



CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO Planning Commission Minutes January 28, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair William Gaar called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 380 A Avenue, Lake Oswego, Oregon.

2. ROLL CALL

Members present were Chair Gaar, Vice Chair Jim Johnson, and Commissioners Puja Bhutani, Todd Hennelly, Todd Prager and Sandi Swinford. Commissioner Randy Arthur was excused. Councilor Liaison Jon Gustafson was also present.

Staff present were Debra Andreades, Senior Planner; Dennis Egner, Assistant Planning Director; Hamid Pishvaie, Assistant Planning Director; Leslie Hamilton, Senior Planner; Laura Weigel, Associate Planner; Evan Boone, Deputy City Attorney; and Iris McCaleb, Administrative Support.

Ms. Andreades introduced Ron Bunch, the new Planning and Building Services Director.

3. CITIZEN COMMENT (Regarding issues not on the agenda)

None.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Gustafson reported that the Council had selected a new city manager; appointed liaisons to boards and commissions, identified 2013 preliminary goals and scheduled a town hall meeting. He announced that Councilor Gudman was to chair the Comprehensive Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and Todd Hennelly had been appointed as the new Planning Commissioner. Councilor Gustafson also reported that the Council had decided to intervene in the appeal related to expanding the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and would also be discussing repealing the Foothills urban renewal area. Chair Gaar and Commissioner Johnson encouraged the Council to involve the CAC in the Comprehensive Plan implementation phase.

5. MINUTES

5.1 July 23, 2012. Action was postponed pending availability of the draft.

5.2 August 27, 2012. Commissioner Prager moved to adopt the Minutes of August 27, 2012 as amended by Commissioner Arthur. Commissioner Bhutani **seconded** the motion and it **passed 4:0:1**. Chair Gaar abstained.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS**6.1 Community Development Code Amendments 2011-2012 (LU 12-0054)**

A request by the City of Lake Oswego for legislative amendments to the Community Development Code (CDC) to update various sections in order to eliminate text ambiguity, clarify text so that it reflects existing code interpretations, and to add new provisions that address building colors, awnings and limits on cumulative retail uses in the Mixed Commerce (MC), Campus Research & Development (CR&D) and Industrial Park (IP) zones, and the Industrial Park Overlay (IPO) district.

Chair Gaar opened the public hearing and Mr. Boone outlined the applicable criteria and procedure.

Staff Report

Leslie Hamilton, Senior Planner, referred to the first of two maps in the staff report which were both labeled as 'Exhibit E-4' and noted that that the first map had been corrected to read 'Exhibit E-3.' She reported that Exhibits G-3 through G-7 from Mike Duyn (2), Drew Prell, Group Mackenzie, and Gramor Development had been added to the record. She highlighted the following items:

- Item 11 would bring the code into compliance with Metro Title 4. It limited the cumulative square footage of a single commercial business or building on a single lot or parcel, or on contiguous lots or parcels, including those separated only by a transportation right-of-way, to 60,000 sq. ft. in the MC zone. In the CR&D zone, retail would be limited to 20,000 sq. ft or 20% of the square footage of development on site, whichever is less. Metro staff had indicated that Metro would accept the draft code. The latest version of the amendments would bring three more uses into 'retail': personal services, tailors and laundries. No substantive changes were proposed to the IP and IPO district.
- Item 16 changes reflect First Addition Neighbors/Forest Hills Neighborhood Association's (FAN's) desire to drop certain design requirements.
- Civilis Consultants recommended against requiring awnings downtown because they could overwhelm facades and block views into the buildings. Staff recommended awnings be optional on single-story downtown buildings. Civilis recommended dropping the requirement for color review. The Commission had directed staff to present options related to color review. The three options were: 1) no color review for any building; 2) a streamlined color review that did not require a pre-application conference, and could have a reduced design review fee; and 3) a path showing how using a color palette would work.

