

## TALENT HOUSING CODE UPDATE PROJECT

### Planning Commission Meeting #1: DRAFT Meeting Summary

March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2019



---

Zac Moody, Talent Community Development Director, welcomed the consultant team to the Planning Commission floor. Anais Mathez, 3J Consulting, and Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning, gave brief introductions and an overview of the presentation.

Anais Mathez, 3J Consulting, began by reviewing project objectives, the project timeline and key definitions. The overarching goal for the code amendments is to remove regulatory barriers to the development of a wide variety of housing types in compliance with both the letter and the spirit of Oregon's clear and objective requirements, to better meet the City's identified needs for housing.

The presentation turned over to Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning. Elizabeth reminded Planning Commission that the content of the memo and presentation is intended to provide a starting point for discussion to refine priority areas and code amendment concepts within the topics of subdivisions, residential zones and uses, commercial and mixed-use, site development standards, development review, and other special standards. The presentation covered some of the following priority code amendments:

- Amend dimensional and density standards for existing RS-5 and RS-7 to enable more efficient use of land for future development.
- Develop a Medium-Density Residential zone, through adapting either the existing RS-7 or potential RS-MH zone.
- Revise the high-density residential RM-HD zone to expand diversity of housing types.
- Expand missing middle housing types in all residential zones, and provide clear and objective review path to develop them.
- Develop cottage housing standards to permit higher-density but smaller-scale residential development around a central green courtyard.
- Create opportunities for higher-density residential uses mixed with commercial uses by either creating a new Mixed-Use/High-Density Residential zone that permits vertical or horizontal mixed use at specified minimum ratios of commercial and residential uses, or alternatively developing a strategy for selectively rezoning commercial properties to residential use to create an equivalent mix of uses within the commercial districts.
- Develop clear and objective landscaping buffer requirements by use or zone, tied to adjacent use or zone.
- Amend the Site Development Plan Review regulations to provide a clear and objective approval path for residential projects, including a viable Type II Site Review option rather than defaulting all projects to a Type III review.
- Develop clear and objective subdivision preliminary plat approval criteria and applicable infrastructure standards.
- Revise PUD standards to provide discretionary path for more creative projects.

After the presentation, Planning Commission was invited to comment. Points of discussion included:

- An open question was posed about what HB 2001 will require in the future with regards to missing middle housing in single-family zones, and that these code updates should be made in interim with the understanding that more changes are coming down the road. HB 2001 is for communities under 10,000 but Talent should be forward thinking.
- Uses proposed in RS-5 must walk line of respecting the character of existing development along with capturing opportunity. Pushing a lot of additional uses could heighten the concern without actually resulting in any infill development.
- The term “allow” was clarified as “required to permit uses.”
- Code update priorities should reflect the City’s efficiency measures.
- A PUD ordinance itself is inherently subjective. Whereas a subdivision is generally a clear and objective path, a PUD is a discretionary path.
- Landscaping requirements are a lower priority. However, buffers that determine the distance between uses have discretionary standards that must be limited.
- More clarity is needed in describing the Type I, II and III review process. Currently, Type III language makes it sound like anything in other review processes could be elevated to Type III if desired. However, under clear and objective standards, any variances would be easier to identify and fix in the right review process.

Discussion turned to the project process. Planning Commissioners requested more information about the public process. The consultant team reviewed the project timeline and deliverables and noted that any feedback received by April 1<sup>st</sup> would allow for timely delivery of a revised work product for Planning Commission and the Public meeting on April 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>. However, Zac clarified that public comment can be submitted anytime. Planning Commission requested a study session before then to continue reviewing the memo and compile more feedback for the consultant. Planning Commission also requested a weekly digest of public comment as it is received.

The discussion returned to the code amendment concepts. Comments included:

- There has been interest in the creation of intentional communities and there should be a means to support this concept in the zoning code. This may best be done through the cluster housing section.
- It is important to recognize that height restrictions must fit with the form and function of the existing neighborhoods.
- A request was made to provide an appendix describing where numbers or formulas are being derived about dwelling units/acre.
- There was discussion about the pros and cons of merging two zones into one. While it can provide much needed simplicity, the distinct character of each zone could get lost.
- Manufactured home parks should not be rezoned to medium density. It was agreed that they need protection so they don’t get redeveloped and residents get displaced. It was clarified that individual manufactured homes can be located on any residential lot, though there may be specific building code requirements.
- It was suggested that the Old Town District can also be a designated historic district (i.e. the overlay is intended to create a historic district).
- Cluster housing maximum square footage of 1,500 sq ft seems high but developers often wouldn’t hit that. Another tool would be to limit the maximum footprint in order to generate

smaller homes on smaller lots. This should also include standards and provisions that would dictate shared spaces in cluster or shared housing.

- A key policy consideration is whether a mixed-use zone (new or modified) should allow for horizontal or vertical uses, or a combination of both. It was agreed that a checkered pattern of commercial and high-density residential uses is not as desirable as creating some separation between residential and commercial across a mixed-use zone.

Zac thanked the Planning Commission and noted that a study session will be scheduled in the next month to discuss the memo further, in advance of the public meeting and second Planning Commission presentation at the end of April. The meeting adjourned at 9pm.