



## **Harrisburg Planning Commission (Non-Meeting) Notes for March 20, 2018**

The Harrisburg Planning Commission did not have a quorum, and therefore met in an informal meeting on this date at City Hall, located at 120 Smith St., at the hour of 7:07pm. Presiding was Chairperson Todd Culver. Also present were as follows:

- Charlotte Thomas
- Kurt Kayner
- Youth Advisor Rocio Luiz-Lopez
- City Planner/Administrator Brian Latta
- City Recorder/Asst. City Administrator Michele Eldridge

Concerned Citizens in the Audience: A person who didn't identify himself, other than an E-Mail address with 'Jeff' in it, was in the audience, and wanted to get information about the 100-acre park. He knew the city had gotten land, that it was going to make into a park. He had been reading minutes, but he maybe should be directing these questions to a different group. He thought maybe he should come back and get himself on the agenda. Did he miss the approval of the minutes?

- Latta told him that because we didn't have a quorum tonight, that the Planning Commission couldn't make any formal actions. That requires 4 people. Unfortunately, the Youth Advisor is an advisory vote, and doesn't count as part of the quorum.

Latta and Jeff had several minutes of conversation, in which Latta told him about the actions the city had already taken in relation to the park lands south of the city. Jeff said that was really what he was interested in. He wanted to get involved with the City.

### **The matter of a Work Session:**

**Staff Report:** Latta said that as we worked through the tables previously, we had a series of what was called special standards. These are land use types that don't have as high an impact as something that requires a conditional use permit, but still needed to be reviewed more than something that is allowed outright. The chapter isn't quite complete; he hadn't completed the wireless communication section. He added that for some of these, that it would be what is considered as a type II review, which means that they are administratively reviewed. Those wouldn't come to the Planning Commission.

- Jeff wanted to know why it wouldn't come to the Planning Commission.
- Latta said that other types of uses would come to the Planning Commission. Type II reviews all have clear and objective standards. Basically, does something comply with a checklist or not. If it complies, then there is no reason to bring it to the Planning Commission, because they already created the rules in relation to those.
- Thomas added that those don't cost as much money too.

- Latta said that is correct; it doesn't take as much time. For instance, he reviews a lot line adjustment. As long as they meet all the criteria, there is no reason to come to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission gets involved when there is discretion in relation to a land use request.
- Kayner said that there was a lack of standards like this in the past. That's why he sees so much nonsense stuff, because we didn't have these.
- Latta said exactly; it relieves the Planning Commission from reviewing these, which also reduces the time and cost for the citizen. The Planning Commission reviews the issues that requires more discretion, and takes more time to review.

**Artisanal and Light Manufacture Uses:** Latta noted that this was a use that encourages mixed use development, with commercial uses, or in this case, the combination of commercial and light manufacturing. Thomas asked what the orange box meant, along with the highlighted TBD's. Latta said that the boxes are user guides; sometimes they have notes that are helpful. Those will be removed. Some of those help guide your thinking. The TBD, is just that we haven't determined those areas in the zoning code yet. Once we get farther, you'll start seeing those filled in. He said that right now, JB Woodworks has a mixed use designation. They have some retail, with manufacturing usages. Its allowed in a commercial zone, or as a conditional use review (CUP) as applicable. That's determined by the uses tables. This is where manufacturing wouldn't be allowed in a commercial zone, but is used only in conjunction with the primary commercial use and it can't exceed the floor area of the primary commercial use. Thomas asked then if there wasn't a commercial use; only manufacturing? Latta told her you can't have a manufacturing use by itself in a commercial zone. If you had a 10,000 sq. ft. building, then you wouldn't be allowed more than 5,000 sq. ft. of manufacturing space. Kayner said that would keep the retail space larger. Latta said correct. JB Woodworks wouldn't comply with this part of the code if they were applying now. They would have a nonconforming use. Otherwise, they would need to have a larger showroom. Kayner asked why it was 50/50? Latta said that's what is proposed. He said that we could keep that 50/50, or if you want to model it like JB Woodworks, then you could allow 25/75. Kayner said then if they got competition, that business would need to comply. Thomas said that maybe 25/75 was realistic. A company like a screen printer wouldn't necessarily have 50% retail space. Kayner was thinking about companies like carpet and tile companies too. Thomas asked if a drycleaners would count that way. Kayner asked if any of those could ask to change that. Latta told him sure; they can ask for a variance. Kayner said that's like the business across the street from Hurd's. They had to name their hours. Chairperson Culver felt that he would lean more to 25%. He wished he had more of a feeling about what other cities have done. He had no problem with a 50/50, if they had the option of coming in and applying for a CUP. Thomas asked Latta if he could put a note in there, to come back and discuss it. She was wondering how it would apply for something like Hynix, or a bakery too.

