

TALENT HOUSING CODE UPDATE PROJECT

Planning Commission/Advisory Committee Meeting Discussion Guide



Title 18 Proposed Revisions

Discussion points are summarized for each proposed residential zoning chapter below, with particular question areas noted in *red italics* for PC/AC discussion and feedback to guide code revisions. Comments in blue *italics* represent initial staff comments and comments in *green italic* represent Planning Commission consensus.

Definitions (TMC 18.15)

1. Revisions for consistency throughout the code, including residential terms and types of housing.

Land Use Classification (TMC 18.20)

1. *Clarifies process to determine similar uses, including assigning authority to planning director to make determination for Type I and II uses and planning commission for Type III uses.*

Q: What defines the “dispute” process for use classification?

A: A dispute in this case would involve staff making a determination that a particular use is not allowed based on the classification standards in Section 18.20.020 and a property owner or applicant disagreeing with the staff interpretation. In this case, staff would forward the classification request to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Volkart said Use Determination disputes sound like an appeal. Glass asked staff to please provide more information on the Dispute process. Glass supports a PC dispute process that is local, as opposed to something going to LUBA. Pastizzo provided his interpretation of the code: if staff follows what’s in the code, and determines the use is not allowed, and the applicant objects, the decision comes here (to the PC). Volkart asked if this is simply for addressing new uses, adding what is the appeal path if a use is disputed? If staff determines that a proposed use is not allowed, applicant can dispute, if they do, it goes before PC? Volkart asked, what is a dispute? Ponomareff suggested the City could potentially make appeals of type 1 decisions go to PC. Volkart added, currently Use Determination is solely a staff decision... do we want to change this? Glass expressed support for having a local dispute resolution process for going to the PC first. The Housing Authority recently brought forth a proposal, but a neighbor is slowing down the process in Ashland. Volkart asked for more info and to perhaps codify the Use Determination dispute process. Pastizzo recommended asking staff to clarify this process.

Residential Low Density (TMC 18.25)

2. Single-family detached, single-family common wall, duplexes, residential care homes, and ADUs proposed as permitted uses. Cluster housing, 2-3 dwellings on a lot proposed as Type II site plan review use.
3. *2-3 dwellings on a lot is an unusual standard: discuss current application and whether to maintain or remove this use.*

Q: Can you explain where the 2 to 3 dwelling per lot allowance originated from?

A: A fair amount of research was conducted to determine the origin of this particular section, but information was found that would explain if there was a specific purpose for this addition. Staff recommends removing the language because it serves no purpose. If a lot or parcel can accommodate multiple parcels it is likely it could be divided.

Volkart explained there may be good reasons to put 2-3+ homes on a parcel. Pastizzo suggested that farmers with kids might want to provide their family a place to stay, adding, they aren't sure it makes a lot of sense to retain. Pastizzo provided another way to look at it: try to figure out why it's there, if the commission can't figure out, consider...does it make sense going forward? Removing this language prevents people from getting in their own way by (by preventing future subdivision). Pastizzo added, there might be more harm leaving it in. Davis, cluster housing could accomplish this (multiple homes on one parcel). Volkart would vote against removing this language. Giesen, since there is no clear history what this code language is about, they recommended striking language, as suggested by the consultant and Zac. Hazel agreed. **Aside from Commissioner Volkart, there was consensus to strike the 2-3+ house language.**

4. To implement efficiency measures, reduced 6,000-SF minimum lot size proposed.
5. Minimum and maximum density derived from lot size: 5.8 units/acre proposed for minimum, 7.2 units/acre effective maximum, but up to 10.8 units/acre average proposed for new subdivisions to allow mixture of single-family and duplex dwellings. Note that density measurement formulas are included in the subdivision code.
6. Dimensional standards support the reduced lot size to use the lots more effectively: 0-5 ft side yard setbacks, 40-50 ft minimum lot width, 50% building coverage.

