



CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO Planning Commission Minutes April 9, 2018

-
- 1
2 **1. CALL TO ORDER**
3 Chair Robert Heape called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of City
4 Hall, 380 A Avenue, Lake Oswego, Oregon.
5
6 **2. ROLL CALL**
7 Members present were Chair Robert Heape, Vice Chair Bill Ward and Commissioners Randy
8 Arthur, Skip Baker, Ed Brockman, Vickie Hansen and Nicholas Sweers. Councilor Theresa
9 Kohlhoff was also present.
10
11 Staff present were Scot Siegel, Planning and Building Services Director; Debra Andreades,
12 Senior Planner; Evan Boone, Deputy City Attorney; and Iris McCaleb, Administrative Assistant.
13
14 **3. COUNCIL UPDATE**
15 Councilor Theresa Kohlhoff provided an update on recent Council actions.
16
17 **4. CITIZEN COMMENT**
18 Jim Bolland, 804 5th Street, Lake Oswego, 97034, spoke regarding the recent Council Study
19 Session on annexation policy which he had attended. He stated that Council had given no
20 direction to move forward. He encouraged the Commission to view the video of the meeting
21 and testimony submitted.
22
23 **5. MINUTES**
24 5.1 February 12, 2018
25 Vice Chair Ward **moved to approve the Minutes of February 12, 2018**, as amended.
26 Commissioner Sweers **seconded** the motion and it **passed 7:0**.
27
28 5.2 February 26, 2018
29 Commissioner Baker **moved to approve the Minutes of February 26, 2018**, as written.
30 Commissioner Brockman **seconded** the motion and it **passed 7:0**.
31
32 5.3 March 12, 2018
33 Commissioner Baker **moved to approve the Minutes of Mach 12, 2018**, as amended. Vice
34 Chair Ward **seconded** the motion and it **passed 7:0**.
35
36 **6. COMMISSION FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT – GENERAL UPDATES**
37 Chair Heape announced upcoming neighborhood association meetings and various board and
38 commission vacancies. He also noted that the Planning Commission was working on
39 scheduling their first neighborhood tour of the Blue Heron Neighborhood Association.

7. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

7.1 Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments for Property Located at 1061 Sunningdale Road (LU 17-0079)

On March 12, 2018, the Planning Commission made a preliminary recommendation that the City Council approve the proposed amendments. *Staff coordinator was Paul Espe, Associate Planner.*

Commissioner Arthur **moved** that the Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendment for property located at 1061 Sunningdale Road (LU 17-0079) be approved. Commissioner Baker **seconded** the motion and it **passed 7:0.**

8. PUBLIC HEARING

8.1 Community Development Code Amendments – Secondary Dwelling Units (LU 18-0003)

A request from the City of Lake Oswego for text amendments to the Community Development Code (CDC) to amend the standards for Secondary Dwelling Units (SDUs), LOC 50.03.004.1.b.vi. The purpose of the amendments is to allow development of SDUs with fewer restrictions and a more efficient permit process. *Staff coordinator was Debra Andreades, Senior Planner.*

Chair Heape opened the hearing and Mr. Boone outlined the applicable criteria and procedures. At time of declarations Commissioner Arthur stated that he had considered adding a secondary dwelling unit to his property, but had no plans, nor had he taken any steps toward that consideration. No other declarations or conflicts of interest were reported and no one challenged any Commissioner’s right to consider the application.

Staff Report

Debra Andreades provided an overview on the proposed text amendments for secondary dwelling units (SDUs). She explained that the amendments were a Council goal to make a more efficient SDU process and increase affordable housing options. She reviewed data from a 2013 Portland State University survey done in Portland of surrounding jurisdictions.

She stated that three new letters had been added to the record since March 2, 2018. Exhibit G-2, from the Lake Grove Neighborhood Association, commented on land division, short term rental, that no second driveway should be allowed, and that amendments should not trigger property value increases related to SDUs. Staff responded that the zoning code must still be met and that only a parking pad would be required for internal conversions to a SDU, as proposed. Short term rentals were not proposed to be allowed in an SDU and the zone or overlay zone would not be changed. The second letter, Exhibit G-3, was from Dianne Cassidy regarding inadequate public notice on the proposed text amendments, that Senate Bill (SB) 1051 – State guidance on SDUs was not mandatory, and without onsite owners the SDU would become a duplex. Staff responded that the staff report and public review draft were available 35-days prior to the hearing; the proposed amendments were initiated at the direction of the City Council, and not SB 1051. Ms. Andreades stated that the difference between a duplex and SDU was that there was no square footage limitation on duplexes and there was a limit for SDUs. The third letter was from Housing Land Advocates and stated that Goal 10 was not addressed nor was the Housing Needs Analysis to show compliance. Ms. Andreades responded that SDUs were never counted in the City’s Buildable Land Inventory or Housing Needs Analysis, they were not counted as needed housing; and the City was in compliance with Goal 10.