Latta then continued on to C; standards. He went over the 4 lines here. Chairperson Culver asked if you are building homes, what is the time frame you are allowed to make noise in. Latta told him 7:00am to 10pm, he believed. Kayner didn't think we should have different time frames. Latta asked if they wanted to change that to 10:00 then. The consensus was yes. Kayner said that we should be considering other things too, like if we decide to sell a product, does that include the storage facility? If you have one big building, and you do pallet racking; would it be industrial or commercial in nature? Latta said if customers are walking up and down in the storage area, then it could be both. It's a good question.

**Drive-Through Service:** Latta reminded them that they would be able to have diagrams that showed what is acceptable.

**Duplex Dwellings:** Latta told them that they had previously discussed duplexes in the R-2 and R-3 zones, as an outright permitted use. If you'd like them to meet special standards, then here are some suggestions. If you do like these, then we'll need to go back to change the tables. If you don't think these have value, then we can delete them. He told them this wouldn't apply to a duplex that is across the street from a single family dwelling (SFD). It's only if it's next to a SFD. Chairperson Culver said then if a duplex couldn't be taller than 20% over a SFD, then it would need to be a single story duplex, correct? Latta told him yes, if it's next to a SFD. Jeff asked what areas were they talking about? Latta told him it's the zones he can see that are orange and brown, not yellow. Chairperson Culver asked if this was proposed as a model code? Latta told him yes, but you don't have to do this. These are guidelines to consider. He gave an example of C.3; you wouldn't be allowed to have a blank wall facing the street. You would need something to break it up, like windows and doors. The garage door opening does count as a door. The main issue here is that it looks and feels similar to dwellings on the rest of the street, rather than looking out of place. Thomas thought it could even lower property values to not have openings like that. Latta reminded them that they can modify these, throw them out, add things, etc. Thomas was worried about C.1 being too restrictive. She suggested nixing 1 and 4. Kayner agreed, and said we should keep 2 and 3. Thomas wanted to get Roger Bristol's opinion, since he's a builder; Latta said that we can revisit that section when we finalize everything.

**Townhomes, Attached Single Family Dwellings:** Everyone agreed that this section made sense. They liked the fact that garage entrances could be from the alley.

**Multifamily Development:** Latta really liked the open space requirements; they would only be required to have one of these listed, but could have as many of them as they'd like. Thomas didn't like the fact that only 40% of the ground floor dwelling units would have the patio/deck requirements, because then 60% of the units wouldn't have anything. Latta told her that it's uncommon that the front entrances wouldn't have anything. Most of the time, it's just a flat concrete slab. It can either be in the front, or in the back. Thomas was concerned about most of them not having anything. Chairperson Culver said that we are trying to maintain a certain quality of life in this community, so we need to be careful with what we plan. He was worried about the 40% because he could envision slum lords using that. Latta said that in Corvallis, it's a 100% requirement. Thomas wouldn't have a problem with that. We are a rural community, and we shouldn't have houses on top of houses. It will also lower the number of units per acre that there are. She thinks it would provide happier living. Latta said that he would keep a and b, but change the percentages. The Planning Commission liked the requirements in C.3 and C.4, because it means being nice to your neighbors.

