CITY OF NORTH PLAINS PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES
AUGUST 14, 2013, 7:00 P.M.
NORTH PLAINS SENIOR CENTER
31450 NW COMMERCIAL STREET

1. Chairperson King called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Chairperson King led the pledge of allegiance.

3. **ROLL CALL**
Commission: Chairperson Stewart King, Vice-Chairperson Heather LaBonte, Commissioners Jeff Low, Ethan Hagar, Doug Nunnenkamp and Daryl Olson and Ex Officio Charlynn Newton present. Commissioners Aeron Braukman excused absence.

Staff: City Manager Martha DeBry, and Account Clerk Margaret Reh present.

Audience: None in attendance.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
None forthcoming

5. **CONSENT AGENDA**
May 8, 2013, Regular Session Minute Approval. Chairman King asked the Commissioners if there were any changes to the May 8, 2013 Minutes. Hearing none, King stated the minutes would be approved as written.

Because the Planning Commission meeting was being held at a new venue than was advertised in the public hearing notice, the order of the agenda was changed. This allowed time to check Jessie Mays Community Hall to make sure no one reported there for the meeting.

6. **Comprehensive Plan Discussion:**
Chairman King asked DeBry for the Staff Report. DeBry stated that in February the Planning Commission held a work session to discuss the Comprehensive Plan. At that time it was noted that City Ordinance and policies did not always align, and some aspects of Comprehensive Plan are in need of evaluation. It has become apparent that a re-evaluation of the Comprehensive Plan needs to happen sooner than later.

DeBry is seeking feedback from the Commission for direction on drafting any changes. The Comp Plan is a guiding document which lays out the City's housing goals—it is actually a part of our Municipal Code. So we have to follow it because it is law. When staff reviews applications it has to be done in light of the Code as it is, not as we would prefer it to be.

Municipal code Section 15.02.020 Land Use Planning states "Residential: The City's goal is to achieve a mix of low density (40%), medium density (40%), and high density (20%) residential uses providing an average density of 8.4 units per acre." In general, the Comprehensive Plan strives for compact growth, and the ability to accommodate up to 4,000 residents by 2021 which could be around 1600 dwelling units.

The Commission discussed how these numbers came to be. It was clarified that the State set the 8.4 density requirement and the percentage breakdown was established in the Neighbor City Study.

At this point in time the City is on pace to have a higher density than 8.4 units per net acre. In 2012 there were 806 dwelling units in North Plains. The housing mix is about 27% low, 44% medium and 27.5% high, with few handfuls of housing units in the commercial and industrial areas—including the North Plains Senior Plaza. By 2015, if progress is made by developers to build out the Highland Court, McKay Fields and East expansion area the City will have 959 dwelling units and the mix of housing will be about 26.4% low, 40.2 medium and 33.3 high density. These percentages will likely evolve to 26.8% low, 36.5% medium and 36.6% high if the plans for the remaining parts of the East and North expansion areas are built out as proposed reaching a total of 1,438 dwelling units.

King stated when the 8.4 density was drawn up, much of the infill in the city was not done yet. We are now seeing that most of the infill has been developed at high density which has increased the density ratio.

Nunnekamp asked about what we can build on right now. What is in the city limits that can still be developed? DeBry explained what the potential could be if everything were to be developed. The property owners of the east expansion area has stated their intention to start building next Spring. We have around 100 acres that are available to us at 8.4 dwelling units per acre. We could have 917 housing units built in this available land. But just because you can build doesn't mean it will get built. Property is available to develop, but not all land owners want to develop. If there is a housing boom and money becomes available—it could happen. The comp plan deals with property that is developed and that which will be developed in the future. Comp plan does include the North expansion area and it is slated for high density development.

The Commission discussed the different aspects of the Urban Reserve and the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The UGB can expand into Urban Reserve but in order to be developed an annexation vote must pass. Annexation will come up in the next couple of years. DeBry expressed full disclosure in that she lives near to where the North Expansion would develop.

There is a new master plan that is being changed for the East expansion area. It does restore most of the large lots and we will see high density housing in the next phase. DeBry stated that what are considered large lots in the expansion area are small in comparison to the lots in the existing city. A large lot is only 5000 sf, not 7500 sf as in the existing town. It could be possible to make the minimum lot requirement to be 4000 sf. That would be more than the R2.5 and less than R5.

Nunnenkamp asked if the 8.4 is citywide or just in new development. DeBry stated it is a number that the City must meet for all land within the UGB. King stated that the city has agreed to an overall 8.4 density. But expansion area doesn't have to comply to the 8.4 if the main part of the city is meeting that requirement. The total urbanized area must be the 8.4 density. We need to comply with the requirements we agreed to.

Most zoning codes are written in a manner that encourages meeting density goals, but does not require meeting the goal. For example in 2007 the original McKay Fields subdivision map provided 27 homes on roughly 2 net acres, which is a density of 13 units per net acre. The 2013 McKay Fields subdivision map provides a density of 17 units per net acre. Currently plans for the subdivisions of Sunset Terrace I and II at the northwest corner of city are zoned R2.5. In 2005 the development was designed to be 71 homes. These maps could expire soon and a different developer could propose up to 174 units in the same space. Likewise R2.5 parcels near McKay Creek can also be developed or redevelop with the 17.4 units per net acre density resulting in another 209 homes. In theory this could push the total number of dwelling units in the City to a number in excess of 1,800, with more than 50% of the units in a high density area.

