



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Carla Mikkelson – Chair  
Dennis Person – Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
George Grabenhorst  
Mike Long  
Rick Massey  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

**DATE:** March 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, 555 Court St. NE, Salem

Present: Stanley Birch, Carla Mikkelson, Mike Long, Rick Massey, George Grabenhorst, Dennis Person and Gary Monders

Absent: None

Chair Mikkelson called the meeting to order:

1. Work Session:

- Continued discussion on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in urban growth boundary areas.

Brandon Reich, Senior Planner, indicated this is a continued discussion on ADUs. He began going through the packet of information sent to the PC. Chair Mikkelson asked about the proposed provision for same ownership of an ADU and primary dwelling. With regard to the current proposed legislative house bills, Mr. Person asked if passed it looks like quite a bit for regulations will be left up to the County and it looks like the definition of ADU is proposed to change? Brandon replied that was correct just for this area in the ORS. Discussion followed on whether this would apply to RVs, including how many can live in an RV, size limit, lot density, impact on existing septic systems, etc. When asked, Brandon explained the intent of the legislative bills was to address need for affordable housing. Members discussed options available to small farms for additional housing, the lack of the ability for multi-generations to live on family farms, and the impact of allowing ADUs in rural areas. Discussion on septic systems continued regarding impact if a property owner added an ADU. Mr. Grabenhorst expressed concern of long-term use of RVs as they are not built with dwelling safety standards. The group discussed RV parks as the appropriate option for long-term use of RVs, how they deteriorate quickly, etc.

Brandon explained the Association of Oregon County Planning Directors discussed these legislative bills and made recommendations. He included it in the PC packet for review even though it covers just ADUs in rural areas. Chair Mikkelson added she thought the recommendations made were very good. Mr. Person asked if farmers that want family members to come and live on the farm is a driving factor in the legislative bills? Brandon explained the current regulations that do allow additional dwellings for farms making a certain income from the farm. Allowing an ADU would add another

option. Mr. Grabenhorst added the affordable housing option is one of the driving forces of these bills and to lessen homelessness. Discussion followed on the homeless issue is more a city issue and not applicable in the rural areas. Mr. Monders added there is a statement in one of the bills regarding ADUs already being lived in and making these legal. A number of members indicated use of RVs as permanent dwellings should be limited, for the most part, to RV parks. Brandon added another factor is allowing property owners to use an ADU for elderly parents. Mr. Long stated he prefers stick-built as dwellings and not using RVs as permanent dwellings.

Brandon continued that the State of Oregon Building Codes Division is considering regulations that would allow them to inspect RVs and park models, similar to dwellings. Discussion followed on “tiny homes” on wheels versus those built on foundations. Mr. Grabenhorst commented these “tiny homes” create issues with septic systems and are also not built to dwelling safety standards and discussion followed. Mr. Monders added there is a push by the industry to get these considered as manufactured homes. Brandon continued with the handout showing various ADUs, going through the pictures and discussing what makes each different and how a unit change from being considered an RV, on wheels, to an ADU when put on a foundation. Discussion followed with members giving different examples of RVs, ADUs, modular units, manufactured homes, etc.

Brandon continued with the criteria spreadsheet from the packet by explaining the issue with coming up with regulations for urban growth boundary areas, what other cities are doing, etc. He referred to the preliminary regulations the City of Salem is considering and briefly explained the list of possible standards. Chair Mikkelson replied the issue of an ADU being a rental should be discussed. She feels a unit being rented out for a year, for example, is very different from one being rented nightly. Brandon cautioned about design standards as it would, for example, be difficult for new unit to match a neighborhood built in the 1970s. Brief discussion followed and Brandon suggested specifics not be discussed at this point, waiting until some of the cities decide on any design standards.

Attached or detached? Members discussed what that means, a unit above a garage or in a basement (considered an ADU if it has a separate bathroom and kitchen), etc. Examples were given of detached garages, carports with a breezeway, etc. Brandon summarized that the PC seems to approve of the Aurora standards 1, 2 and 3. He asked about using manufactured homes in urban areas as an ADU and the members commented that might be ok as long as it was smaller than the existing home. Brandon then asked about RVs and members commented against that.

Size? Brandon explained the cities have either a maximum square footage or a percent of the existing dwelling. Mr. Grabenhorst replied he likes the Salem standard of 900 square feet and others agreed. Brandon commented a double-wide manufactured home has a minimum of 1000 square feet so that would exclude them and some jurisdictions preclude single-wide units. Discussion followed and most members preferred the 900 square foot standard.

Density? Brandon explained how density is applied to current land use regulations and this is also lot size limit. Mr. Grabenhorst commented this might be part of design standards, along with setbacks, which sets up limits. Discussion followed on how to get an ADU on a small lot.

Property owner occupied? Brandon explained either the primary dwelling or ADU is owner-occupied and went through the standards from other cities. Mr. Grabenhorst commented he liked the Keizer standard where a separate ownership cannot be created. Discussion followed on how that is different than one being owner-occupied and the issue with rentals. Brandon stated staff will come up with draft language for this regulation and find out why Salem came up with its standard.

Number of ADUs? Brandon stated staff would recommend just one. If it would work very well, a change can be made later. Mr. Long added one probably won't be an issue but adding two could create problems with SDCs, for example. The general consensus was to allow just one.

When asked for a preference on the next step, the PC discussed continuing to another meeting. A subdivision application has been scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>, and the members agreed to continue discussion after the subdivision hearing on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

2. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Carla Mikkelson – Chair  
Dennis Person – Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
George Grabenhorst  
Mike Long  
Rick Massey  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

**DATE:** March 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, 555 Court St. NE, Salem

Present: Stanley Birch, Carla Mikkelson, Mike Long, Rick Massey, George Grabenhorst, Dennis Person and Gary Monders

Absent: None

Chair Mikkelson called the meeting to order:

1. Work Session:

- Continued discussion on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in urban growth boundary areas.

Brandon Reich, Senior Planner, indicated this is a continued discussion on ADUs. He began going through the packet of information sent to the PC. Chair Mikkelson asked about the proposed provision for same ownership of an ADU and primary dwelling. With regard to the current proposed legislative house bills, Mr. Person asked if passed it looks like quite a bit for regulations will be left up to the County and it looks like the definition of ADU is proposed to change? Brandon replied that was correct just for this area in the ORS. Discussion followed on whether this would apply to RVs, including how many can live in an RV, size limit, lot density, impact on existing septic systems, etc. When asked, Brandon explained the intent of the legislative bills was to address need for affordable housing. Members discussed options available to small farms for additional housing, the lack of the ability for multi-generations to live on family farms, and the impact of allowing ADUs in rural areas. Discussion on septic systems continued regarding impact if a property owner added an ADU. Mr. Grabenhorst expressed concern of long-term use of RVs as they are not built with dwelling safety standards. The group discussed RV parks as the appropriate option for long-term use of RVs, how they deteriorate quickly, etc.

Brandon explained the Association of Oregon County Planning Directors discussed these legislative bills and made recommendations. He included it in the PC packet for review even though it covers just ADUs in rural areas. Chair Mikkelson added she thought the recommendations made were very good. Mr. Person asked if farmers that want family members to come and live on the farm is a driving factor in the legislative bills? Brandon explained the current regulations that do allow additional dwellings for farms making a certain income from the farm. Allowing an ADU would add another

option. Mr. Grabenhorst added the affordable housing option is one of the driving forces of these bills and to lessen homelessness. Discussion followed on the homeless issue is more a city issue and not applicable in the rural areas. Mr. Monders added there is a statement in one of the bills regarding ADUs already being lived in and making these legal. A number of members indicated use of RVs as permanent dwellings should be limited, for the most part, to RV parks. Brandon added another factor is allowing property owners to use an ADU for elderly parents. Mr. Long stated he prefers stick-built as dwellings and not using RVs as permanent dwellings.

Brandon continued that the State of Oregon Building Codes Division is considering regulations that would allow them to inspect RVs and park models, similar to dwellings. Discussion followed on “tiny homes” on wheels versus those built on foundations. Mr. Grabenhorst commented these “tiny homes” create issues with septic systems and are also not built to dwelling safety standards and discussion followed. Mr. Monders added there is a push by the industry to get these considered as manufactured homes. Brandon continued with the handout showing various ADUs, going through the pictures and discussing what makes each different and how a unit change from being considered an RV, on wheels, to an ADU when put on a foundation. Discussion followed with members giving different examples of RVs, ADUs, modular units, manufactured homes, etc.

Brandon continued with the criteria spreadsheet from the packet by explaining the issue with coming up with regulations for urban growth boundary areas, what other cities are doing, etc. He referred to the preliminary regulations the City of Salem is considering and briefly explained the list of possible standards. Chair Mikkelson replied the issue of an ADU being a rental should be discussed. She feels a unit being rented out for a year, for example, is very different from one being rented nightly. Brandon cautioned about design standards as it would, for example, be difficult for new unit to match a neighborhood built in the 1970s. Brief discussion followed and Brandon suggested specifics not be discussed at this point, waiting until some of the cities decide on any design standards.

Attached or detached? Members discussed what that means, a unit above a garage or in a basement (considered an ADU if it has a separate bathroom and kitchen), etc. Examples were given of detached garages, carports with a breezeway, etc. Brandon summarized that the PC seems to approve of the Aurora standards 1, 2 and 3. He asked about using manufactured homes in urban areas as an ADU and the members commented that might be ok as long as it was smaller than the existing home. Brandon then asked about RVs and members commented against that.

Size? Brandon explained the cities have either a maximum square footage or a percent of the existing dwelling. Mr. Grabenhorst replied he likes the Salem standard of 900 square feet and others agreed. Brandon commented a double-wide manufactured home has a minimum of 1000 square feet so that would exclude them and some jurisdictions preclude single-wide units. Discussion followed and most members preferred the 900 square foot standard.

Density? Brandon explained how density is applied to current land use regulations and this is also lot size limit. Mr. Grabenhorst commented this might be part of design standards, along with setbacks, which sets up limits. Discussion followed on how to get an ADU on a small lot.

Property owner occupied? Brandon explained either the primary dwelling or ADU is owner-occupied and went through the standards from other cities. Mr. Grabenhorst commented he liked the Keizer standard where a separate ownership cannot be created. Discussion followed on how that is different than one being owner-occupied and the issue with rentals. Brandon stated staff will come up with draft language for this regulation and find out why Salem came up with its standard.

Number of ADUs? Brandon stated staff would recommend just one. If it would work very well, a change can be made later. Mr. Long added one probably won't be an issue but adding two could create problems with SDCs, for example. The general consensus was to allow just one.

When asked for a preference on the next step, the PC discussed continuing to another meeting. A subdivision application has been scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>, and the members agreed to continue discussion after the subdivision hearing on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

2. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Carla Mikkelson – Chair  
Dennis Person – Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
George Grabenhorst  
Mike Long  
Rick Massey  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

**DATE:** March 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, 555 Court St. NE, Salem

Present: Stanley Birch, Carla Mikkelson, Mike Long, Rick Massey, George Grabenhorst, Dennis Person and Gary Monders

Absent: None

Chair Mikkelson called the meeting to order:

1. Work Session:

- Continued discussion on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in urban growth boundary areas.

Brandon Reich, Senior Planner, indicated this is a continued discussion on ADUs. He began going through the packet of information sent to the PC. Chair Mikkelson asked about the proposed provision for same ownership of an ADU and primary dwelling. With regard to the current proposed legislative house bills, Mr. Person asked if passed it looks like quite a bit for regulations will be left up to the County and it looks like the definition of ADU is proposed to change? Brandon replied that was correct just for this area in the ORS. Discussion followed on whether this would apply to RVs, including how many can live in an RV, size limit, lot density, impact on existing septic systems, etc. When asked, Brandon explained the intent of the legislative bills was to address need for affordable housing. Members discussed options available to small farms for additional housing, the lack of the ability for multi-generations to live on family farms, and the impact of allowing ADUs in rural areas. Discussion on septic systems continued regarding impact if a property owner added an ADU. Mr. Grabenhorst expressed concern of long-term use of RVs as they are not built with dwelling safety standards. The group discussed RV parks as the appropriate option for long-term use of RVs, how they deteriorate quickly, etc.

Brandon explained the Association of Oregon County Planning Directors discussed these legislative bills and made recommendations. He included it in the PC packet for review even though it covers just ADUs in rural areas. Chair Mikkelson added she thought the recommendations made were very good. Mr. Person asked if farmers that want family members to come and live on the farm is a driving factor in the legislative bills? Brandon explained the current regulations that do allow additional dwellings for farms making a certain income from the farm. Allowing an ADU would add another

option. Mr. Grabenhorst added the affordable housing option is one of the driving forces of these bills and to lessen homelessness. Discussion followed on the homeless issue is more a city issue and not applicable in the rural areas. Mr. Monders added there is a statement in one of the bills regarding ADUs already being lived in and making these legal. A number of members indicated use of RVs as permanent dwellings should be limited, for the most part, to RV parks. Brandon added another factor is allowing property owners to use an ADU for elderly parents. Mr. Long stated he prefers stick-built as dwellings and not using RVs as permanent dwellings.

Brandon continued that the State of Oregon Building Codes Division is considering regulations that would allow them to inspect RVs and park models, similar to dwellings. Discussion followed on “tiny homes” on wheels versus those built on foundations. Mr. Grabenhorst commented these “tiny homes” create issues with septic systems and are also not built to dwelling safety standards and discussion followed. Mr. Monders added there is a push by the industry to get these considered as manufactured homes. Brandon continued with the handout showing various ADUs, going through the pictures and discussing what makes each different and how a unit change from being considered an RV, on wheels, to an ADU when put on a foundation. Discussion followed with members giving different examples of RVs, ADUs, modular units, manufactured homes, etc.

Brandon continued with the criteria spreadsheet from the packet by explaining the issue with coming up with regulations for urban growth boundary areas, what other cities are doing, etc. He referred to the preliminary regulations the City of Salem is considering and briefly explained the list of possible standards. Chair Mikkelson replied the issue of an ADU being a rental should be discussed. She feels a unit being rented out for a year, for example, is very different from one being rented nightly. Brandon cautioned about design standards as it would, for example, be difficult for new unit to match a neighborhood built in the 1970s. Brief discussion followed and Brandon suggested specifics not be discussed at this point, waiting until some of the cities decide on any design standards.

Attached or detached? Members discussed what that means, a unit above a garage or in a basement (considered an ADU if it has a separate bathroom and kitchen), etc. Examples were given of detached garages, carports with a breezeway, etc. Brandon summarized that the PC seems to approve of the Aurora standards 1, 2 and 3. He asked about using manufactured homes in urban areas as an ADU and the members commented that might be ok as long as it was smaller than the existing home. Brandon then asked about RVs and members commented against that.

Size? Brandon explained the cities have either a maximum square footage or a percent of the existing dwelling. Mr. Grabenhorst replied he likes the Salem standard of 900 square feet and others agreed. Brandon commented a double-wide manufactured home has a minimum of 1000 square feet so that would exclude them and some jurisdictions preclude single-wide units. Discussion followed and most members preferred the 900 square foot standard.

Density? Brandon explained how density is applied to current land use regulations and this is also lot size limit. Mr. Grabenhorst commented this might be part of design standards, along with setbacks, which sets up limits. Discussion followed on how to get an ADU on a small lot.

Property owner occupied? Brandon explained either the primary dwelling or ADU is owner-occupied and went through the standards from other cities. Mr. Grabenhorst commented he liked the Keizer standard where a separate ownership cannot be created. Discussion followed on how that is different than one being owner-occupied and the issue with rentals. Brandon stated staff will come up with draft language for this regulation and find out why Salem came up with its standard.

Number of ADUs? Brandon stated staff would recommend just one. If it would work very well, a change can be made later. Mr. Long added one probably won't be an issue but adding two could create problems with SDCs, for example. The general consensus was to allow just one.

When asked for a preference on the next step, the PC discussed continuing to another meeting. A subdivision application has been scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>, and the members agreed to continue discussion after the subdivision hearing on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

2. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Carla Mikkelson – Chair  
Dennis Person – Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
George Grabenhorst  
Mike Long  
Rick Massey  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

**DATE:** March 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, 555 Court St. NE, Salem

Present: Stanley Birch, Carla Mikkelson, Mike Long, Rick Massey, George Grabenhorst, Dennis Person and Gary Monders

Absent: None

Chair Mikkelson called the meeting to order:

1. Work Session:

- Continued discussion on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in urban growth boundary areas.

Brandon Reich, Senior Planner, indicated this is a continued discussion on ADUs. He began going through the packet of information sent to the PC. Chair Mikkelson asked about the proposed provision for same ownership of an ADU and primary dwelling. With regard to the current proposed legislative house bills, Mr. Person asked if passed it looks like quite a bit for regulations will be left up to the County and it looks like the definition of ADU is proposed to change? Brandon replied that was correct just for this area in the ORS. Discussion followed on whether this would apply to RVs, including how many can live in an RV, size limit, lot density, impact on existing septic systems, etc. When asked, Brandon explained the intent of the legislative bills was to address need for affordable housing. Members discussed options available to small farms for additional housing, the lack of the ability for multi-generations to live on family farms, and the impact of allowing ADUs in rural areas. Discussion on septic systems continued regarding impact if a property owner added an ADU. Mr. Grabenhorst expressed concern of long-term use of RVs as they are not built with dwelling safety standards. The group discussed RV parks as the appropriate option for long-term use of RVs, how they deteriorate quickly, etc.

Brandon explained the Association of Oregon County Planning Directors discussed these legislative bills and made recommendations. He included it in the PC packet for review even though it covers just ADUs in rural areas. Chair Mikkelson added she thought the recommendations made were very good. Mr. Person asked if farmers that want family members to come and live on the farm is a driving factor in the legislative bills? Brandon explained the current regulations that do allow additional dwellings for farms making a certain income from the farm. Allowing an ADU would add another

option. Mr. Grabenhorst added the affordable housing option is one of the driving forces of these bills and to lessen homelessness. Discussion followed on the homeless issue is more a city issue and not applicable in the rural areas. Mr. Monders added there is a statement in one of the bills regarding ADUs already being lived in and making these legal. A number of members indicated use of RVs as permanent dwellings should be limited, for the most part, to RV parks. Brandon added another factor is allowing property owners to use an ADU for elderly parents. Mr. Long stated he prefers stick-built as dwellings and not using RVs as permanent dwellings.

Brandon continued that the State of Oregon Building Codes Division is considering regulations that would allow them to inspect RVs and park models, similar to dwellings. Discussion followed on “tiny homes” on wheels versus those built on foundations. Mr. Grabenhorst commented these “tiny homes” create issues with septic systems and are also not built to dwelling safety standards and discussion followed. Mr. Monders added there is a push by the industry to get these considered as manufactured homes. Brandon continued with the handout showing various ADUs, going through the pictures and discussing what makes each different and how a unit change from being considered an RV, on wheels, to an ADU when put on a foundation. Discussion followed with members giving different examples of RVs, ADUs, modular units, manufactured homes, etc.

Brandon continued with the criteria spreadsheet from the packet by explaining the issue with coming up with regulations for urban growth boundary areas, what other cities are doing, etc. He referred to the preliminary regulations the City of Salem is considering and briefly explained the list of possible standards. Chair Mikkelson replied the issue of an ADU being a rental should be discussed. She feels a unit being rented out for a year, for example, is very different from one being rented nightly. Brandon cautioned about design standards as it would, for example, be difficult for new unit to match a neighborhood built in the 1970s. Brief discussion followed and Brandon suggested specifics not be discussed at this point, waiting until some of the cities decide on any design standards.

Attached or detached? Members discussed what that means, a unit above a garage or in a basement (considered an ADU if it has a separate bathroom and kitchen), etc. Examples were given of detached garages, carports with a breezeway, etc. Brandon summarized that the PC seems to approve of the Aurora standards 1, 2 and 3. He asked about using manufactured homes in urban areas as an ADU and the members commented that might be ok as long as it was smaller than the existing home. Brandon then asked about RVs and members commented against that.

Size? Brandon explained the cities have either a maximum square footage or a percent of the existing dwelling. Mr. Grabenhorst replied he likes the Salem standard of 900 square feet and others agreed. Brandon commented a double-wide manufactured home has a minimum of 1000 square feet so that would exclude them and some jurisdictions preclude single-wide units. Discussion followed and most members preferred the 900 square foot standard.

Density? Brandon explained how density is applied to current land use regulations and this is also lot size limit. Mr. Grabenhorst commented this might be part of design standards, along with setbacks, which sets up limits. Discussion followed on how to get an ADU on a small lot.

Property owner occupied? Brandon explained either the primary dwelling or ADU is owner-occupied and went through the standards from other cities. Mr. Grabenhorst commented he liked the Keizer standard where a separate ownership cannot be created. Discussion followed on how that is different than one being owner-occupied and the issue with rentals. Brandon stated staff will come up with draft language for this regulation and find out why Salem came up with its standard.

Number of ADUs? Brandon stated staff would recommend just one. If it would work very well, a change can be made later. Mr. Long added one probably won't be an issue but adding two could create problems with SDCs, for example. The general consensus was to allow just one.

When asked for a preference on the next step, the PC discussed continuing to another meeting. A subdivision application has been scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>, and the members agreed to continue discussion after the subdivision hearing on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

2. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Carla Mikkelson – Chair  
Dennis Person – Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
George Grabenhorst  
Mike Long  
Rick Massey  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

**DATE:** March 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, 555 Court St. NE, Salem

Present: Stanley Birch, Carla Mikkelson, Mike Long, Rick Massey, George Grabenhorst, Dennis Person and Gary Monders

Absent: None

Chair Mikkelson called the meeting to order:

1. Work Session:

- Continued discussion on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in urban growth boundary areas.

Brandon Reich, Senior Planner, indicated this is a continued discussion on ADUs. He began going through the packet of information sent to the PC. Chair Mikkelson asked about the proposed provision for same ownership of an ADU and primary dwelling. With regard to the current proposed legislative house bills, Mr. Person asked if passed it looks like quite a bit for regulations will be left up to the County and it looks like the definition of ADU is proposed to change? Brandon replied that was correct just for this area in the ORS. Discussion followed on whether this would apply to RVs, including how many can live in an RV, size limit, lot density, impact on existing septic systems, etc. When asked, Brandon explained the intent of the legislative bills was to address need for affordable housing. Members discussed options available to small farms for additional housing, the lack of the ability for multi-generations to live on family farms, and the impact of allowing ADUs in rural areas. Discussion on septic systems continued regarding impact if a property owner added an ADU. Mr. Grabenhorst expressed concern of long-term use of RVs as they are not built with dwelling safety standards. The group discussed RV parks as the appropriate option for long-term use of RVs, how they deteriorate quickly, etc.

Brandon explained the Association of Oregon County Planning Directors discussed these legislative bills and made recommendations. He included it in the PC packet for review even though it covers just ADUs in rural areas. Chair Mikkelson added she thought the recommendations made were very good. Mr. Person asked if farmers that want family members to come and live on the farm is a driving factor in the legislative bills? Brandon explained the current regulations that do allow additional dwellings for farms making a certain income from the farm. Allowing an ADU would add another

option. Mr. Grabenhorst added the affordable housing option is one of the driving forces of these bills and to lessen homelessness. Discussion followed on the homeless issue is more a city issue and not applicable in the rural areas. Mr. Monders added there is a statement in one of the bills regarding ADUs already being lived in and making these legal. A number of members indicated use of RVs as permanent dwellings should be limited, for the most part, to RV parks. Brandon added another factor is allowing property owners to use an ADU for elderly parents. Mr. Long stated he prefers stick-built as dwellings and not using RVs as permanent dwellings.

Brandon continued that the State of Oregon Building Codes Division is considering regulations that would allow them to inspect RVs and park models, similar to dwellings. Discussion followed on “tiny homes” on wheels versus those built on foundations. Mr. Grabenhorst commented these “tiny homes” create issues with septic systems and are also not built to dwelling safety standards and discussion followed. Mr. Monders added there is a push by the industry to get these considered as manufactured homes. Brandon continued with the handout showing various ADUs, going through the pictures and discussing what makes each different and how a unit change from being considered an RV, on wheels, to an ADU when put on a foundation. Discussion followed with members giving different examples of RVs, ADUs, modular units, manufactured homes, etc.

Brandon continued with the criteria spreadsheet from the packet by explaining the issue with coming up with regulations for urban growth boundary areas, what other cities are doing, etc. He referred to the preliminary regulations the City of Salem is considering and briefly explained the list of possible standards. Chair Mikkelsen replied the issue of an ADU being a rental should be discussed. She feels a unit being rented out for a year, for example, is very different from one being rented nightly. Brandon cautioned about design standards as it would, for example, be difficult for new unit to match a neighborhood built in the 1970s. Brief discussion followed and Brandon suggested specifics not be discussed at this point, waiting until some of the cities decide on any design standards.

Attached or detached? Members discussed what that means, a unit above a garage or in a basement (considered an ADU if it has a separate bathroom and kitchen), etc. Examples were given of detached garages, carports with a breezeway, etc. Brandon summarized that the PC seems to approve of the Aurora standards 1, 2 and 3. He asked about using manufactured homes in urban areas as an ADU and the members commented that might be ok as long as it was smaller than the existing home. Brandon then asked about RVs and members commented against that.

Size? Brandon explained the cities have either a maximum square footage or a percent of the existing dwelling. Mr. Grabenhorst replied he likes the Salem standard of 900 square feet and others agreed. Brandon commented a double-wide manufactured home has a minimum of 1000 square feet so that would exclude them and some jurisdictions preclude single-wide units. Discussion followed and most members preferred the 900 square foot standard.

Density? Brandon explained how density is applied to current land use regulations and this is also lot size limit. Mr. Grabenhorst commented this might be part of design standards, along with setbacks, which sets up limits. Discussion followed on how to get an ADU on a small lot.

Property owner occupied? Brandon explained either the primary dwelling or ADU is owner-occupied and went through the standards from other cities. Mr. Grabenhorst commented he liked the Keizer standard where a separate ownership cannot be created. Discussion followed on how that is different than one being owner-occupied and the issue with rentals. Brandon stated staff will come up with draft language for this regulation and find out why Salem came up with its standard.

Number of ADUs? Brandon stated staff would recommend just one. If it would work very well, a change can be made later. Mr. Long added one probably won't be an issue but adding two could create problems with SDCs, for example. The general consensus was to allow just one.

When asked for a preference on the next step, the PC discussed continuing to another meeting. A subdivision application has been scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>, and the members agreed to continue discussion after the subdivision hearing on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

2. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



# ***Marion County***

## **OREGON**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Carla Mikkelson – Chair  
Dennis Person – Vice Chair  
Stanley Birch  
George Grabenhorst  
Mike Long  
Rick Massey  
Gary Monders  
(vacant)  
(vacant)

**DATE:** March 14, 2017  
**TIME:** 6:30 p.m.  
**PLACE:** Senator Hearing Room, 555 Court St. NE, Salem

Present: Stanley Birch, Carla Mikkelson, Mike Long, Rick Massey, George Grabenhorst, Dennis Person and Gary Monders

Absent: None

Chair Mikkelson called the meeting to order:

1. Work Session:

- Continued discussion on accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in urban growth boundary areas.

Brandon Reich, Senior Planner, indicated this is a continued discussion on ADUs. He began going through the packet of information sent to the PC. Chair Mikkelson asked about the proposed provision for same ownership of an ADU and primary dwelling. With regard to the current proposed legislative house bills, Mr. Person asked if passed it looks like quite a bit for regulations will be left up to the County and it looks like the definition of ADU is proposed to change? Brandon replied that was correct just for this area in the ORS. Discussion followed on whether this would apply to RVs, including how many can live in an RV, size limit, lot density, impact on existing septic systems, etc. When asked, Brandon explained the intent of the legislative bills was to address need for affordable housing. Members discussed options available to small farms for additional housing, the lack of the ability for multi-generations to live on family farms, and the impact of allowing ADUs in rural areas. Discussion on septic systems continued regarding impact if a property owner added an ADU. Mr. Grabenhorst expressed concern of long-term use of RVs as they are not built with dwelling safety standards. The group discussed RV parks as the appropriate option for long-term use of RVs, how they deteriorate quickly, etc.

Brandon explained the Association of Oregon County Planning Directors discussed these legislative bills and made recommendations. He included it in the PC packet for review even though it covers just ADUs in rural areas. Chair Mikkelson added she thought the recommendations made were very good. Mr. Person asked if farmers that want family members to come and live on the farm is a driving factor in the legislative bills? Brandon explained the current regulations that do allow additional dwellings for farms making a certain income from the farm. Allowing an ADU would add another

option. Mr. Grabenhorst added the affordable housing option is one of the driving forces of these bills and to lessen homelessness. Discussion followed on the homeless issue is more a city issue and not applicable in the rural areas. Mr. Monders added there is a statement in one of the bills regarding ADUs already being lived in and making these legal. A number of members indicated use of RVs as permanent dwellings should be limited, for the most part, to RV parks. Brandon added another factor is allowing property owners to use an ADU for elderly parents. Mr. Long stated he prefers stick-built as dwellings and not using RVs as permanent dwellings.

Brandon continued that the State of Oregon Building Codes Division is considering regulations that would allow them to inspect RVs and park models, similar to dwellings. Discussion followed on “tiny homes” on wheels versus those built on foundations. Mr. Grabenhorst commented these “tiny homes” create issues with septic systems and are also not built to dwelling safety standards and discussion followed. Mr. Monders added there is a push by the industry to get these considered as manufactured homes. Brandon continued with the handout showing various ADUs, going through the pictures and discussing what makes each different and how a unit change from being considered an RV, on wheels, to an ADU when put on a foundation. Discussion followed with members giving different examples of RVs, ADUs, modular units, manufactured homes, etc.

Brandon continued with the criteria spreadsheet from the packet by explaining the issue with coming up with regulations for urban growth boundary areas, what other cities are doing, etc. He referred to the preliminary regulations the City of Salem is considering and briefly explained the list of possible standards. Chair Mikkelson replied the issue of an ADU being a rental should be discussed. She feels a unit being rented out for a year, for example, is very different from one being rented nightly. Brandon cautioned about design standards as it would, for example, be difficult for new unit to match a neighborhood built in the 1970s. Brief discussion followed and Brandon suggested specifics not be discussed at this point, waiting until some of the cities decide on any design standards.

Attached or detached? Members discussed what that means, a unit above a garage or in a basement (considered an ADU if it has a separate bathroom and kitchen), etc. Examples were given of detached garages, carports with a breezeway, etc. Brandon summarized that the PC seems to approve of the Aurora standards 1, 2 and 3. He asked about using manufactured homes in urban areas as an ADU and the members commented that might be ok as long as it was smaller than the existing home. Brandon then asked about RVs and members commented against that.

Size? Brandon explained the cities have either a maximum square footage or a percent of the existing dwelling. Mr. Grabenhorst replied he likes the Salem standard of 900 square feet and others agreed. Brandon commented a double-wide manufactured home has a minimum of 1000 square feet so that would exclude them and some jurisdictions preclude single-wide units. Discussion followed and most members preferred the 900 square foot standard.

Density? Brandon explained how density is applied to current land use regulations and this is also lot size limit. Mr. Grabenhorst commented this might be part of design standards, along with setbacks, which sets up limits. Discussion followed on how to get an ADU on a small lot.

Property owner occupied? Brandon explained either the primary dwelling or ADU is owner-occupied and went through the standards from other cities. Mr. Grabenhorst commented he liked the Keizer standard where a separate ownership cannot be created. Discussion followed on how that is different than one being owner-occupied and the issue with rentals. Brandon stated staff will come up with draft language for this regulation and find out why Salem came up with its standard.

Number of ADUs? Brandon stated staff would recommend just one. If it would work very well, a change can be made later. Mr. Long added one probably won't be an issue but adding two could create problems with SDCs, for example. The general consensus was to allow just one.

When asked for a preference on the next step, the PC discussed continuing to another meeting. A subdivision application has been scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>, and the members agreed to continue discussion after the subdivision hearing on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

2. Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.