Discussion/Questions*60,000 Sq. Ft. Cumulative Limit on Retail*

Ms. Hamilton clarified that there would be a new, 60,000 square foot, cumulative limit on retail uses on a site and adjacent sites in addition to the per business size limit shown on the use table. She pointed out that Metro had asked for the cumulative limitation and acknowledged that it would benefit the first uses to go in more than the last. She indicated that staff had tempered that requirement in the CR&D zone by limiting each individual lot to a total of 20,000 sq. ft., or 20% of the development, whichever is less. Ms. Hamilton confirmed that parking structures would be subject to the Building Orientation standards because they were considered habitable buildings.

Color Review Options

Ms. Hamilton cautioned that eliminating the need for a pre-application conference might save three weeks but that was not guaranteed. She advised that mixed use would be subject to color review. Option 2 would not meet the clear and objective standards for housing requirement, but Options 1 and 3, which either eliminated any color review or established a color palette from which to select colors, would meet it. Commissioner Johnson questioned why the city should regulate color and if there was any Comprehensive Plan policy to base it on. Mr. Pishvaie related that in his experience with the City since the late 1980s design review had always looked at how a proposed color would complement buildings in the surrounding area. He did not know the policy basis for doing it.

Section 50.03.004 Accessory Structures and Uses

Commissioner Bhutani pointed out provision 2.b.i.2 needed to be corrected; it called for an accessory structure greater than four feet in height to be separated from other buildings by three feet or more. She recalled the intent had been to require them to be at least 5 feet away. Commissioner Swinford questioned allowing reduction of setbacks for a 10-foot high structure. Ms. Hamilton advised this applied to medium sized structures that met both the 10-foot maximum height and 600 sq. ft. maximum footprint limits.

Table 50.04.001-1: Residential – Low Density Zones Dimensions

Ms. Hamilton agreed to add rear setbacks to this table. She addressed a concern that a 2.5-story house could be as close as five feet from the neighbor. She used a graphic illustration to show the relationship between setbacks and the side-yard-setback plane. She noted the structure had to fit inside the setbacks and behind the plane which pushed the bulk back from the property line and reduced impact to neighbors.

Gramor and MPD LLC Letters & Kruse Way/Carman Impacts

Chair Gaar asked staff to respond to the letters. Staff indicated that they had not yet had time to examine them. Ms. Hamilton advised that no substantive changes were proposed to the IP and IPO zones. Commissioner Bhutani and Chair Gaar inquired how the proposed changes would impact the property at Kruse Way/Carman. Ms. Hamilton advised that a land use application had already been submitted for that site and that future code changes would not affect that application. She indicated that if a development application was submitted for that site after the code was adopted it would be limited to the maximum of 20,000 sq. ft. of retail per lot. Commissioner Johnson noted the applicant could apply for a zone change and plan amendment.

How Much Latitude did Lake Oswego Get from Metro?

Staff advised that Metro found the proposed amendments – even those proposed for the CR&D zone – were in substantial compliance with Metro requirements. Staff explained that the CR&D approach was intended to spread the retail around more fairly and make it easier to track; the end result would be very similar to Metro's cumulative 60,000 sq. ft. requirement because of the lotting pattern. Mr. Bunch explained that Metro's objective was to retain employment potential in employment zones and that retail uses had lower per-acre employment than uses such as manufacturing and office.

Table 50.04.001-18: EC Maximum Height

Commissioner Swinford observed that the heights jumped in this table in a way that resembled a tiered cake. Ms. Hamilton advised a similar standard was used in the Lake Grove Village Center and downtown. Chair Gaar noted the Commission should discuss that in the future.

Section 50.06.009(10) Historic Preservation, Economic Incentives (Proposed for Deletion)

Ms. Hamilton clarified this would be deleted because it was not a development standard. Commissioner Bhutani wanted assurance it was somewhere in the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Johnson suggested the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) should consider it. Chair Gaar recalled incentives had been discussed and were on the 'parking lot' list of issues. He observed that they would all be lost if the Council removed the CAC from the implementation phase.

Section 50.05.004(6)(g) Downtown Redevelopment Design District, Building Design, Awnings

Commissioner Prager noted the staff report indicated that awnings would be optional on existing single-story structures, but the code seemed to exempt all single-story structures. Staff advised any new building downtown had to be more than one story.

