

GLADSTONE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2022

Meeting was called to order at 6:30 P.M. (In Person and Zoom)

ROLL CALL:

Chair Natalie Smith, Commissioner Michael Milch, Commissioner Andrew Labonte, Commissioner Thomas Mersereau, Commissioner Jennifer Volbeda, Commissioner Andriel Langston

ABSENT:

None

STAFF:

Jacque Betz, City Administrator; Joy Fields, Senior Planner; John Southgate, Consultant; Tami Bannick, City Recorder

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Approval of February 15, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Milch made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion was seconded by Commissioners Mersereau and Langston. Ms. Bannick took a roll call vote: Commissioner Langston – yes. Commissioner Labonte – yes. Commissioner Labonte – yes. Commissioner Mersereau – yes. Commissioner Volbeda – yes. Chair Smith – yes. Motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA:

2. MONTHLY PLANNING REPORTS – FEBRUARY AND MARCH 2022:

Ms. Fields went over the reports.

In February they had two members of the public come to the customer service counter, responded to 67 phone calls/emails, reviewed four building permits that required land use review, and held one administrative decision (land use compatibility statement for Tom's Auto Sales). The Planning Commission considered and approved the Gladstone Library design review application, which has gone through the appeal period, so the decision is final. There is a new permitting software system at the County. There was a brief discussion regarding the building permit application from the Card Room/420 Portland Avenue.

In March they had one member of the public come to the customer service counter, responded to approximately 52 phone calls/emails, reviewed six building permits with land use review, and one administrative decision. The Planning Commission had a joint session with the City Council – a work session on the housing code amendments and no land use action was taken during that meeting. There was a sign permit for the 18000 Webster Road project.

3. PUBLIC HEARING: FILE TXT-2022-01 – AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING IN CHAPTER 17 OF THE GLADSTONE MUNICIPAL CODE (GMC):

Chair Smith opened the public hearing.

The proposed amendments are intended to bring the code into compliance with House Bill (HB) 2001. She went over the procedures that will be followed. She asked the members of the Planning Commission if they needed to declare any conflicts of interest – there were none. Ms. Fields went over the staff report (included in the packet). They will be discussing the draft

housing code amendments, looking at the municipal code, the statewide planning goals, Metro's functional plan, and looking at next steps. She went over the background information. The intent is to align local policies and standards to the recently adopted Housing Bill 2001 and clarify a few other housing related items in the current code. This is a legislative hearing because it impacts all the residential zoning districts in Gladstone. HB 2001 is required in the low-density residential zoning districts and Gladstone has to allow at least a duplex, as well as the middle housing types, in these areas. She went over the zoning map. The Planning Commission will be making a recommendation to the City Council – the Council will hold another public hearing and make the final decision. She went over the statewide planning goals/guidelines. The proposed amendments do not impact the goals in the Comprehensive Plan, but some of the policies. She went over the goals. The staff recommendation is for the Planning Commission to consider the amendments, discuss potential changes that may be needed, and draft a recommendation for City Council to consider.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Mr. Southgate said they received communication yesterday from the DLCD staff.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

None.

There was a presentation (included in the packet) by Jon Pheanis, project manager/planner and Sou Gardner from MIG – they are the consulting firm that has been assisting with the middle housing zoning code update. They have had a technical advisory committee, a needed housing advisory committee, and have had various opportunities for community engagement at each step. They shared what they learned from community input and the survey results. Mr. Pheanis went over some of the proposed changes. Mr. Pheanis went over the comments they received from the DLCD and options to consider (also included in the packet). Mr. Southgate went over the options as well.