Residential Medium Density (TMC 18.30)

1. Single-family detached, single-family common wall, single-family attached, duplexes, residential care homes, and ADUs proposed as permitted uses. Cluster housing, 2-3 dwellings on a lot, triplexes and quadplexes proposed as Type II site plan review use.
2. *Discuss what additional development standards might be developed for single-family attached, triplexes and quadplexes.*
3. *2-3 dwellings on a lot is an unusual standard: discuss current application and whether to maintain or remove this use.*
4. To implement efficiency measures, reduced 4,000-SF minimum lot size proposed. 3,000 SF for townhouses, 8,000 for triplexes and quadplexes.
5. Minimum and maximum density derived from lot size: 7.2 units/acre proposed for minimum, 10.9 units/acre effective maximum, but up to 14.5 units/acre average proposed for new subdivisions to allow mixture of dwelling types.
6. Dimensional standards support the reduced lot size to use the lots more effectively: 0-5 ft side yard setbacks, 25-40 ft minimum lot width, 60% building coverage.

Residential Manufactured Home (TMC 18.35)

1. Application of this zone to be limited through future map amendments.
2. Single-family detached and manufactured homes (to be treated equally), duplexes, residential care homes, and ADUs proposed as permitted uses.

3. Manufactured home parks proposed as Type II site plan review use. *Discuss whether additional housing types be permitted, or limited to avoid "competition" with manufactured home parks.*
4. *2-3 dwellings on a lot is an unusual standard: discuss current application and whether to maintain or remove this use.*
5. To implement efficiency measures, reduced 5,000-SF minimum lot size proposed.
6. Minimum and maximum density derived from lot size: 7.0 to 8.7 units per acre range.
7. Dimensional standards support the reduced lot size to use the lots more effectively: 0-5 ft side yard setbacks, 50% building coverage.
8. Additional standards proposed for individual manufactured homes, taken directly from ORS 197.307(8). *Discuss minimum size requirement for manufactured homes, whether to retain existing 600 SF minimum or increase up to 1,000 SF as permitted by state law.*

Residential High Density (TMC 18.40)

1. Existing (but not new) single-family detached, single-family attached, duplexes, and ADUs proposed as permitted uses. (Note: draft code incorrectly lists single-family attached as a Type II use but was meant to be listed as a permitted use.)
2. Multifamily, cluster housing, triplexes and quadplexes, residential care facilities, and boarding houses proposed as Type II site plan review use.
3. *Discuss whether multifamily development over a certain density or height should trigger a Type III review.*

Q: What is the suggested density that change a multi-family dwelling review from a Type II to a Type III?

A: A tiered system with a Type II and Type III review path based on project density is not recommended because it could have a chilling effect for any projects with higher density because of the additional review requirements, which would undermine the intent of recent changes to the RM-HD zone to support higher densities. Instead, the recommendation is to offer a clear and objective, Type II review option for projects of any size or density, with a discretionary, Type III review option for projects that propose alternative or creative designs outside the clear and objective standards.

Ponomareff suggested the mindset is to encourage high density as Type-II. Volkart explained seeing a chart that illustrates what housing projects would be reviewed as a Type-I, -II -III would be helpful. Glass feels strongly about not going to Type-III review when possible as it could water down effectiveness of infill if project opposition is philosophically steadfast/stubborn. The commission agreed it would be helpful to have a chart with the types and uses laid out. Glass mentioned support for a definition of the housing types, review types and dispute processes. Volkart agreed that definitions should be made as part of the process.

4. *Discuss what additional development standards might be developed for single-family attached, multifamily, triplexes and quadplexes.*
5. Minimum and maximum density: 18 units/acre minimum, no maximum but effective maximum through minimum lot sizes and dimensional/bulk standards.
6. Three story or 40-ft height limit proposed, 75% building coverage
7. Dimensional standards reduce impacts of increased height: 5-20 ft side yard setbacks depending on height and adjacent zone.