1
2 Ms. Andreades explained that the goal for the text amendments was to provide clear and
3 objective standards so that the process for developing an SDU would be ministerial. She
4 outlined the proposed standards for setbacks, windows, doors and parking. For discussion
5 she proposed two changes; consider removing the requirement for one unit to be owner-
6 occupied; and, have a minor development process for those that cannot meet the window,
7 door or parking placement requirements, maybe have an alternative design feature to maintain
8 privacy.

9
10 Mr. Siegel clarified that no changes were proposed to the development standards and that the
11 parking allowance was typically a parking pad on an existing driveway such as in front of a
12 garage, lot coverage was not being expanded. Ms. Andreades stated that neighborhood
13 overlays that restricted the amount of impervious surface would still have to be met.

14
15 ***Questions of Staff***

16 Chair Heape asked if there could be waivers for additional parking for sites that were within a
17 certain distance of public transportation. Mr. Siegel stated that parking would have to be
18 provided onsite.

19
20 Chair Heape shared a late arriving comment from the Blue Heron Neighborhood Association
21 regarding better property maintenance for owner occupied SDUs. He cited a study showing
22 better maintenance of owner-occupied units. Mr. Siegel responded that the City currently had
23 an owner-occupancy requirement, and commented that the Commission may find that it is a
24 reasonable siting standard.

25
26 Ms. Andreades confirmed for the Commission that owners could be in either the primary or
27 secondary unit. Vice Chair Ward commented that there were property maintenance issues
28 with rental homes in his neighborhood. Mr. Siegel clarified for the Commission that the
29 enforcement process was complaint driven.

30
31 Chair Heape asked if Homeowner Associations could instill their own restrictions. Mr. Boone
32 advised that Homeowner Associations imposed covenants on private property and they were
33 usually put on the properties by the developer; the covenants were a private matter and
34 enforced at the civil level. He stated that he had not researched the application of the Fair
35 Housing Act as to private covenants on SDUs.

36
37 Commissioner Arthur asked if the proposed SDU amendments would ensure housing
38 affordability and whether the Planning Commission was being asked to make a finding that
39 more economical housing would be advanced by the proposed amendments. Mr. Siegel
40 responded that there was no criterion for a legislative change, to ensure that housing would be
41 affordable. Commissioner Arthur cited a City of Portland study stating that 80 percent of
42 accessory dwelling units rented at market rate; hence, his question about making a finding on
43 housing affordability.

44
45 Chair Heape asked Ms. Andreades if staff had recommendations on the size of the SDU or
46 number of bedrooms or other attributes to limit occupancy. Ms. Andreades stated that the size
47 limit was 800 square feet and there were no specifics in the amendments that specified how
48 the 800 square feet would be used. Mr. Boone had a concern about limiting the number of
49 people, which may be affected by the Fair Housing Act.

50
51 Vice Chair Ward supported the limit of 800 square feet for an SDU. Commissioner Sweers
52 stated he had a rental unit of 875 square feet that slept up to 6 people. Vice Chair Ward

1 reiterated his support of owner-occupancy requirements. He also said there should be notice
2 to neighbors and that a minor development permit should continue to be required.
3

4 **Public Testimony**

5 Dianne Cassidy, 3601 Wren Street, Lake Oswego, 97034, testified that she owned about 185
6 units in Gladstone and Oregon City, giving her a lot of experience with rentals. She said the
7 goal of the SDU ordinance was to provide affordability for some, but for many they were
8 income producing. She held it would lead people to maximize their investment and charge
9 market rates; not necessarily increasing affordable housing. She stated that the City should
10 reflect the values of the community. She advised that renters didn't necessarily care for the
11 property as owners would who had "skin in the game", ensuring neighbors that properties
12 would be cared for. She opined that if duplexes were allowed, they were commercial
13 enterprises and didn't match the single family aesthetic of Lake Oswego. She raised the idea
14 of licensing secondary units to ensure safety, which could be subject to building inspection.
15 She also noted that parking pads in the front yard should not be allowed. She said each
16 neighborhood should have a protective overlay to prevent bad things from happening.
17

