



Marion County OREGON

PLANNING COMMISSION

PLANNING COMMISSION

George Grabenhorst - Chair
Mike Fischer - Vice Chair
Stanley Birch
Ryan Evenson
Mike Long
Carla Mikkelson
Gary Monders
Bill Sanders, Jr.

AGENDA

DATE: August 18, 2009

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

PLACE: Senator Hearing Room, Courthouse Square Bldg.

Present: Planning Commission members Long, Fischer, Birch, Monders, Evenson, Sanders, Shrock, and Mikkelson

Absent: Planning Commission member Grabenhorst

1. Introduction of new member. Vice-Chair Fischer asked the group to introduce themselves to the new member, Mike Shrock.
2. Review Updated Proposed 2030 Population Forecast Information

Brandon Reich, Associate Planner, explained that after the close of the Planning Commission's hearing of June 16, 2009, staff worked with the cities of Salem, Keizer, Woodburn, Silverton and Stayton regarding comments from DLCDC. The comments pertained to the use of ranges for forecast and growth numbers. After discussions with Woodburn, Silverton and Stayton, these cities agreed with the proposed forecast. Mr. Reich continued that a meeting was also held with Salem, Keizer and Polk County and agreement was reached to use a single urban growth boundary number, as requested by DLCDC. A decision was made to apportion individual numbers for Salem and Keizer at a later date when either city begins comprehensive planning efforts that require a forecast. Ms. Mikkelson asked about the numbers for Woodburn and Silverton and Brandon responded Silverton's went a bit higher. Mr. Monders asked if only Salem and Keizer remain and Brandon indicated that was correct. He continued that resolution may take a few months but there is no deadline and future discussions will include the level of growth, facility needs, etc. There being no further questions, and based on the need for other cities to be able to move forward with planning projects, Mr. Monders made a motion to recommend the Board adopt the 2030 Population Forecast as outlined in the staff 8/18/09 memo. The motion was seconded and passed, unanimously.

3. Work Session on Proposed Amendments to the County Urban Zoning Ordinance

Joe Fennimore, Principal Planner, provided background on the need to have a major update to the UZO, which has not been done since it was adopted in 1990. He indicated since that date there have been new laws passed, housekeeping issues such as typographical errors, changes in state law, court cases setting precedent, requests from other agencies for changes in regulations, etc. that need to be addressed. Mr. Fennimore continued that there is also a desire to more closely match the City of Salem code as much of the County's urban growth area is adjacent to Salem. Changes were specifically made to setback requirements, zones were combined for simplicity and to avoid duplication, and a section on Administrative Reviews were added to match the Rural Zoning Ordinance. He indicated staff is in agreement with all of the proposed changes except the addition of a recycling standards section, added at the request of Public Works Environmental Services. Mr. Fennimore concluded by saying the Planning Commission has options, after the review is completed, to hold a public hearing or simply make recommendations to the Board but the Board is required by state law to hold a public hearing.

Mr. Fennimore then began a page-by-page review of the UZO, highlighting sections with significant changes:

Chapter 1: no questions were asked and no comments made by members.

Chapter 2: discussion was held on not using the term "street" and the definition of flag lot.

Chapter 3: similar changes as in previous chapters.

Chapter 4: discussion on exclusion of single family dwelling wording.

Chapter 5: changes clarified uses.

Chapter 6: uses added; discussion on lodging rooms and mixed use buildings; PC members asked about potentially allowing mixed uses in the CR zone and Lester Sasaki, Principal Planner, explained Salem allows it through overlay zones. Mike Fischer asked staff to include it as an option under a conditional use in CR and CG zones.

Chapter 7: same changes as Chapter 6; no comments.

Chapter 8: minor changes and discussion on only a bit of certain zoning near Stayton; no comments.

Chapter 9: the group discussed some of the setback changes.

Chapter 10: same changes as previous chapters; no comments.

Chapter 11: same changes as previous chapters; no comments.

Chapter 12: same changes as previous chapters; no comments.

Chapter 13: Mr. Fennimore explained the difference between the UT and UD zones and the combination with the previous UTF zone and went through the changes. A PC member asked about the 80 foot regulation in section 13.31 and Joe to check, as he was unsure why 80 was chosen.

Chapter 14: reviewed but no comments made.

Chapter 15: group discussed the automatic rezoning to RS and setback changes.

Chapter 16: Mr. Fennimore provided some historical background on this chapter and changes to setbacks.

Chapter 19: Mr. Fennimore explained these changes brings the standards to match the rural code, reviewed the modeling done after the 1996 floods, and some changes are consistent with FEMA standards.

Chapter 20: Mr. Fennimore explained most of the changes in this chapter are from state regulations.

Chapter 21: minor changes; no comments.

Chapter 22: Mr. Fennimore explained the LUO zone purpose; only minor changes; no comments.

Chapter 24: Mr. Fennimore explained the purpose of the zone, the reporting requirements, discussion on licensing requirements.

Chapter 25: Mr. Fennimore explained the purpose of this zone, one PC member found a typo, and the group reviewed the guest facility. Members asked about the difference between these regulations and the definition. The PC indicated, as a group, they were ok with keeping the standards and/or changing the definition but the two must match. Mr. Fennimore indicated he will find out why the change to the standards was made to the rural code. The group also discussed addressing and parking trucks on residential property.

4. Adjournment.

There being no further questions or comments the Vice-Chair set the next meeting for September 1st to continue review of the draft amendments to the Urban Zoning Ordinance. The meeting was adjourned.