8. 250 SF open space required per dwelling; *discuss whether this could be reduced or modified.*

Q: Is there a way to lower the open space requirements, but require the space be more specific “usable space”? Could the open space requirements for multi-family developments be the same as the cottage cluster standards?

A Yes, less open space but more usable open space could definitely be a tradeoff. The existing multifamily standard is 250 square feet per unit, and the proposed cottage cluster standard is 150 square feet per unit. It would make sense to bring those numbers closer together, since residents of both types of developments presumably have similar open space needs. The recommendation is to require 150 SF per unit for all projects, with requirements for open space improvements such as children’s play areas for multifamily projects with 20 units or more. Staff and the Consultant believe that it makes sense to only require improvements for 20 units and up, which total 3,000 SF of open space, it also makes sense to require a common green space for developments of all sizes. Cottage clusters with 4-12 units, as proposed, are required to provide it and it is a central feature.

Commercial Neighborhood (TMC 18.45)

1. Better supports mixed-use development by expanding permitted residential uses to include ground-floor residential set back 100 feet from the street up to 50% of the total development (horizontal mixed-use), in addition to existing upper-story residential (vertical mixed-use).
2. Cleans up standards for existing residential development, including explicit permission for ADUs consistent with SB 1051 requirements. *Are the majority of existing uses single-family detached dwellings, or other types as well?*
3. *Are additional front yard setbacks for sites adjacent to residential sites necessary? CN zone allows 10-foot front setback, compared to 20-foot front setback in most residential zones. Proposed compromise is a 15-foot front setback for sites adjacent to residential for transition, but front yards are not a common transition area. Consider eliminating additional front yard setback, in favor of increased side and rear setbacks adjacent to residential sites.*
4. Maximum height increased to three stories or 40 feet, whichever is less. Height transition standards in 18.90 require additional setbacks for taller buildings.
5. Clear and objective buffering and landscape standards added to TMC 18.105.
6. Note that CN zone is currently applied to relatively few sites, future map amendments may expand application of the zone.

Central Business District (TMC 18.50)

1. Creates a mixed-use zone by expanding residential uses to include ground-floor residential set back 100 feet from the street up to 50% of the total development (horizontal mixed-use), in addition to existing upper-story residential (vertical mixed-use). *Should horizontal mixed-use allowance be expanded as proposed? Existing standards limit ground-floor residential to a single dwelling unit behind the primary commercial uses. Proposed standards allow up to 50% of the building area, while maintain commercial ground-floor uses along the street façade.*

Q: Are the restrictions on residential development of no more than 50% necessary? Should we consider allowing more than 50% development in the CBD to be residential?

A: Allowing more than 50% of a commercially zoned property to be built as residential would be counter to the intent of the zone if the property is “substantially” developed as residential. There are a number

of reasons that this could be problematic, but most importantly, the intent of the commercial zone is to serve as the hub of government, public services and social activities and encourages retail trade, personal and business services. Adding residential to the area is encouraged only to strengthen and enliven the downtown. If too much of the commercial land is consumed by residential uses, the City risks not having enough buildable commercial land in its core downtown area and risks losing the vibrancy that a balanced mix of uses provides. Additionally, allowing more than 50% of commercial land to be used for residential could conflict with the Economy Element and could be out of compliance with the State's requirement to have a 20-year supply of commercial buildable lands. If the desire is to see more acreage in or near the downtown core converted to residential, it may be more appropriate to rezone the commercial land to high-density residential.

Q: Wouldn't that meet stated goals, increase support for existing and new commercial by increasing pedestrian traffic and people in the neighborhood (vs. driving by the highway)?

A: Yes, but staff believes that at some point the high demand for residential will consume much of the downtown commercial land. Once committed to residential uses, it is unlikely to be converted back to commercial. Staff believes that a balance is necessary, unless a zone change to high-density residential can be justified through the zone change process and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and statewide planning goals as they relate to economics.

