

PHILOMATH PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
May 18, 2015

1
2
3
4
5 **1. CALL TO ORDER.** Commissioner Shon Heern called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in
6 the City Hall Council Chambers.

7
8 **2. ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTIONS:**

9
10 **Present:** Commissioners Shon Heern, Leroy Fenn, Gabe Callaway, Jacque Lusk,
11 and Patrick McDonald.

12
13 **Staff:** Chris Workman, City Manager; Deputy City Attorney Dan Miller, and Jim
14 Minard, Planner.

15
16 **Absent:** Commissioners John Houk and Mark Knutson.

17
18 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

19 **3.1 February 17, 2015, Minutes**

20
21 **MOTION:** Commissioner Lusk moved, Commissioner Galloway second, the
22 February 17, 2015, minutes be accepted as presented. Motion APPROVED 5-0.

23
24 **4. PUBLIC HEARING:**

25 **4.1 PC15-01; Applicant: City of Philomath; Application Type: Amendments to**
26 **PMC Chapter 18 – Zoning –** Chair Heern opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m.
27 He read the hearing rules and requested any ex parte contacts, conflicts of
28 interest, bias or site visits. Members of the Planning Commission declared no ex
29 parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias or site visits. Chair Heern announced the
30 order of testimony.

31
32 **Staff Report:** Mr. Minard reviewed the staff report, which was part of the packet
33 and is incorporated by reference, focusing on the substantive issues that were
34 proposed. The first issue was related to concerns with quality of life issues in the
35 community associated with the lack of a definition of family in the Development
36 Code. Staff had developed language to define family, boarding house, and
37 dwelling unit. The definition for family came with several caveats that could be
38 evaluated to determine if residents of a given household met the definition.

39
40 The next issue addressed staff concerns over encroachments into the yard
41 setback areas. It was suggested that all encroachments be set at no more than
42 two feet.

43
44 Inserting language relating to flag lots, particularly the length and share drives
45 was then discussed.

46
47 It was recommended that height standards for accessory structures or dwellings
48 be consistent and not to exceed 25-feet in height or the height of the primary
49 structure, whichever is less.

50
51 Commercial zone standards and setbacks were then reviewed. It was suggested
52 that multi-family units continued to be allowed subject to developing under the
53 High Density (R-3) residential standards. The reference to a maximum setback of
54 20 feet in these zones should be deleted. It was suggested that commercial zone

1 setbacks be such that a setbacks be required when abutting a residential zone, as
2 opposed to a residential use. The requirement for one of several pedestrian and
3 transit amenities was proposed to be amended to read “such as but not limited
4 to”.

5
6 Parking demands in the commercial zones was discussed. In essence it was
7 recognized that there is a surplus of on-street parking and the city was losing
8 new businesses due to the requirement to provide additional off-street parking.
9 Staff suggested a waiver for such requirement subject to new development
10 occurring within the building envelope and signing a waiver of non-remonstrance
11 to participate in a future parking district.

12
13 Lastly, a new standard for fencing and securing water features greater than 12-
14 inches deep was presented.

15
16 Chair Heern asked for comments from the audience.

17
18 Harriet Hughes provided written and oral testimony on her concerns over the
19 definitions of family and boarding houses (Supplemental Agenda Item #4.1A).

20
21 John McGee testified as to his concerns over the specific language relating to
22 commercial parking. He saw the intent as being good for business downtown, but
23 was opposed to the concept of having to sign any agreement on a yet to be
24 developed parking plan. And, while he thought he understood the term “building
25 envelope” a definition may be helpful. He also noted the need to update the code
26 terms for the Oregon Structural Specialty Code and the International Fire Code or
27 Oregon Fire Code.

28
29 Chair Heern questioned his concern over such a waiver, even with the uncertainty
30 of location or cost, given the fact that the Code required parking as part of
31 business development. City Manager Workman noted that any parking plan
32 would be developed as part of the on-going Transportation System Plan update,
33 which would likely not be completed for another year. Given this delay, and the
34 limited possibility of any major commercial development in the Central
35 Commercial District it was suggested this “non-remonstrance” language be
36 deleted.

37
38 Heern questioned if “boarding houses” would be allowed in the Single-family
39 zone. Workman noted they would not as they were seen more of as a multi-family
40 use.

41
42 Mr. Workman distributed written testimony submitted by Tim Ranney, Philomath,
43 OR, regarding metal buildings, alley access and alley parking (Supplemental
44 Agenda Item #4.1B).

45
46 There being no further testimony the public hearing was closed and the Chair
47 asked how best to proceed. Planner Minard suggested, given the proposed
48 changes, that it might be best to continue the meeting to June 15, 2015, at 7:00
49 p.m., which was accepted by the Commission by consensus.

50
51 **5. OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

52
53 **5.1 Business Park – Ron Hartz, Philomath, OR – Mr. Hartz requested the**
54 **Commission consider implementing a “Business Park” on certain industrial lands**

1 to help spur a variety of business opportunities. It was suggested that he work
2 with the staff to better determine what was being requested.

3
4 **5.2 System Development Charges – Barb Hartz, Philomath, OR** – Ms. Hartz
5 expressed concerns over the SDC's (System Development Charges) imposed by
6 the City on new development and suggested they be lowered by any means to
7 help development and the added taxes would offset some of those SDC losses.
8 City Manager Workman explained that the City was now working on two master
9 plans that would hopefully reflect lower SDCs.

10
11 **6. LAND USE FEES REVIEW:**

12
13 **6.1** City Manager Workman provided the Commission with some background on the
14 City's land use fee structure. The Commission had reviewed and recommended
15 minor increases to the fee structure in 2013, but the matter had not been
16 accepted by the City Council. He was requested the Commission input again to
17 assess how to proceed. Chair Heern moved to recommend the proposed fee
18 structure, which was seconded by Commissioner Galloway and approved 5-0.

19
20 **7. ADJOURNMENT:**

21 There being no further business Chair Heern adjourned the regular meeting at
22 8:45 p.m.

23
24 **SIGNED:**
25 Jacque Lusk, Vice-Chair

ATTEST:
Ruth Post, MMC, City Recorder