Public Comment

Matt Grady, Senior Project Manager, Gramor Development, Tualatin, Oregon 97062, stated that he had submitted written comments. He advised that Gramor was interested in what happened downtown and in the CR&D district and they did not support the limit on retail uses staff proposed for the CR&D zone. They preferred to apply Metro's 60,000 sq. ft. cap on retail on the lot and adjacent lots and allow the exceptions listed under Section 3.07.440 E of Title 4. He pointed out that the exceptions allowed someone to make a case for 60,000, sq. ft. or more retail if they did not generate more than a 25% increase in the net vehicle trips above the permitted non-industrial uses and met the parking requirements in Table A. He referred to the two maps attached to his letter: Lake Oswego Zoning and Title 4 Areas; and Metro 2030 Growth Concept Design Types Kruse Way Enlargement map. He pointed out that when Title 4 areas covered part of a parcel staff made the entire parcel subject to Metro regulations. He pointed out the yellow 'corridor' strip along Kruse Way. He observed that a 'corridor' was a land use type that implied a commercial designation of some kind. He pointed out blue-toned land along Kruse Way that was light industrial and employment area. He asked that more fairness, credence or weight be given to whatever the corridor designation meant. He noted that the staff report did not talk about it. He suggested the city had found it easier to say it would be more restrictive than Metro and just blanket all of the lots with the same type of designations.

Mr. Grady then discussed proposed downtown design concepts. He explained that Gramor supported use of a color palette, and that an applicant should have to at least meet the realm of the color palette hues and not have to spend three months waiting for approval of a color. He reported that Gramor supported outdoor displays with a permit system and they thought awnings should be elective and not required everywhere.

During the questioning period Chair Gaar asked what kind of development the city would see if it only applied the 60,000 sq. ft. cap. Mr. Grady explained Gramor had already submitted a plan for a single story, multi-tenant, retail/office development with parking concealed in the interior. He indicated that the uses would be services that directly supported the offices in the neighborhood and tenants would likely be less than 6,000 sq. ft., which met current demand. Mr. Grady noted that having services anchored at either end of the corridor would mean they were places people would be able to walk to. He advised that his firm could not fit any more than about 64,000 sq. ft. on the site without putting structured parking somewhere due to the limitations of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and 25% landscaping requirements.

Chair Gaar asked what the development would look like if it were developed in five years and if it would pencil out. Mr. Grady indicated his firm believed the demand was there and would

be there for quite a while. He indicated that it could cause a developer to plan 70 to 140 units of residential above ground floor retail, but it would likely not be more office use.

Mr. Grady confirmed that he supported some kind of color review, although it could be a challenge to get everyone to agree on a color palette. He noted that once it was agreed on developers could use hues of the approved colors. He confirmed he would prefer that to trying to decide if proposed colors were compatible with everything downtown.

Barry Cain, Gramor Development, SW 72nd Ave., Ste. 100, Tualatin, Oregon, indicated that what Gramor was proposing on Kruse Way was exactly what the area needed: restaurants and services to liven it up.

Deliberations

Chair Gaar closed public testimony and opened deliberations. Commissioner Swinford referring to the proposal to exempt single-story buildings from the awning requirement so it was easier to see into the businesses, commented that awnings were nice, but they did not need to be on every building. Chair Gaar observed general agreement.

Chair Gaar observed consensus to make a change suggested by Commissioner Bhutani which would more accurately reflect intent of a provision under Accessory Structures and Uses 50.03.004:

2.b. An accessory structure greater than 4 feet high is to be detached from other buildings by 5 feet or more. Accessory structures less than 4 feet high can be detached by 3 feet or more.

The Commissioners considered color review options. Commissioner Johnson noted that the only public testimony the Commission had heard favored Option 3 (create a program with an identified palette of acceptable paint colors). He advised that, in that case there should be a goal, purpose or design target to base the particular palette on. Chair Gaar recalled that the Planning Department and the Development Review Commissioners had been advised that a palette be a clear and objective standard. Commissioner Bhutani noted that if the city adopted a color palette it would only apply to a few properties. She indicated she would support Option 2 (a streamlined process) because staff was concerned about the impact if really prominent properties that had gone through design review, changed their colors. Commissioner Johnson cautioned that some prominent properties such as the Wizer block would not be subject to color review and those buildings could be painted a color that changed downtown overnight. He suggested a broader policy discussion was necessary regarding whether the city wanted a certain type of design for districts like downtown. He held that to only require a few properties to have color review seemed like a waste of time if the rest could paint whatever color they wanted. Commissioner Prager indicated he liked the concept of a color palette which could be looked at some time in the future. He would support Option 2 now in order to move forward.