Q: Is it realistic that Talent could end up with a deficit of commercial lands as a result of this?

A: Yes, removing residential use allowances would be difficult in the future should the City determine that too much commercial land was being consumed by residential.

2. Cleans up standards for existing residential, including explicit permission for ADUs consistent with SB 1051 requirements.
3. Maximum height increased to three stories or 40 feet, whichever is less. Height transition standards in 18.90 require additional setbacks for taller buildings.
4. Clear and objective buffering and landscape standards added to TMC 18.105.

General Standards (TMC 18.90)

1. Revised building height transition standards require additional setbacks adjacent to residential districts. Scope is expanded to include all side and rear property lines adjacent to RLD, RMD, and RMH residential districts, rather than limited to single-story residential uses in any district, for a clearer purpose and uniform application. Setback applies only to new development over 30 feet tall, which could include multifamily and mixed-use in the RHD, CN and CBD zones.
2. Proposed setbacks work out to 15 to 25 feet for buildings 30 to 40 feet tall, compared to 5 to 10-foot setbacks in underlying zones. *Do proposed setbacks strike the balance of providing sufficient separation between tall buildings without reducing development potential of the subject lots, or should the setbacks be adjusted?*

Q: What about solar setbacks when a 3-story building is next to residential? Is there a difference in setbacks on the west or east?

A: There are no regulations for solar setbacks in the Talent Zoning Code except for those that have an easement. If the Planning Commission would like to examine this further, staff recommends that the solar setback review be completed after the code amendments have been completed.

Confusion about the solar easement process. The commission informally preferred to have this discussion prior to adoption of new code in support of the emerging Energy Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Q: In 18.090.050 Building height (B) transitions, we discussed confusing language over the standard applying to buildings exceeding 30 feet or two stories whichever is less. We may have also had a question on the consultant comment on setbacks. Do we need to clarify these standards?

A: After clarifying, Section B and subsection 1 should read the same. The intent is to allow buildings up to 30 feet in height with not mention of number of stories. This will be corrected in the next set of revisions.

Sounds like staff and consultant are proposing to do away with the # of stories. See page 18.90, under solar setbacks. 30 feet or three stories. Pastizzo supports what staff is proposing, the Commission unofficially agreed.

3. Discretionary buffer standards deleted in favor of objective standards in TMC 18.105.

Residential Lot Improvement Standards (TMC 18.95)

1. Establishes development and limited design standards for single-family, duplex, triplex and quadplex dwellings. Manufactured home parks, multiple-family dwellings, and cluster housing are subject to separate standards.
2. Recommendation to strike TMC 18.95.040.A requiring the owner of a dwelling to the owner of the tax lot, which is an unusual zoning standard and has potential for exclusionary effects. Any legal separation of ownership between dwellings and tax lots would be covered through condominium law.
3. New duplex standards proposed in TMC 18.95.045, requiring uniform design details for both units to make duplexes look more similar to single-family homes and improve integration into neighborhoods with variety of unit types.
4. *Consider additional standards for townhouses, limiting total number of attached units in a single building to 4-8, and limiting presence of driveways and garages to 50% of lot width, potentially requiring alley access or shared driveways.*
5. *Consider additional standards for triplexes and quadplexes, similar to duplex standards requiring identical design details on each unit for a more cohesive appearance, and limiting presence of driveways and garages similar to townhouses.*

Multiple-Family Design (TMC 18.96)

1. Two-track design review process for multifamily, allowing an objective or discretionary design review option to address the same design objectives. *Are there any individual standards or guidelines to adjust to improve design outcomes and reduce development barriers, or that are not clear and objective?*
2. *Consider whether to add a standard requiring windows in every room that overlook a common area to create "eyes on the street," or playground or parking lot, to deter crime. While this is a common*

standard for multifamily, it is not recommended here because no such similar standard exists for any other type of development, large or small, and it can perpetuate a stereotype that multifamily development is more crime-prone than other types of development.