18 In response to a Commission question about the Fair Housing Act, she opined that the Act
19 addressed who could rent a dwelling, not what it looked like; the industry rule of thumb was 2
20 people per bedroom plus one. She said 800 square feet was enough for a 2-bedroom unit.
21

22 Commissioner Arthur asked Ms. Cassidy if she had an opinion on increasing the limit to 1,000
23 square feet for interior SDU conversions. She said she didn't have an objection to 1,000
24 square feet, but would prefer the 800 square foot limit.
25

26 Chair Heape asked Ms. Cassidy if the SDUs would be in conflict with her rental business. She
27 said it would not.
28

29 David Beckett, 17738 Kelok Road, Lake Oswego, 97034, stated he was the chair of the Blue
30 Heron Neighborhood Association. He said that his neighborhood was almost exclusively
31 single family and that 44-percent of the houses were on the lakefront. He clarified that some
32 of the waterfront homes were part of the Blue Heron Homeowners Association. He stated that
33 his and the neighborhood's position was that there should be an owner-occupancy
34 requirement. He spoke to the need for SDUs for caretakers or family members. He supported
35 standards for development and enforcement. He said they would like to see the term "ADU"
36 erased from the discussion because it implied that it might be attached to the primary dwelling
37 which could become a duplex arrangement. They were also in favor of the 800 square foot
38 limit. He added that the current code for lot coverage should be kept.
39

40 Chair Heape asked Mr. Beckett to clarify if an owner-occupant would have to be onsite full
41 time. Mr. Beckett responded he could not answer that from the perspective of the
42 Neighborhood Board. Vice Chair Ward said that some ordinances specify that a unit be a
43 "principal residence". He asked Mr. Beckett if he agreed with that. Mr. Beckett again said he
44 could not speak for the Neighborhood Board.
45

46 Commissioner Baker asked if the Blue Heron Homeowners Association allowed rental
47 properties. Mr. Beckett said he could not answer for the Homeowners Association and
48 referred to Ms. Cassidy, who was a member of the Homeowners Association. Ms. Cassidy
49 said the bylaws would only allow one house per lot, the conversion of another building was
50 different, rental units were not allowed, but having a "granny unit" was currently being
51 reviewed. She was not sure what direction the Homeowners Association was going to go.
52

1 Chair Heape asked if the number of secondary units per lot was fixed. Mr. Siegel responded
2 that currently only one secondary dwelling unit was allowed in the code. Chair Heape then
3 asked about building code compliance and if it were required for SDUs. Mr. Siegel said that
4 building permits would be required for SDUs, internal or freestanding.
5

6 Commissioner Sweers asked about tenure of owner-occupants. Mr. Siegel responded that it
7 should be a "principal residence" for the owner which could be evidenced by utility bills or
8 other proof. Mr. Boone spoke to the need for evidence of time spent at a unit if there was a
9 specific time requirement, such as 50 percent occupancy per year. Commissioner Sweers
10 spoke to the difficulty of enforcement for a time period.
11

12 Carole Ockert, 910 Cumberland Road, Lake Oswego, 97034, stated that she was the chair of
13 the First Addition Neighbors-Forest Hills (FAN-FH) Neighborhood Association. She shared the
14 neighborhood association's position on the following:

- 15 1. Did not support changes in existing code regarding parking.
- 16 2. Did not support increase in size of internal conversion of SDUs in the R-0, R-2, R-3,
17 RDD, R-5, R-6 and R-7.5 zones.
- 18 3. Did support increase in size to 1,000 square feet for internal conversion SDUs in R-
19 10 and R-15 zones.
- 20 4. Did not support any change to current code language requiring owner- occupancy
21 in one of the units.
- 22 5. Did support protective standards for neighboring property owner's privacy, but did
23 not believe the proposed code was sufficient.
24