Commissioner Swinford indicated that she favored Option 1 (no review). She reasoned that primary developers would hire good designers who would come up with colors that fit the city. She held that over-regulating colors could prevent the city from being as great as it could be; and the city might not have the time and money to spend on determining color requirements. She recalled that there were unique and different art features all around the city. Chair Gaar suggested a palette (Option 3) could be created by looking at past Development Review Commission (DRC) decisions about color since they seemed to be getting it right. He indicated that if an applicant wanted to deviate from it they should have to go through some level of review and the applicant would likely budget for that. Commissioner Swinford cautioned that it would take time to agree to a particular color palette and the palette would need to be updated because color trends changed and color schemes dated buildings.

Commissioner Bhutani explained she would only support Option 3 if all properties were subject to color review, not just a few of them. She advised that the related discussion would have to consider things like whether color review was required for all commercial even if it included mixed use. She indicated that for the time being Option 2 was a good way to move forward. Commissioner Johnson agreed. He suggested that in the longer term the city could look at regulating color in distinct districts such as downtown. Perhaps a group of downtown businesses could decide to address it and propose something to the city.

Chair Gaar summarized that the Commission had not achieved consensus on the color issue, three of them favored Option 2 and he favored Option 3. The Commissioners agreed that a color palette would need to be discussed in a broader context.

The Commissioners then discussed the proposed amendments related to Metro Title 4. Commissioner Swinford suggested the city should listen when one of its biggest developers questioned whether this would allow them to get their highest and best use. She recalled the Council goal to make the city business friendly. She anticipated that the people who worked in the buildings could benefit from some additional retail.

Chair Gaar related that he worked in the area and was not sure he would benefit from more retail development because there was already plenty of retail in the area; that said, he was not inclined to limit a developer's ability to get the highest and best use out of their property. He opined that in the future the undeveloped parcel could be a mixed-use high rise with retail or office space below and living space above. He explained he was inclined to agree with Gramor because the proposed amendment was too restrictive, not because there was a need for retail there.

Commissioner Johnson indicated he was inclined to go along with the staff suggestion for the following reasons: it would protect some of the last employment land the city had from being converted to other uses and help prevent having to expand the UGB; it would prevent large, stand-alone retail uses that were more like destination retail than services for the employment area which could take business away from Boones Ferry Road and downtown; and it would protect employment areas that generated higher paying jobs than retail did.

Commissioner Bhutani agreed and talked about balancing what was good for the property owner with what the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Plan laid out, as well as regional requirements: retail had to be supportive of employment uses in the area. She agreed that what the staff proposed was a good balance, it allowed retail, but limited it.

Commissioner Prager suggested continuing the hearing to allow more time to go over the letters and information the Commission had received that day. He asked staff to provide more background information about regional draw businesses.

Chair Gaar **moved** to continue LU 12-0054 to February 11, 2013 for deliberations only. Commissioner Johnson **seconded** the motion and it **passed 5:0**.

6.2 Community Development Code Amendments in IP Zone & IP Overlay (LU 12-0051)

Amendments to the Community Development Code, Chapter 50, Article 50.03.003.3 (Use Table) to allow "Fitness exercise and sports facilities" to have up to 20,000 sq. ft. of floor area in the Industrial Park (IP) zone and Industrial Park Overlay (IPO) District. Staff asked the Commission to continue the hearing.

Commissioner Johnson **moved** to continue LU 12-0051 to February 11, 2013. Commissioner Swinford **seconded** the motion and it **passed 5:0**.

7. WORK SESSIONS

7.1 Comprehensive Plan Update – Community Health and Public Safety, Part 1 (P 10-0007)

Review “local food access” draft goals and policies to prepare for the May 13, 2013, public hearing. This was a new topic in the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Report

Ms. Weigel read the Community Health and Public Safety Vision Statement:

“Our community is a safe place to live and supports lifelong active and healthy living. We have excellent public safety response systems that work together with an involved community to ensure peace and safety. There are opportunities for active lifestyles and to obtain locally grown food that promotes the health and social interaction of our residents.”