Landscaping, Fencing and Hedges (TMC 18.105)

1. Reduce overall landscaping percentages for residential and mixed-use zones to free up more site area for residential development.
2. Propose clear and objective landscaping buffer standard for mixed-use and multifamily sites (CBD, CN and RHD) adjacent to low and medium-density residential sites (RLD, RMD, RMH). Ten-foot buffer with fence and trees or “living wall” required.
3. Eliminate discretionary requirement for low-density residential uses to provide a buffer along property lines shared with commercial or industrial uses. Typically, standards require the more intensive uses (commercial and industrial) to provide buffers to minimize impacts on residential uses, rather than the other way around. There may be cases where residential is developed after a commercial/industrial use has been established, however, those residential developments can develop site-specific designs to address potential conflicts. *Is this proposal consistent with development patterns in Talent, or is a clear and objective buffering requirement desired for residential uses adjacent to nonresidential uses?*
4. Recommendation to develop clear and objective landscaping buffers for commercial and industrial uses as well, but outside the scope of this project.

Q: A.2 states that “the type of buffer shall be considered in relation to existing and future land use. This is not clear/defined. Does this mean zoned use? The sentence goes on to state that the degree of conflict between adjacent uses would also be a consideration but does not clearly lay out one which side of a conflict the burden of buffering would fall.

A: No significant changes to the transition buffers for commercial and industrial development are proposed with this project, because we are focusing on residential standards which must be clear and objective. Future code updates could improve the commercial and industrial standards as well; generally, standards that are based on the site’s base zone are easier to interpret than ones based on use categories, if there is debate about what use category applies to a certain development.

Additional changes are recommended to create clear and objective standards for buffering on new residential development that is adjacent to existing commercial or industrial development, to replace existing 18.105.050.B. Standards will include at least two vegetative screening options, such as evergreen trees or shrubs or larger caliper trees planted every 30 feet.

Q: Are pallets an acceptable fencing material? Do any additional requirements exist for pallet fencing?

A: Pallets are not listed on the list of prohibited fence materials. However, Section 18.105.060(F)(1) states that the City can either disallow or require the elimination or mitigation of fences it finds deleterious to public health or safety or at odds with the purpose of the Fence chapter.

Q: By reducing the minimums are we primarily reducing the number of trees required for planting? How much efficiency gain is expected by reducing the minimums?

A: The City has primarily used the site percentage as a way to calculate the number of required trees and shrubs, rather than a percentage of space that cannot be developed. The recommendation is to use the existing percentages as the basis for calculating the number of required trees and shrubs, while clarifying what the minimum percentage of landscaping standard means and how it impacts site development area. This will ensure no changes to the number of trees planted, while potentially freeing up site area for more residential development.

Q: Is it clear in the code that buffering counts toward landscaping requirements?

A: As long as the buffer area is landscaped, nothing in the code prevents it from being counted towards the landscaping percentage. Standards could more explicitly permit the buffering to count if desired.

Off-Street Parking and Loading (TMC 18.110)

1. Create clear, limited standards for parking for single-family and duplex dwellings, with a minimum of two spaces per lot including at least one covered space in a garage or carport.
2. Provide new standard of 1.5 spaces per unit for triplexes, quadplexes, and cluster housing, which can be reduced using on-street parking credits for sites with available on-street parking. Revised parking lot development standards restrict applicability to clusters of five or more spaces, rather than three or more spaces, so that parking areas for these missing middle uses can be developed more easily.
3. Revise tiered parking minimums for multifamily housing, with one space for studios, 1.5 spaces for 1-2 bedrooms (current standard is 2 spaces), and 2 spaces for 3+ bedrooms (current is one per bedroom, though larger units less common in multifamily developments).
4. Manufactured home park minimum standard reduced to one space per unit.
5. Reduce parking minimums by 50% for residential portion of mixed-use development in CN zone, to account for shared parking opportunities.
6. Add parking requirement for new residential uses in CBD zone at 50% of required minimum; other uses in CBD zone remain exempt from off-street parking requirements.
7. Expand bike parking exemption to include quadplexes and cluster housing, in addition to single-family, duplex and triplex dwellings.