The exception is the Neighborhood Community zone which requires a density of 8.4 units per net acre. LaBonte suggested revisiting the NCZ in the east expansion area and perhaps having it rezoned to an actual residential zone. We could review Neighborhood Community ordinance and revise that. We could submit that for revision by itself without the Comp Plan and see how it flies.

The Commission discussed the process that lead to the current Comp Plan and requirements for density. King mentioned the conceptual plans that were discussed years ago that included building out to the golf course and realigning some of the existing streets. It was also explained that the Population projections were based on past average of growth—but that has changed significantly over the past 6 years.

The consensus of the group was that McKay Creek should be higher density because it is closer to commercial zones. They would like to see the land further away from the center of the town be low density.

From the recent work sessions, it is apparent there is a desire to see more low and medium density housing. Perhaps we can ease up on the density in the NZC and reduce the amount of land in the R2.5

King stated that if you take out large areas of the R2.5, you remove your opportunity for an apartment house complex. One apartment complex could change the net results.

Nunnenkamp asked how we get the developers to get on board with this direction of what the density ratio should be. Will they change with us?

DeBry asked if the Commission is leaning more toward easing up on the density in the NCZ rather than rezoning the R2.5 or do we want a combination of both? What is our true goal? Do we want to just let it go the direction it is and get denser? How do we get the density down? Do we want to speak with council about maybe going back to the State and fight a little harder to be not as dense?

King expressed he would like to see a combination of both. King stated that since the existing city is already beyond the density we could ask for less in the expansion areas. We could look at a blend of changes in the Neighborhood Community zones and the R2.5 zones. We could

modify the Comp Plan to say "Overall" and we will maintain the agreed 8.4 density, but our new developers don't have to go dense.

Another process would be to go through and refine the master plans. We have two master plan areas. King mentioned that whatever we decide in regards to the changes in the Comp Plan, we need to make sure we develop a new outreach process to communicate any potential changes with the public. If the Plan requires major modifications it may be advisable to conduct a more extensive public outreach prior to submitting information to DLCD.

If the City wants to create a trend towards larger lots, the Comprehensive Plan should be addressed sooner than later, in order to allow the modification of existing master plans for expansion areas in the North and East, and to align the zoning with acreage available for development and redevelopment.

We have to change the Comprehensive Plan before we would be able to change the code. Comprehensive plan has a different review process than a normal ordinance. If the Plan is modified to retain the overall 8.4 density per net acre, and relatively minor changes are made to the Plan, the proposed ordinance can be presented to DLCD for comment in a manner similar to other ordinances. This could be a long process—it could require at least six months to complete. We need to start working with DLCD and see how we can change the Comp Plan and still be complying.

DeBry stated DLCD just came out with their grant packages and we will be applying for one. The City will try to get a grant for Technical Assistance grant so we can hire someone to help with this process.

7. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Preliminary plat approval for a 7-Lot Single Family Residential Subdivision, File #13-030-01-SD, VAR, FPP (also known as Pacific Estates). The applicant requested a postponement of the public hearing for this application.

DeBry suggested that Chairperson King open the public hearing and then continue the public hearing until the meeting on September 11, 2013.

King opened the Public Hearing at 7:50 p.m. for File #13-030-01-SD, VAR, FPP, and called for abstentions, ex parte contacts or any conflicts of interest by any Planning Commissioner. Commissioner LaBonte stated that she lives just south of the property but would be able to continue without bias. There were no other declarations by any other Commissioner about potential conflicts of interest, personal bias or ex parte contacts. King asked if anyone in the audience wished to challenge any of the Commissioners for impartiality, and there were no audience members who wished to do so.

DeBry stated she would postpone the reading of the Staff report, and defer it to the next scheduled meeting. Since this is a public hearing and the public hearing was being continued, King asked if there was any public testimony. Since staff is deferring until the next regular scheduled meeting, King state the public hearing will be continued until September 11, 2013

and the public hearing remains open.

7. STAFF REPORT. DeBry stated she is expecting an application for development on the east property in the next couple of months.

McKay Fields is delayed somewhat. We think it will continue to move forward but it will not be DR Horton who will be moving forward.

Parks Board will be meeting for the first time on September 25, 2013. Blake will be the support to the Parks Board.

King asked if the Commissioners had any other questions or comments.

Nunnenkamp will be absent at the 09/11/13 meeting.

LaBonte asked if we had anything in our code for the naming of streets. The naming of streets must be approved by the Planning Commission. DeBry stated there are public works standards which discusses the naming standards and they must be approved by the City. There is nothing in the ordinance regarding re-naming streets. King suggested looking at naming standards while we are revisiting the Comprehensive Plan.

8. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 pm. The next regular Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 11, 2013.

Submitted by:

Margaret L Reh

Margaret L. Reh, Deputy City Recorder

Minutes Approved: 9/11/13