Ms. Weigel reported that community input showed that people wanted access to things like the Farmers’ Market and community and school gardens. She explained that the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) had worked on the proposed goal and policies and that some Sustainability Advisory Board (SAB) and Natural Resource Advisory Board (NRAB) members had submitted suggestions.

Goal: Provide the opportunity for residents to access a variety of healthy, fresh and local food options.

Policies:

1. **Support farmers’ markets, farm/produce fresh food stands* and community gardens that are compatible with the surrounding uses.**
2. **Provide the opportunity for employment centers, town centers and neighborhood villages to have healthy, fresh and local food options within walking distance (half mile).**
3. **Encourage residents to grow and raise healthy, fresh foods.**

***Definition: Farm/produce stands - A building or structure used for the retail sales of fresh fruits, vegetables, flowers, herbs, and/or plants, and accessory sales.**

SAB and NRAB members’ suggestions were to replace ‘healthy’ with ‘organic’; encourage residents to grow, consume, preserve and store (strike ‘raise’) healthy, fresh foods; and add a new policy to support the preservation, use and development of agricultural lands owned by the City. Staff noted the only city-owned agricultural land was Luscher Farm. A general comment had been received that another aspect/advantage that had been overlooked was being able to enjoy the joy of gardening and actually growing food to eat and interacting with nature.

Discussion

Chair Gaar recalled the CAC had talked about removing ‘raise’ from Policy 3 so people understood it was not about raising animals such as pigs. Commissioner Swinford advised the last sentence of the vision statement was not clear enough.

Chair Gaar observed consensus to agree to Commissioner Bhutani’s suggestion to shorten the goal statement to simply call for providing the opportunity for residents to have access to local food. She had explained that that was more in keeping with a land use policy; whether or not it was genetically modified food or had pesticides and chemicals in it could be regulated some other way. Mr. Bunch advised the City of Portland’s food-related code had a land use

focus that allowed things like community gardens, farm stands, and Community Service Associations (CSAs) to occur and addressed aspects such as their size.

The Commissioners discussed the SAB and NRAB members' suggestions. Commissioner Johnson advised against replacing 'healthy' with 'organic' because that was not a settled issue; not all non-organic food was unhealthy; and he would consider 'organic' a subset of 'healthy.'

The Commissioners discussed the suggested new policy: *Support the preservation, use and development of agricultural lands owned by the City*. Commissioner Johnson indicated he favored adding it. He explained that the policy would ensure there was some sort of agriculture going on at Luscher Farm; in other parts of the district that had not been part of the original Farm; and on land the city might acquire in the future.

Staff confirmed for Commissioner Prager, that they planned to reconsider what it meant by 'development' before they took the policies back to the CAC. Commissioner Swinford wanted to know how this policy might affect the dialogue between ball field and agriculture advocates. Commissioner Johnson indicated he believed SAB members wanted this policy in the Comprehensive Plan in order to protect an agreement that had been reached about the amount of land to be designated for ball fields, agriculture and historic preservation. He advised that they were afraid the Parks and Recreation Department would renege on the agreement.

Commissioner Prager suggested making it a higher level policy by removing 'owned by the city'; referring to agricultural lands in and near the city, even if they were outside the UGB; and ending with 'for agricultural purposes'. Commissioner Johnson advised that once land was inside the UGB it was no longer considered agricultural land and that keeping land inside the UGB strictly for agricultural use would violate statewide planning goals. Commissioner Prager noted that the word development in the policy did not make it clear as to what type of development. Commissioner Johnson stated that he planned to think about better language before the CAC looked at it.