Q: Table 18.110.060-1 and section B under 18.110 Off Street Parking and Loading: Parking Requirements in these sections include half numbers. In the case of the table, and 50% in the latter section, what is 50% of 1 required parking space? Do we round up or down for parking requirements?

A: Typically, the code should have a statement about how to deal with fractions of spaces, requiring rounding to the nearest whole number. 1.5 spaces would be rounded to 2 and 19.2 spaces would be rounded to 19. For larger projects like multifamily, it typically isn't a problem to round. The standards for smaller residential projects could benefit from further review, specifically: should a triplex, at 1.5 spaces per unit or 4.5 spaces total, require 4 spaces or 5 spaces? Cluster housing could also run into similar issues. Additional feedback from the PC/AC would be useful to revise these parking standards and rounding preferences.

Glass, because we are looking to infill and not provide cost barriers, in favor of a standard that rounds down for cottage housing, multiplexes and duplexes. Ponomareff, as we try to encourage mass transit, to the extent we can move away from car-centric transportation seems smart. The commission seeks clarification from staff regarding the threshold of units/parking stalls when to

round up vs round down? Or more generally, how to deal with fractional parking space? Glass pointed out that the impact on smaller projects are potentially much higher. Pastizzo suggested rounding down for developments of ALL sizes unless staff can come up with reason not to. Davis proposed considering road width and street parking while considering off-street parking requirements and supports ideas to defer cost to developers with regard to parking. Glass explained that the City needs housing more than parking right now. The commission informally agreed.

Q: Migrant housing was removed but is a state housing goal. Would new migrant housing development just fall under whatever type (multifamily for example) instead of this designation?

A: Yes, any housing intended for migrant households would simply be regulated by the type of housing it is, multifamily or otherwise, which is consistent with the approach throughout the rest of the code. The PC/AC could recommend a reduced parking requirement for migrant housing and/or affordable housing that could help lower development costs for these types of projects, likely codified as a percentage reduction to the number of spaces otherwise required. There is significant debate on whether lower-income households have fewer cars or not, but often the primary purpose of the reduction is to reduce upfront development costs rather than predict parking needs of future residents.

Q: Why do duplexes only require one spot per unit but triplex and quadplex require 1.5?

A: The duplex standard is intended to support integration of duplexes with single-family dwellings: the standard requires two total spaces as a minimum for a duplex, similar to the two spaces for a single-family dwelling next door. Because duplexes can be built on the same size lot as single-family residences, there may not be room for more than two total off-street spaces, and larger parking areas on such a lot could create negative visual impacts. There is also the practical matter of how to divide the spaces: 1.5 spaces per unit would result in three total spaces, which could be hard to divide between the two duplex units.

The 1.5 spaces per unit standard for a triplex and quadplex is intended to be consistent with the cluster housing and multifamily minimums. The standard could also be lowered to one space per unit as an incentive to develop these types of units and reduce the amount of paved off-street parking on these smaller sites.

In addition to the minimum number of spaces, additional development standards are recommended to reduce the visual presence of parking areas from the street. Quadplexes and triplexes could be required to have a garage or carport for some of the required spaces, with the balance provided in driveways or other paved areas. Alley access and shared driveway standards will also help minimize vehicle-related impacts.

A related recommendation is to clarify that the existing on-street parking credit in 18.110.060.F can only apply to improved streets. This recommendation would require a development adjacent to an unimproved street to bring the street frontage to current standards if the request was to have some required parking be on-street.

