an additional 89 spaces bringing the total to 153. He also displayed images of the shared driveway that straddles the property line and stated the commission may want to consider whether any change in zoning should expand to the property at 162 Pioneer as well.

Questions of Staff

Staff was asked why the Historic Commission was unsupportive. Mr. Molnar explained the commission was concerned about the impacts described by Mr. Potoki but did not see how changing the zone would alleviate those problems. They felt the city should be doing a better job to mitigate the impacts and were concerned a commercial zoning designation would intensify the use and result in potential changes to the historic structure.

Commissioner Pearce commented that changing the zone would require a comprehensive plan amendment and questioned how the city would address the applicable statewide planning goals, specifically Goal 2, and justify that there is a public need for this change.

Commissioner Thompson stated there are a lot of similar areas in town where two zones butt up next to each other and asked if the parking lot was the compelling feature in this case. She voiced concern with the impacts described by the property owner but stated those impacts will continue even with a rezone. Mr. Molnar commented that when Mr. Potoki purchased the property he expected some type of commercial development, but did not anticipate one of the city's largest parking lots being placed there. He has asserted that a residential use is undesirable at this location.

Mr. Molnar commented on resident concerns of changing neighborhood character by removing residential uses through the CUP process and stated as part of the city's discretionary review on neighborhood impacts and evaluating the target use of the zone, they have not approved a 100% commercial use in the R-2 zone. He added there were a few that tried, but they were all denied and the city has only approved commercial uses in the R-2 zone in conjunction with a residential use.

Public Testimony

Joseph Lusa/135 B Street/Voiced support for the Historic Commission's recommendation. Mr. Lusa stated changing the zone will exacerbate the existing parking, noise, and traffic problems and requested the city not change the zone.

Dorothy Brooks/136 B Street/Stated the historic character of the neighborhood is important and voiced concern with commercial creep changing the character of the historic area. Ms. Brooks cited a petition they circulated and received 40 signatures opposing the change. She stated Ruby's and Gil's have radically increased the traffic and noise in the area and urged them to vote no on this zone change.

Stan Potoki/150 N Pioneer/Stated he has operated a business at this location since 1989 and stated the two prior planning directors informed him that his property would be rezoned but moved on to other positions before following through. Mr. Potoki stated no one in their right mind would want to live on this property. He stated Pioneer Street is a commercial corridor and there is drug and alcohol use in the parking lot, as well as profanity and public urination. He stated people sleep in the lot and there are barking dogs, car alarms, and loud music being played. Additionally, the driveway is continually blocked due to the restaurant across the street and it is not safe to park or pull out. Mr. Potoki stated you do not want kids or families living here and it would be a better use of the property if it were not residential.

Joe Collouge/111 B Street/Stated he does not understand how changing the zone on a map will have an impact on what's happening in the area. Mr. Collouge stated he is concerned a zone change will increase the number of vehicles parked on B and Pioneer Streets and questioned the property owner's motivation for this request.

Jerry Brooks/136 N Street/Cited a petition they circulated and stated none of the people they approached were in favor of the rezone. Mr. Brooks stated rezoning the property is not a solution to the problem and voiced concern with chipping away at the character of the neighborhood. He stated he does not want a commercial use behind his house and stated this is not the only place in the city that is impacted by the types of people coming here.

Marilyn Stewart/142 B Street/Voiced her support for the Historic Commission's recommendation and stated the zone should not be changed. Ms. Stewart stated zone changes should be based on need and there is no basis for this change. She stated there is enough commercially zoned property to meet Ashland's needs and the change would take away from the neighborhood feel. Ms. Stewart stated changing the zone could be devastating to their property values and she would not have purchased her house if she knew this was a possibility. She stated the homeless go to commercial properties at night because no one is there and making this change would just move those people further into the neighborhood.

Questions of Staff

Commissioner Thompson asked staff if the unusual circumstances of this site would be justification for a conditional use permit that allows an exclusive commercial use on this property. Mr. Molnar responded that he believes there are grounds for this and Thompson commented that this would be a remedy that does not require amending the comprehensive plan.

Deliberations and Decision

Commissioner Norton commented on the driveway easement and stated if the property is zoned commercial they might have to modify the house in order to install a wide enough driveway. Commissioner Miller sympathized with Mr. Potoki but stated a zone change will not address the issues. She voiced support for the residential character of the neighborhood and stated commercial encroachment into the historic district is a concern. Commissioner Pearce agreed with Norton and Miller. He stated under the land use goals you need to have a public need to justify a zone change. He added if this property is rezoned to commercial at some point there will be pressure to redevelop the lot and intensify the use. Commissioner Thompson stated she can see how the impacts might be more tolerable to a commercially zoned property, but has a problem with the public need versus private need. She stated changing the comprehensive plan on a property by property basis is not something she is comfortable with and stated there is a workable solution through the CUP process. Mindlin agreed with the other commissioners and stated she is not seeing the public need in this situation. She stated it is very unfortunate that Mr. Potoki is having to deal with this situation but it has nothing to do with the zoning. She added there is a good background established for a 100% commercial use approved through the CUP process. Commissioner Brown agreed and stated there are other options to get this done. He stated the problems won't be solved by a zone change and this would just kick the can down the road. He stated the city has been a terrible property manager and recommended the city step up its efforts to address the problems occurring at this location.