25 In regard to Code Concerns:

- 26 1. 50.03.002(ii), Use Table, showed that SDUs were allowed in all residential zones,
27 except Waterfront Cabana District (RW), and requiring one unit to be owner-
28 occupied. Ms. Ockert read the definition of a duplex. If the owner-occupancy
29 requirement was removed, then SDUs would become a de facto duplex. The
30 conundrum was that duplexes were not allowed in R-6, R-7.5, R-10 and R-15. The
31 proposed language would be overriding the use table. If the owner-occupancy
32 requirement was removed, there would be duplexes in every zone except in the
33 RW zone.
- 34 2. Parking would be removed for conversions of garages to SDUs, reducing required
35 parking for homes. One parking space per unit should be required.
- 36 3. Notification was currently required for SDU applications. The proposed changes
37 would make the SDU decision ministerial. Her Board would like to see a
38 notification and comment period for SDU applications.
39

40 Ms. Ockert clarified that the Board supported a larger SDU size (1,000 square feet) in the R-10
41 and R-15 zones, because there were larger lot sizes and homes; while there may be more
42 people living in the units, there would likely be fewer impacts on surrounding properties in
43 those two zones.
44

45 Jim Bolland, 804 5th Street, Lake Oswego, 97034, representing Lake Oswego Neighborhood
46 Action Coalition (LONAC) testified that he echoed Ms. Cassidy's testimony on housing
47 affordability. He reported that his neighborhood supported SDUs for family members. He
48 articulated a concern that City Council was looking at allowing short term rentals, which would
49 impact the use of SDUs. He suggested waiting until City Council made their decision before
50 approving the text amendments for SDUs. He advised that the LONAC did not support larger
51 units (1,000 square feet) in internal conversions. Regarding parking, he stated there would be

1 a disaster in the R-6 zone as there was not enough room on lots and there were problems with
2 accessing paved surface street parking. He held that the impacts would mostly impact the
3 dense neighborhoods of FAN-FH and Evergreen; LONAC was opposed to clear and objective
4 standards, they want to retain pre-application conferences so neighbors could have input on
5 projects. Mr. Bolland indicated that in regards to establishing owner-occupancy, it would be
6 difficult to substantiate. He commented that enforcement was complaint driven and definitions
7 of occupancy may be unenforceable. He questioned how the proposed amendments would
8 affect historic homes. He opined that the code could not address everything that may come
9 up. He commented that affordable housing would regress if these amendments were put into
10 place, and especially if short term rentals allowed.

11
12 In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Bolland responded that the SDUs that had
13 been built in his neighborhood had been fine as there had been input from the neighborhood
14 at pre-apps and vigilance of neighbors. He said that there was a mix of SDUs built above
15 garages and some separate buildings.

16
17 Chris Wojda, 18304 Tamaway Drive, Lake Oswego, 97034, testified that he had considered an
18 SDU for his aging parents to age in place and that eventually he might use the property for
19 income producing purposes. He found it unfeasible to do an internal conversion due to fees
20 and regulations; in his situation, he would need to add square footage to have a space
21 functional enough for his family's needs. He noted that the term "accessory dwelling unit"
22 should be used as no other jurisdiction used SDU and it was confusing to look up regulations
23 under the SDU term.

24
25 In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Wojda stated that he was in favor of the
26 amendments, however neighborhood character needed to be taken into account. He noted
27 that that there were alternative ways to define the size of units. He indicated that the current
28 living situation was not ideal, but they made it work; however, a separate unit with a kitchen for
29 his mother was preferred.

30
31 Chair Heape closed the public testimony portion of the hearing. The Commission took a short
32 break then the meeting was reconvened.

33
34 Chair Heape opened deliberations.

35
36 ***Deliberations and Questions of Staff***

37 Size of SDU – 800 or 1,000 square feet: Commissioner Brockman asked staff on how to
38 handle the additional 200 square feet (for up to 1,000 square feet per unit) on a case-by-case
39 basis. He asked if a variance process would be appropriate. Ms. Andreades made the
40 observation that it would depend on whether the process for review was to be ministerial or
41 minor development. Mr. Siegel gave options such as allowing a larger size unit outright in the
42 less dense zoning districts where there were larger homes; alternatively, a minor variance
43 could be used. He advised that the variance criteria looked at harm to surrounding the
44 neighbors, and it was hard to see how an internal conversion would be harmful; he indicated
45 that objective standards would be preferred. Staff indicated that floor area was measured from
46 exterior of walls and was inclusive of everything, such as HVAC, hallways and chimneys. Mr.
47 Boone said that if the Commission wanted to exclude certain components of what was
48 counted within gross square footage for SDUs, that was an option; he stated it would not be
49 changing the definition it would be after excluding x, y and z. Staff confirmed that if the 200
50 square feet were limited to circulation areas, chimneys and mechanical systems and
51 depending on the design, it may not reach 1,000 square feet, it could be less.
52