Commissioner Prager, Chair Gaar and Commissioner Swinford questioned having a policy specifically targeted at Luscher Farm. Chair Gaar offered the example that if the library was torn down the neighborhood might want to have a community garden on that site. Commissioner Prager suggested the land might be owned by a nonprofit entity in the future and not necessary owned by the city. Chair Gaar anticipated that Policy 3 would support private landowners getting together as a co-op to develop private land as agricultural land. He would make the SAB-suggested language Policy 4, focused on public agricultural land in general. He would ask the CAC to look at taking a broader approach when it looked at it so it was not as focused on Luscher Farm. Commissioner Swinford would broaden the proposed policy to enable community gardens in many different forms on public and private properties. She advised that it would allow things like making parts of some parks community gardens.

Commissioner Johnson clarified the proposed new policy had not been suggested in order to allow community gardens; the intent of the SAB was to protect Luscher Farm; the Board was worried that without a policy specific to Luscher Farm the Parks and Recreation Department would put in ball fields. Both Commissioner Johnson and Chair Gaar agreed that Luscher Farm had a master plan; seemed to be a district; was similar to a neighborhood plan; and it needed to be dealt with in the implementation phase.

Commissioner Bhutani observed that agricultural land was the fourth way of accessing local food. She indicated that the other three ways were in Policies 1-3: community gardens, neighborhood centers and encouraging residents to grow food. Commissioner Prager noted there was a lot of agricultural land outside the city that was not owned by the city that should be considered. Commissioner Johnson observed that Stafford was now in the urban reserve.

Commissioner Swinford explained she had thought that Luscher Farm was established and well protected. Chair Gaar clarified that he did not believe it was well protected but he did not favor drafting a policy for a specific district. He would prefer to call out the master plan for that district as an overlay for example. He recalled that Mr. Bunch had related how villages in France protected the agricultural land around them. He had suggested calling for creation of agricultural districts within the urban and rural reserve in Lake Oswego and its vicinity that would address land just outside of Lake Oswego.

Chair Gaar observed the Commission was not in agreement about the suggested new policy. He asked staff to discuss it with the CAC.

Staff agreed to remove the reference to 'half mile' as walking distance in Policy 2 after Commissioner Swinford and Chair Gaar observed that an acceptable walking distance could vary from one person to the next, i.e. for some walking half a mile was too far and for others it was not, it depended on the person.

Commissioner Prager questioned whether Policy 3 was a little too prescriptive; if that was the city's role; and if it should be in a land use plan. Commissioner Johnson advised that many cities were adopting policies like that so they would have a policy basis for code that allowed things like home food businesses or chickens. Commissioner Prager then suggested reconsidering use of the word, 'encourage.' Chair Gaar summarized that 'encourage' would be changed to indicate support; and the general consensus was that the city wanted local foods, so it would support residents growing and raising local foods.

7.2 Comprehensive Plan Update – Connected Community (LU 12-0033)

Follow-up of the October 8, 2012 hearing of Connected Community Action Area Goals and Policies. Goals discussed were: Goal 4 Accessibility, Policies 4 and 5; Goal 7 Sustainability, Policy 9; and parking policies.

Goal 4 Accessibility

Policy 4. Place a high priority on making walking and biking more accessible in areas with high populations of seniors (65+) and youth.

Policy 5. Provide more opportunities for walking and biking within the employment centers, town centers, neighborhood villages and hubs so residents can access their daily needs.

Ms. Weigel pointed out staff had added these two policies to address the Commissioners' concern that the policies under this goal were focused on transit and did not get at the multimodal aspect of the goal. She indicated that the consultant had created a map showing that the priority areas were mainly around Mountain Park, where there were more younger and elderly residents. Staff had focused on youth and seniors because they did not have cars.

Commissioner Bhutani questioned prioritizing Mountain Park and suggested priority areas might be around schools or retirement communities. Chair Gaar questioned the focus on age groups; people might not have vehicles because of their income or because they lived in an area where they did not have a parking space. Commissioner Johnson opined that this was about making it easier for everyone to walk and bike. He and Chair Gaar advocated doing the prioritizing in the implementation phase and being less specific at the policy level. Commissioner Swinford observed this goal was about access between Centers and Villages and that residents might decide to drive to some and bike to some. Commissioner Bhutani talked about the concept of universal design: making it easy for people with disabilities to go from point A to point B worked for everyone who used that route. Ms. Weigel agreed to look into crafting a policy using universal design language.