Chair Smith asked the Commissioners how they wanted to proceed. Commissioner Mersereau recommended accepting the package the way it is and reviewing the comments/issues from citizens in the future. Commissioner Milch asked for clarification regarding compliance timelines – Mr. Southgate said with the changes the City should be compliant with HB2001. Commissioner Milch had a question regarding housing needs goals. Mr. Southgate responded. He also clarified questions regarding requirements for various housing types. Commissioner Labonte feels it would be wise to continue this until the meeting in May. Commissioner Volbeda agreed. Ms. Betz added that the public also needs an opportunity to review the comments from the DLCD. Chair Smith asked for a consensus to hold this over until the next meeting (May 17th) and hold another public hearing. Everyone agreed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

None.

Ms. Fields said there are no glaring issues from her perspective, but there is an omission that she would like the Commission to consider/discuss: sidewalks. Sidewalks are required for design review applications and for land division applications. They are not required for a single-family home nor if someone resurrects historically platted lot lines to provide a building location for a new home. If we require sidewalks for middle housing we also have to require it for single-family homes because the middle housing bill has to be the same or less restrictive for middle housing than for single-family. She went over Section 17.50.020. She asked the Commissioners if they would like to provide that in our single-family residential zoning districts: Commissioner Mersereau – thinks there is going to be a lot of concerns if that is put in. Commissioner Milch –

wants to say yes. Commissioner Labonte – would like more guidance and discussion. Commissioner Langston – agreed with Commissioner Milch. Commissioner Volbeda – is leaning toward yes. Chair Smith – is leaning toward yes as well. She would like to see consistency. This will be discussed at the next meeting. Ms. Fields went over what Clackamas County requires.

Commissioner Milch made a motion to continue the public hearing/public testimony until the May 17th meeting. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Volbeda. Ms. Bannick took a roll call vote: Commissioner Langston – yes. Commissioner Milch – yes. Commissioner Labonte – yes. Commissioner Mersereau – yes. Commissioner Volbeda – yes. Chair Smith – yes. Motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Discussion:

Commissioner Milch asked if they needed to remove references to large scale planned unit development when it is no longer defined in the code. Ms. Gardner gave an explanation and options.

Commissioner Labonte asked about the parking credit for off-site parking in 17.48.030. Mr. Pheanis said that is only related to an application/use that would require design review. The middle family housing they are discussing would not have that same requirement. Commissioner Labonte asked for clarification on what defines a historic building – Ms. Gardner could not find a definition specifically for historic structures. Ms. Fields said there are registries for historic resources/buildings. Mr. Pheanis said if those *documented* historic resources are described as such there are additional measures and limitations outlined in the OARS for middle housing. Commissioner Milch asked for clarification regarding the new minimum size for ADU's, which is equivalent to what the former maximum size was. He suggested adding a sentence in 7.2 and 5.0 similar to what Oregon City's code says: "Conversion of an existing basement to an ADU shall be exempt from the size limits provided that no new floor area will be added with the conversion".

4. UPDATE ON GLADSTONE HOUSING CODE INITIATIVES AND DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION EFFORTS:

Mr. Southgate said they intended on giving a presentation regarding where this process is and decided to pull this item in order to spend more time discussing the previous agenda item. He suggests giving the presentation at a future meeting.

BUSINESS FROM THE PUBLIC:

None.

BUSINESS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Milch:

He said they are blessed to have Ms. Fields, who is very knowledgeable about our local codes, raises good issues, and has quick answers to questions on complex issues. He also appreciates the people at MIG.

Commissioner Langston:

He wanted to remind everyone that the Meldrum Bar Park site plan survey is online, and he encouraged everyone to participate.

Chair Smith:

She said Commissioner Poole has resigned his position so they will have a vacant seat. She said if any of the Commissioners know anyone who has good some background and might be interested in serving on the Planning Commission to have them apply through the City's website.

ADJOURN:

Commissioner Langston made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Milch. Ms. Bannick took a roll call vote: Commissioner Langston – yes. Commissioner Milch – yes. Commissioner Labonte – yes. Commissioner Mersereau – yes. Commissioner Volbeda – yes. Chair Smith – yes. Motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:08 P.M.

Minutes approved by the Planning Commission this 18th day of May, 2022.

Natalie Smith

Natalie Smith, Chair