1 Vice Chair Ward recalled a letter from Dr. Kibler about a 1,300 square foot conversion of his
2 basement for a living unit. Ms. Andreades stated that if it were an SDU, it would currently
3 have to go through a land use review. Mr. Siegel said that if there was a connection and
4 communication between the two units it could be considered a single dwelling. There was
5 discussion about rentals, duplexes versus SDUs and the definitions. Mr. Boone stated that a
6 family could consist of a group of not more than 5 unrelated, unassociated individuals living
7 together in a dwelling as a single housekeeping unit.
8

9 Definition and use of secondary dwelling unit or accessory dwelling unit: Ms. Andreades said
10 that changing the terminology could be proposed. Chair Heape asked that staff change the
11 code reference to ADU, if it would not result in excessive work for the staff.
12

13 Clarification of definition of attached, detached and internal SDUs: Ms. Andreades spoke to
14 reworking the definition to differentiate between an internal conversion of floor area within the
15 existing walls of a house and detached SDUs. Staff clarified An SDU built above a detached
16 garage would not be a conversion, it would be additional floor area. Ms. Andreades read the
17 definition of a guest house - a floor area limit of 400 square feet, no kitchen or cooking
18 facilities, used for occasional temporary lodging of persons and no payment or compensation
19 received.
20

21 Commissioner Baker clarified his understanding regarding size and standards: a new dwelling
22 unit (SDU), additions to existing structures (attached or detached) or conversion of existing
23 floor plan.
24

25 Commissioner Arthur asked for staff's opinion on FAN-FH Neighborhood Association
26 recommendation of having larger units (1,000 square feet) for internal conversion in only the
27 R-10 and R-15 zones. Ms. Andreades said that no matter what zone it was located in, the
28 house already existed and the unit would still have to meet the zoning standards.
29

30 Number of Bedrooms: Chair Heape asked about limiting the number of bedrooms.
31 Commissioner Brockman said that City Council asked for simplification of the code, not
32 complicating it. The Commission agreed to not limit bedrooms.
33

34 Owner-Occupancy: Commissioner Baker said there was overwhelming testimony on keeping
35 owner-occupancy in the code. Commissioner Sweers indicated that more definition was
36 needed for owner-occupants and he commented that there was no guarantee that an owner-
37 occupied dwelling was better maintained. Mr. Boone advised that it should be clear when an
38 owner was not present on the property. Ms. Andreades said that most enforcement problems
39 concerned the lack of presence of homeowners onsite. Commissioner Brockman reiterated
40 the concern of Commissioner Sweers on maintenance of properties by owners not being
41 guaranteed. There was a suggestion to identify one unit as primary and one unit as
42 secondary.
43

44 Number of SDU on a Property: Chair Heape asked staff about allowing more than one SDU
45 on a property. Staff responded that this was not a concern as only one secondary unit was
46 allowed.
47

48 Parking Requirement: Commissioner Brockman said he didn't think having a parking pad
49 would be detrimental. Commissioner Baker was in favor of leaving the existing staff
50 recommendation for parking. Ms. Andreades said the recommendation was to allow an
51 additional pad for internal conversions only. Mr. Siegel spoke to the parking requirements for
52 single family dwellings and not allowing parking within the front yard setback, but parking in an

1 existing driveway was allowed if the parking was not within the front yard setback. He stated
2 that the proposed code allowed parking within the front yard setback for a parking pad for
3 internal conversions, with limitations. He advised that there could be some unintended
4 consequences, based on public testimony.

5
6 Commissioner Arthur clarified that for existing homes, one paved parking place was required
7 and the SDU code was requiring an additional parking site for internal conversions. He
8 suggested revising the parking requirement to clarify that parking in the existing driveway in
9 the front yard setback would also satisfy the requirement for additional onsite parking for
10 internal conversions. Ms. Andreades said that the suggestion could work as that was how
11 people parked anyway and there were few complaints or enforcement referrals.

12
13 Vice Chair Ward asked, as an example, if an additional curb cut and driveway would be
14 allowed for a corner lot to serve an SDU. Staff advised there could be potential problems
15 depending on size of corner lot.