Goal 7 Sustainability: Provide a transportation system that maintains and improves economic vitality, environment health, social equity and well-being for citizens today and in the future.

Policy 9. Allow for the design of off-street parking to provide multiple functions such as storm water management, reducing the urban heat island effect, decreasing impervious surfaces and providing temporary space for public functions.

Ms. Weigel had revised this policy because Commissioner Prager had asked for a policy that would reflect that parking lots could serve multiple roles. Commissioner Prager confirmed that he liked the new language.

Parking Policies

Ms. Weigel and the Commissioners looked at the 1994 Comprehensive Plan policies related to parking. The Commissioners had asked for assurance that no policies had been lost during the conversion to the new Comprehensive Plan format. Ms. Weigel indicated that there was no longer a specific goal related to parking.

1994 Goal 11. Parking

Policies

1. The City shall develop and maintain parking regulations that require off-street employee and customer parking and loading facilities be provided on-site and commensurate with the size and relative needs of each new development, balanced with the need to reduce auto trips, encourage alternative transportation and retain the natural drainage system.

Ms. Weigel reported that all aspects of this policy had been implemented and most had been incorporated in the new Plan. She clarified that the new Plan had no parking policies because the intent of the parking regulations language had been to ensure the city developed parking standards and they had been developed and implemented. She asked if this policy was still needed. Commissioner Johnson cautioned against having parking standards that had no basis in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Weigel agreed to retain and clean up the parking regulations policy language so it was consistent with the language of the updated Plan.

2. When commercial, industrial or institutional uses are changed or intensified, customer and employee parking shall be adjusted commensurately.

Ms. Weigel reported that the code already required this. Chair Gaar agreed this policy could be removed because it was not needed.

3. Commercial and industrial parking shall not intrude into adjacent residential neighborhoods. The impacts on adjacent residential areas of new commercial and industrial parking facilities or increases in the size of existing lots shall be reduced through buffering and screening.

Ms. Weigel advised the city now had very specific parking requirements for onsite parking. Ms. Andreades related the neighborhoods expected parking demand to be 100% captured on site. Mr. Boone advised that if the intent was to capture 100% of the parking demand at peak times the Commission could keep this policy and look at the parking standards to ensure the minimum standards in fact accomplished it. Ms. Weigel agreed to keep the first sentence. She pointed out she had moved buffering and screening language to existing **Policy 5: Address neighborhood livability issues.** The Commissioners agreed to that.

4. The City, through the neighborhood associations, shall develop residential area parking guidelines to maintain the safety, character and utility of residential streets.

Staff proposed to replace this with: *Develop residential area parking guidelines to maintain the safety, character and utility of residential streets.*

Ms. Weigel reported that this policy had never been implemented. Mr. Bunch recalled that some neighborhoods, such as FAN, liked their lanes and did not want fully developed streets with curbs and gutters. Commissioner Bhutani suggested it would be good to have a residential area parking policy when the Commission discussed Secondary Dwelling Units. Commissioner Prager suggested softening the proposed language. After a combined language-crafting effort, the Commission agreed to the following language:

‘Consider residential area parking guidelines where appropriate to maintain the safety, character and utility of residential streets.’

5. Require off-street parking in commercial, industrial, and high density residential areas to be at the sides or rear of buildings where practical, with buildings oriented to the street in a manner which is convenient to pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders.

Commissioner Bhutani observed it was good to have a policy to provide the overall basis for the standards. The Commissioners agreed to Chair Gaar’s suggestion to keep it but replace ‘Require’ with ‘Locate’.

Goal 7. Sustainability

Policy 3. Decrease reliance on fossil fuels by encouraging transportation options and opportunities to provide a local energy supply for transportation that is renewable, less carbon intensive and least toxic.

Commissioner Prager recalled that the Commission had decided to say, ‘by encouraging alternative transportation options.’ Commissioner Johnson recalled that the CAC told him the proposed language reflected what the public wanted. Ms. Weigel planned to research that.

8. OTHER BUSINESS – PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

9. OTHER BUSINESS – COMMISSION FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

None.

10. SCHEDULE REVIEW

None.

11. ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business Chair Gaar adjourned the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Iris McCaleb /s/
Iris McCaleb
Administrative Support