Q: Is 1 parking space for MH realistic?

A: The one space per unit for manufactured homes is a minimum and is intended for greater flexibility when applied to existing parks and to support a type of housing that is typically more affordable. The

standards also include provisions for overflow or visit parking at a ratio of one space per 8 manufactured homes.

Q: What is the rationale behind exempting bike parking to tri and quadplexes that also have lower parking requirements?

A: Rationale is to make it triplexes and quadplexes more similar to single-family and duplex homes, and to reduce development requirements and make them easier to construct. Triplex and quadplex residents could store their bikes in a garage or accessory structure if provided.

Pastizzo does not think secure bike storage should be reduced. The City can't lower all transportation parking requirements. Volkart asked for further discussion with staff on this to see what the thought on reducing this number is and see what is logical there.

Q: Do we have proposed new language for off-street parking that we have not seen?

A: Other than what was discussed above, we do not have any proposed new language.

Q: Can you suggest more clear and objective language for section 18.110.100? "Conveniently located", "whenever possible", "creative designs are strongly encouraged", "sufficient security", "well lit" etc., appear more subjective but that may be by design.

A: Future code updates could further refine the bicycle parking standards, but they were not the primary focus of this code update.

The commission requests staff address bike parking to provide clear and objective language. Pastizzo suggested language: sheltered and secured.

Site Development Plan (TMC 18.150)

1. Clearer delineation of Type II Minor Site Development Plan Review (staff) and Type III Major review (PC), with differentiated approval criteria appropriate for respective review authorities.

Cluster Housing (TMC 18.162, new)

1. *Discuss whether SDCs should be assessed at single-family rates, or reduced rates analogous to ADU standards. Alternatively, discuss SDCs through alternative process.*
2. Mix of dwelling unit types proposed, correlated with zone.
3. Key dimensional standards: 1,200 SF maximum size, two-story height limit. *Consider further reductions to setbacks, internal and perimeter to increase feasibility of site development.*
4. Open space requirement of 150 SF per dwelling, with development standards intending to create quality rather than quantity of open space.
5. Existing siding and roofing materials standards for single-family dwellings to apply; *discuss whether additional design standards should be applied.*

Q: Would an application for 12 1200sf single-family homes be a type 3 permit review while 12 cluster homes would be type 2?

A: A subdivision tentative plan would be required to create 12 new lots for single-family homes, and it would require a Type 2 review under the proposed code changes to ensure there is a non-discretionary development opportunity for all residential development.

Manufactured Home Parks (TMC 18.180)

1. Revisions proposed to align with state requirements, notably requirement for a clear and objective review path for manufactured home parks as a needed housing type. Type II process proposed, with Type I final plan review.
2. *Discuss reducing application requirements, particularly those not required for any other type of development such as tree plans.*
3. Maximum density of 10 units/acre proposed for manufactured home parks; *discuss whether it should be consistent with RMH zone maximum of 8.7 units/acre.*

Procedures for Review of Applications and Appeals (TMC 18.190)

1. Table 18.190.020 summarizing type of review required is updated to reflect changes throughout the code, primarily increasing Type II reviews and decreasing Type III reviews.
2. 100-day, rather than standard 120-day, review timeline established for certain affordable housing projects to expedite development, implementing state requirements from 2017.
3. No changes are proposed to appeal procedures, which provide option to appeal Type I decisions to LUBA rather than a local appeal option. Type II and III decisions may be appealed locally to the PC or the hearings officer, respectively.
4. Neighborhood meetings prior to application submittal, in addition to public notice and/or hearings during the review process, are required for subdivisions and site plan applications within residential districts, which would include triplexes, quadplexes, cluster housing, and multifamily residential. *Consider limiting neighborhood meetings to subdivisions and larger multifamily residential (12+ or 20+ dwelling units), and exempting smaller residential projects. Which conditional uses in residential districts should require a neighborhood meeting?*