16
17 There was consensus by the Commission to allow parking in the existing driveway in the front
18 yard for internal conversions.

19
20 Ministerial or Minor Development Process: Ms. Andreades asked the Commission if there was
21 a desire for a minor development process for exceptional circumstances. Commissioner
22 Brockman stated the intent to simplify by use of clear and objective standards. Mr. Siegel said
23 using the building permit process was the key to economical housing.

24
25 Vice Chair Ward supported having a minor development process to ensure compatibility with
26 the neighborhood. Mr. Siegel said the only comments the City received were usually about
27 privacy concerns. He said that a pre-app could be held to inform neighbors. Ms. Andreades
28 said the process could be ministerial but be required to go through a pre-app so the neighbors
29 were informed; it was a 2 week process instead of a 3 month process. Commissioner Baker
30 asked if the internal conversion SDU process could be ministerial and detached SDUs
31 ministerial with a pre-app. Chair Heape said this would streamline the process.
32 Commissioner Brockman noted that some developers chose to go through voluntary pre-apps.
33 He advocated for pre-apps for external accessory dwelling units. Ms. Andreades pointed out
34 that with what was proposed in the amendments, the process would be ministerial.
35 Commissioner Brockman asked for an information vote on what was being proposed.
36 Commissioner Arthur asked for clarification on whether a variance would be available if
37 standards could not be met. Commissioner Brockman confirmed that was his understanding.
38 Vice Chair Ward opined that an internal conversion would not need a minor development
39 process; however, external SDUs would need a minor development process with notification,
40 meeting, and pre-application conference as well. Commissioner Baker stated that his
41 understanding was that internal conversions would be ministerial (staff approval, no pre-app),
42 or ministerial with pre-app or minor development review for external SDUs.

43
44 Commissioner Baker **moved** to allow internal conversion for SDUs to be reviewed using the
45 ministerial process without a required pre-app and all other SDUs be ministerial with a pre-app
46 required. Chair Heape **seconded** the motion. The motion **passed 4:3.**

47
48 The variance process was addressed by staff. Ms. Andreades pointed out that variances
49 could be applied for as an option. Mr. Boone recited the existing criteria for variances, stating
50 that it would not be beneficial to create new variance criteria. He stated that staff could add
51 elements to the code to address privacy concerns.

1 There was a question from Commissioner Brockman on major versus minor variances. Mr.
2 Boone stated that hardship variances would not necessarily be applicable to SDUs. Mr. Siegel
3 articulated the privacy criteria (fencing, door location and windows) could be added to minor
4 variance criteria. Staff was not recommending that, but it could be done. Ms. Andreades said
5 that with clear and objective standards, if they could not be met, the minor variance criteria
6 could address exceptions. Ms. Andreades read the three objective standards that could be
7 subject to a variance: window pane height from finished floor, fence requirement and distance
8 to property line for the entrance of a SDU.

9
10 Commissioner Baker **moved** to add three new standards to the minor variance process to
11 accommodate SDUs: fence requirement, window height and door setback. Commissioner
12 Brockman **seconded** the motion. The motion **passed 7:0.**

13
14 Ms. Andreades reviewed her understanding of the Commission's votes; to allow ministerial
15 review for internal conversion of SDUs; ministerial with a pre-app for detached/external SDUs
16 and adding a variance process for the fence requirement, window height and door setback.
17 There was consensus from the Commission to remove the parking pad and to allow parking in
18 the existing driveway. There was also consensus in regards to internal conversions, for the
19 addition of 200 square feet limited to circulation areas, chimneys and mechanical systems.

20
21 Commissioner Baker **moved** to tentatively recommend approval to the Council of the proposed
22 amendments with changes made by the Planning Commission and staff to return with Findings
23 Conclusions and Order at the April 23, 2018 meeting. Commissioner Brockman **seconded** the
24 motion.

25
26 Commissioner Baker clarified for Commissioner Arthur that the pending motion pertained to
27 three types of SDUs: internal conversion, anything external added on, and a completely
28 separate unit. There was consensus among the Commission with Commissioner Baker's
29 understanding.

30
31 The motion **passed 7:0.**

32
33 **9. OTHER BUSINESS**

34 None.

35
36 **10. SCHEDULE REVIEW**

37 Mr. Siegel reviewed the schedule.

38
39 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

40 There being no other business Chair Heape adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.