Commissioners Dawkins/Brown m/s to recommend denial of PA-2016-00309. Roll Call Vote: Commissioners Brown, Dawkins, Miller, Norton, Pearce, Thompson, and Mindlin, YES. Motion passed 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

*Submitted by,
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor*

**CITY OF
ASHLAND**
ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION
MINUTES
AUGUST 23, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Melanie Mindlin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

Commissioners Present:

Troy J. Brown, Jr.
Michael Dawkins
Debbie Miller
Melanie Mindlin
Haywood Norton
Roger Pearce
Lynn Thompson

Staff Present:

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director
Brandon Goldman, Senior Planner
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor

Absent Members:

None

Council Liaison:

Greg Lemhouse, arrived at 7:15 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Bill Molnar announced the upcoming Southern Oregon Planners Network conference and asked commissioners to notify staff if they would like to attend any of the sessions. He also announced Volunteer Appreciation Day at Oak Knoll Golf Course scheduled for Sunday, August 28.

Commissioner Mindlin noted she would be absent for the September 13 meeting and Vice Chair Pearce will be chairing.

PUBLIC FORUM

Huelz Gutcheon/2253 Highway 99/Comment on climate warming, zero net energy, and recommended solar panels be overseen by the Community Development Department.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Cottage Housing Ordinance.

Community Development Director Bill Molnar provided the introduction. He stated the severity of Ashland's housing issues is quite extreme and construction costs continue to increase. He explained the city is continuing to look at opportunities to create incentives for different types of housing and staff has researched a number of different cottage housing ordinances from other municipalities. Mr. Molnar stated the ordinances have a lot in common but the primary issue each community must decide is what works best for maintaining the character of their existing single family neighborhoods.

Senior Planner Brandon Goldman provided a presentation on cottage housing that addressed housing development trends, land availability, potential cottage housing standards, and examples from Oregon and Washington. He recommended the commission consider how many cottage housing units per development would be appropriate, and stated the draft ordinance lists a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 16. The other draft standards include: 1) a requirement for 75% of cottages to be less than 800 sq.ft. 2) a maximum height of 18 ft. and a 1.5 story limitation, 3) setbacks and lot coverage that match the standards of the existing underlying residential zone, 4) private yards for each unit of at least 200 ft, and 5) 20% of the total lot area to be a usable central open space.

The commissioners shared the following comments regarding the draft proposal:

- Comment was made that under unit garages may work well.
- Commission received clarification that a lot would need to be 1.75 acres in size to accommodate 16 units under the draft ordinance. If the lot was annexed and received density bonuses, 16 units could be accommodated on 1.25 acres.
- Comment was made that the intimacy of these types of developments might be lost if too many units are allowed.
- Staff clarified the draft language allows a higher number of units, but the size of the units would have to be smaller.
- Support was voiced for using a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that allows flexibility on the bottom end and encourages more flexibility for smaller units.
- Comment was made suggesting a minimum of 800 sq.ft. and a maximum of 1,000 sq.ft.
- Statement was made that the minimum and maximum ratios for R-1-7.5 and R-1-5 should be the same, and for staff to reach out to developers to get an idea of what the ratio needs to be in order for these to be feasible.
- Staff commented that some communities have made these a Type I action and eased the land use approval process to encourage this type of development.
- Comment was made that one of the main policy concerns is the expectation people have living or purchasing property in a single family zone and recommending these developments not have too much impact on the character of the environment.
- Staff clarified there is not much remaining inventory in R-2 and R-3 multi-family zones and the land use ordinance already allows for these types of developments in those areas.
- Comment was made that under this proposal the density would not increase dramatically and it was noted you can already build a main house and an accessory dwelling unit on single family lots.
- Opinion was given that these types of developments should be a Type II action, at least at first, and then perhaps change to a Type I after a few years.
- Comment was made that the ordinance should set a maximum size limit.
- Opposition was voiced to a 800 sq.ft. minimum and comment was made that there are plenty of people who would like a 500 or 600 sq.ft. home and the city should make this possible.
- Comment was made that there is substantial inventory available for people who want larger homes, but they do not presently have an option for people who desire smaller homes.

Council Liaison Greg Lemhouse addressed the commission and explained the city council has been interested in different housing types for a long time. He recommended the commission provide the council with a solid starting point, along with their reasoning, and stated it is easier to take something out than add on to it later.

Gil Livni/Commented that 500-600 sq.ft. is sufficient for a very nice one-bedroom unit, and 800 sq.ft. could accommodate a two-bedroom unit. He voiced his support for developing cottage housing standards and stated R-2 properties are expensive and you could not build and sell these types of units in that zone. Mr. Livni stated 16 units in a neighborhood might be shocking to some and suggested smaller units in smaller amounts. He stated people are very creative here and a cottage housing ordinance could allow people to develop properties that you can't do anything with right now. He added the prices in Ashland are continuing to rise due to the desirability of the area and the increasing cost of labor.

Final Comments

Commissioner Norton recommended the commission conduct site visits to gain a better perspective of the draft ordinance requirements. Commissioner Mindlin voiced her interest in a FAR approach and requested some examples of what this might look like. Commissioner Thompson agreed, and stated she would like to see the pros and cons of this approach. Commissioner Mindlin recommended they revisit the 20% open space requirement and questioned if this is the right number. She added the open space should not be too small, but this requirement needs to be viable. Commissioner Brown commented that this will not solve Ashland's housing problems, but it is another type of housing that should be added to the community as another choice.

OTHER BUSINESS

Councilor Lemhouse updated the commission on council's recent activities. He stated second reading of the CPAC amendment was passed, and the council also passed second reading of an ordinance to shift food and beverage tax money to repave roads and maintain open space.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

*Submitted by,
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor*