

TALENT HOUSING CODE UPDATE PROJECT

Planning Commission/Advisory Committee Meeting Discussion Guide

June 11, 2019



COMMISSIONER/COMMITTEE MEMBER: Michelle Glass

Discussion points are summarized for each proposed residential zoning chapter below, with particular question areas noted in *italics* for PC/AC discussion and feedback to guide code revisions.

General comments:

Please provide maps so that we can assess and discuss the potential impacts of proposed changes.

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.

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)

Are the restrictions on residential development of no more than 50% necessary? Talent has a surplus of commercial lands and a deficit of buildable residential lands, and is trying to increase housing efficiency within city limits. The city has a stated goal (UGB CAC, Planning Commission, Council discussions) to increase housing unit production close to the core and limit the need for increased intensity on the outskirts of town farther from transit lines and services. Should we consider allowing more than 50% development in the CBD to be residential? 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 the highway)? Is it realistic that Talent could end up with a deficit of commercial lands as a result of this?

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

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.
I agree with this change and the sound reasoning. An abundance of parks and a need to increase efficiency and reduce barriers to needed housing 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.

Comments re: 18.105.050 Buffer and Screening.

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. Clarifying this in the code should be part of clear and objective standards. Protect residential uses, burden on commercial and industrial development.

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

18.110.060 Number of Parking Spaces Required.

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? Pg 31 of packet), but it is not clear whether rounding should be up or down for calculating required parking spaces.

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?

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.

TALENT HOUSING CODE UPDATE PROJECT

Planning Commission/Advisory Committee Meeting Discussion Guide

June 4, 2019



COMMISSION/COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Discussion points are summarized for each proposed residential zoning chapter below, with particular question areas noted in *italics* for PC/AC discussion and feedback to guide code revisions.

Residential Low Density (TMC 18.25)

1. 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.
2. *2-3 dwellings on a lot is an unusual standard: discuss current application and whether to maintain or remove this use.*
I do not have concerns with this standard and would like to see it maintained if it made sense and other commissioners agreed.
3. To implement efficiency measures, reduced 6,000-SF minimum lot size proposed.
4. 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.
5. 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.*
I would like to see development standards that encourage community engagement and easy walkability. I would also like to keep in mind that too many standards could result in a development that is intended and/or likely to outprice more affordable intentions.
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.*
I want to keep lower square footage for more flexibility.

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.*
This seems sensible to me. I do not know what that density would be though?
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.*
I feel like open space is important, especially in High Density settings. I want it to be valuable and useable open space though that isn't just an ignored weed patch. I do not know the best way to make that happen. If lowering the open space reqs and asking for more specific "useable space" was an option, I'd like to explore that. Maybe similar to the cluster housing open space standards?

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.*
I do not feel like design standards are important here? I see it as limiting potential creativity.

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.*
I would like to see any requirements removed that are not required for other zones.
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.*

TALENT HOUSING CODE UPDATE PROJECT

Planning Commission/Advisory Committee Meeting Discussion Guide

June 11, 2019



COMMISSIONER/COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Discussion points are summarized for each proposed residential zoning chapter below, with particular question areas noted in *italics* for PC/AC discussion and feedback to guide code revisions.

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.

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.*
I am ok with eliminating additional front yard setback..
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.*
I like the proposed standards here....
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?*
I do have concerns about limiting the development potential by the 15-20 ft setbacks. I recognize that separation is important though and I'm not sure how to remedy this... I'd be interested in lowering the setbacks, while being cautious doing so.
3. Discretionary buffer standards deleted in favor of objective standards in TMC 18.105.

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.

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.
I do not understand why duplexes only require one spot per unit but triplex and quadplex require 1.5? I want to be sure and encourage tri and quad development and not have a developer choose one over the other due to parking? Maybe that's a non-issue?

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.

TALENT HOUSING CODE UPDATE PROJECT

Planning Commission/Advisory Committee Meeting Discussion Guide

June 11, 2019



COMMISSIONER/COMMITTEE MEMBER:

Discussion points are summarized for each proposed residential zoning chapter below, with particular question areas noted in *italics* for PC/AC discussion and feedback to guide code revisions.

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.

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.

Commented [FH1]: I agree with the greater setbacks for the sides and rear setbacks with residential neighbors.

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.*
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.

Commented [FH2]: I definitely agree with this zoning change. We need to ensure (or at least facilitate) the future commercial growth in Talent. This will encourage investors/builders with greater initial occupancy potential.

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

Commented [FH3]: what about solar setbacks when a 3-story (albeit tapered) building is next to residential? Is there a difference in setbacks on the west or east?

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.

Commented [FH4]: re #3: This is a little less cut and dry. If there are zoning changes that allow residential or lower impact development next to pre-existing higher impact or commercial/industrial development where there is already a structure(s), I believe the onus should be on the residential development to create the buffer.

However, if it were the other way around, the higher impact development should be responsible for the buffer.

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.

Commented [FH5]: Is 1 parking space for MH realistic?

Commented [FH6]: Please remind me of rationale behind exempting bike parking to tri and quad plexes that also have lower parking requirements? This makes no sense. They already have lower parking requirements based on income assumptions and carrot for developers?

Zac and Elizabeth,

Thanks for your work on this project. I had just a few comments and questions below. I may have a few more when we receive the remainder of proposed draft code revisions.

Given that we desire clear and objective standards yet we have three review types it would be helpful to review a chart of uses and their associated current review type designation as well as the proposed new review type designation. This would help as an overview to understand track changes of how uses in the city are proposed to change under the new proposed zoning language.

For type one permit review procedure, it would be good to have an appeals path for appeal of the clear and objective standards that we are creating (as we discussed at the June 11 meeting). It seems logical that the path should be something less burdensome than LUBA, a standard that historically was relatively easy and straightforward and has become very complex and expensive over time. Perhaps the planning commission is the appropriate appeal path (as a type two use review provides) especially given that the zoning code update as proposed removes the authority of the planning commission to determine uses and places sole authority with staff.

With respect to Classifying uses (18.20.020), because classifying use is inherently subjective and based on goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and the stated purposes of the base zones, it seems that the residents of the city may benefit from the planning commission handling use determination in coordination with staff. Given that staff handles applications and use determination issues if bringing them to the planning commission, this may be an opportunity for a more thorough review of these subjective considerations if both staff and the planning commission weigh in. Of course, I may not have a good handle on the concept of "dispute" for elevating use determination for type 1 and type 2 reviews to the Planning Commission? What defines the "dispute" process?

Under RLD, we wanted to understand where the 2 to 3 dwelling per lot allowance originated from. Do we know? Was it changed in 2007? I believe Zac was looking into this.

It seems logical that we not exclude the Old town district from the opportunity to contribute to efficiencies in the new zoning language especially given that we have design standards in place to apply to the old town.

Is a type 2 permit review the appropriate path for cluster housing (4 to 12 units) rather than a type 3 permit review? An application for 12 1200sf single-family homes would be a type 3 permit review while 12 cluster homes would be type 2?

Regarding 18.105.050 Buffer and screening, I would like to know if pallets are an acceptable fencing material and if any additional requirements exist for pallet fencing? Prior to the new language, the subjective “aesthetically pleasing” language may be the only limitation on design.

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?

Regarding minimum landscaped area (18.105.020), please clarify, by reducing the minimums we are primarily reducing the number of trees required for planting? How much efficiency gain is expected by reducing the minimums?

Did we complete SDC and additional design standard questions regarding Cluster housing?

Regarding parking requirements, do we round up or down?

18.110.050, Off-street parking applicability, Do we have proposed new language that we have not seen?

18.110.100 Bicycle parking facilities language is not clear and objective. “Conveniently located”, “whenever possible”, “creative designs are strongly encouraged”, “sufficient security”, “well lit” etc., appear more subjective but that may be by design.