**Dwellings in Commercial and Industrial Zones:** Latta said that he liked changing the residential uses requirements to be above (or below) a ground floor space. Right now, the current code allows up to 40% of the ground floor to be used for residential. That's too difficult to enforce and monitor. He prefers having the ground floor areas being dedicated to businesses. Both Chairperson Culver and Thomas liked that. For industrial properties though,

Latta noted that he envisioned the caretaker dwelling for the RV Storage place as being mostly office downstairs, with a home upstairs. Instead, the room that is the office is about a ¼ of the size of this room. He would prefer that we prevent that from happening again.

**Residential Care Homes and Residential Care Facilities:** Thomas said that we actually have a few of these in town. Latta agreed, and said that we do require a business license, and the applicant has to meet state licensing requirements. C refers to the larger facilities. Those are not a standard residential unit. Commissioners asked if halfway homes are included in this designation. Latta didn't think that they were included in the same definition. The commissioners were worried about those being automatically allowed; Latta said that he would check on that.

**Home Occupations:** No comments

**Manufactured Home on a Single-Family Lot:** Latta remarked that you can't prevent a manufactured dwelling from being located in an R-1 zone; the Planning Commission had previously stated that they didn't want them there. They are subject to reasonable regulations.

**Mobile Home and Manufactured Dwelling Parks:** Eldridge told the Planning Commission that they might want to specify that single wide manufactured homes aren't allowed in future Manufactured Dwelling parks. Our current parks have lots that are specifically designed for single wides. The Planning Commission said that they'd like to avoid that too, if possible. Latta thought that ORS 446 might cover that; we'll have to look and make sure that we are allowed to do that.

**Temporary Uses:** Latta noted that this allows a temporary use that is not longer than 45 days. They can't overtake the parking lot for an approved permit; they also can't block the only access. Thomas thought that the landscaping issue was sort of strange. Eldridge added that if they are on a parcel with a vacant business, that they might not have access to water. She remembers the Christmas tree businesses having a porta-pot set up. Latta didn't think it would be applicable in all cases; we can apply that as it is applicable. Thomas thought a vegetable stand could be present for longer than 45 days, and Kayner agreed with her. He said it could be a commercial stand. Latta said they could come to us as a type 2 review. The use is permitted in the overlying zone.

**Temporary Sales Office or Model Home:** Latta noted that this is the use of real property in the boundaries of a subdivision. It could be a model home, or it could also apply to temporary buildings, such as trailers, kiosks, and other structures.

**Temporary Buildings, Trailers, Kiosks, and Other Structures:** No comments

**Accessory Dwellings:** Latta said that these are required by the state, to be allowed wherever you allow regular homes. Reasonable standards apply to them. There is only one allowed on a residential property. The floor area can't exceed 600 sq. ft., or 40% of the size of the primary dwelling unit. Eldridge remarked that if they use/add water and sewer connections, than SDC's may apply. Our first accessory dwelling structure is tied to the homes' water and sewer system. Latta thought we could evaluate it on a case by case basis. If they are required to pay SDC's,

then they would be required to obtain a separate meter. If they are under 500 sq. ft., then we don't charge them. Thomas thought if it's under 500 sq. ft., then they can decide if they want to choose a separate water and/or sewer system or not. Latta said it doesn't necessarily need to be in the code. He could write a memo or something to the file.

**Bed and Breakfast Inns:** Latta said that these are allowed in the R-1 zone. Chairperson Culver asked if they would be required to have their garbage buffered somehow. Thomas, however, thought it should be required for the residence.

**General:** Latta said that he will answer your questions in regards to a group home and group facility, and will add in some things missing from the table. Next chapter will be overlay zones, such as Greenway provisions, safe harbor zone, riparian zones, etc. These chapters were more recently adopted by the City Council. Wetlands, and the historic district, will be brought in as a big package. Then eventually, we'll get to head to design standards.

**With no further business to discuss; the in-formal meeting adjourned at the hour of 8:46pm.**

---

**Planning Commission Chairperson**

---

**City Recorder**