

**CITY OF SILVERTON
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

6:00 P.M.

AUGUST 11, 2020

The Planning Commission of the City of Silverton met at the Silverton Community Center and through the virtual meeting platform Zoom on August 11, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. with Chairman Flowers presiding.

I. ROLL CALL:

Present	Absent	
<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	Chairman Clay Flowers
<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	Vice-Chairman Rich Piaskowski
<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	Morry Jones
<u> </u>	<u>Excused</u>	Chris Mayou
<u> </u>	<u>Excused</u>	Tasha Huebner
<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	Peter Matzka
<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	Ammon Benedict

STAFF PRESENT:

Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu and Planning and Permit Assistant, Kate Schlee.

II. AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Case: Silverton Housing Needs Analysis

Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu introduced the purpose of the meeting and the members agreed on a process for reviewing the Housing Needs Analysis and Housing Strategy documents in order to make a recommendation to the City Council.

Action G.1: All members agreed on implementing now because that is what is currently taking place.

Objective 1.1a: All members agreed on waiting until a later date to change zoning. Commissioner Benedict emphasized that when he states “do later”, he really means evaluate later and then make a decision.

Objective 1.1b:
Chairman Flowers pointed out that this objective should have been 1.1a because it is the leg-work before re-zoning could occur.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this objective should be implemented now because this is step

one before re-zoning.

Commissioner Benedict stated that he is very cautious about re-zoning and doesn't want the public to be caught off guard by re-zoning.

Commissioner Piaskowski agreed that this should be implemented now so that the criteria for changing zoning is developed when the topic needs to be decided.

Commissioner Jones agreed that this should be implemented now.

Chairman Flowers agreed with the other members that the criteria needs to be established prior to Objective 1.1a being done, but that it is a matter of when and he doesn't think that it will be done this year.

Commissioner Piaskowski requested that Director Gottgetreu make a list of items that the members identify as "do later", and include a recommendation of when the items would be reviewed again. Director Gottgetreu agreed.

Objective 1.2a:

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks this should be implemented and evaluated now so that population infill can be addressed.

Commissioner Jones stated that this objective scares him, but that he thinks it needs to be evaluated because things change. He later agreed that this objective could be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka does not disagree with evaluating the objective, but that he is against smaller lot sizes.

Commissioner Benedict stated that he was all for this until House Bill 2001. At this point, he agrees that it could be kept as an option.

Chairman Flowers stated that he thinks this should be kept as an option.

Objective 1.2b:

Commissioner Matzka stated that if he were to vote he would say "not consider", but he is willing to keep it as an option.

Commissioner Benedict stated that he is adamantly opposed to even evaluating this option. His reasoning was that when you start removing parking, you end up like Portland and that the items that get evaluated need to be prioritized.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he as an implement now because these are opportunities to work within the city now by looking at available properties instead of having to expand or give up open spaces. By evaluating height limitations and density could allow for using space differently.

Commissioner Jones stated that he feels the opposite of Commissioner Piaskowski and does not think this should be considered.

Chairman Flowers asked Director Gottgetreu what building height limitation means. Director Gottgetreu explained that instead of having maximum density, that parameters be put in place and stating that the developer can fit as many units in the building as possible while remaining within the parameters.

Chairman Flowers stated that he has been swayed to select, do not consider.

Commissioner Benedict and Chairman Flowers added comments about parking.

Objective 1.2.c:

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks this should be implemented now. He does not see the point of planter strips

Commissioner Matzka stated that he selected, not consider because he didn't like it as a broad evaluation, but he changed his mind to implement now.

Commissioner Benedict agreed with implement now.

Chairman Flowers stated that there needs to be a work-load balance and he thinks this should be, keep as an option.

Objective 1.2.d:

Commissioner Matzka stated to keep as an option even though he does not necessarily like the idea.

Commissioner Benedict agreed with Commissioner Matzka and stated to keep as an option.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he is okay with implementing now because in some situations it could be useful.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks this should be implemented now. He does not see the point of planter strips.

Chairman Flowers stated that he thinks this should be, do later.

Objective 1.3.a: All members agreed on waiting until a later date to do complete this objective.

Objective 1.3.b: All members agreed on implementing this objective now. All members acknowledged and agreed that the decision for this objective does not fall to the Planning Commission.

Objective 1.4.a: All members agreed on implementing this objective now.

Director Gottgetreu explained that he currently updates the GIS system based on permits so that there is up to date information on buildable lots.

The members and Director Gottgetreu further discussed Director Gottgetreu presenting the information to the Planning Commission every year.

Objective 1.4.b: After discussion, all members stated that they are in agreement that the recommendation be stated as “Agree”.

Chairman Flowers asked if this includes reviewing comprehensive plans. Director Gottgetreu responded yes and that this would be more stringently enforced than just a review every eight years of the comprehensive plans.

Objective 2.1.a: All members agreed on implementing this objective now.

Objective 2.2.a:

Commissioner Matzka stated that he’s trying to stay positive and selected keep as an option. He doesn’t like this in Silverton, but sees it as a resource for short-term housing. This type of housing is great in college towns and is an option.

Commissioner Benedict stated that he does not think this should be considered because he thinks this is a way of skirting around the code, and does not think this is something that is needed in Silverton.

Commissioner Piaskowski selected keep as an option with an evaluation process put in place. He initially stated that he thinks that Silverton should give this a go and let the market show if it will work, but changed his decision after hearing Commissioner Jones’ example.

Commissioner Jones stated that he does not think this should be considered. He expressed a concern about the safety of the residents and does not think it is in the spirit of Silverton.

Chairman Flowers decided after talking through options that he does not think this should be considered.

Objective 2.2.b

Director Gottgetreu clarified that option would allow more opportunities for possible developments while still allowing the planning commission to come up with the standards for parking, lot size, setbacks, building height, etc.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks this should be implemented now. He thinks these are important to at least evaluate.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks this should be implemented now so that it can be evaluated.

Commissioner Matzka stated that he thinks this is a good option, but thinks that the multi-family, higher density housing is the priority, but does not object to implement now.

Commissioner Benedict stated that he feels the opposite of Commissioner Matzka and thinks this should be implemented now. He sees this as an option to avoid huge apartment complexes while keeping the charm of Silverton and creating affordable housing.

Chairman Flowers stated that he thinks this should be implemented now. He clarified that for design standards clarify what they want in each zone.

Objective 2.2.c

Director Gottgetreu explained that this objective could allow a developer to build something that would not otherwise be allowable within the zoning designation if they are willing to sign an agreement with the City stating that they will limit their profit, which would reduce the rent, in order to provide more affordable housing.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Matzka asked who does the enforcement or monitors that a developer is complying with an agreement to provide affordable housing. He stated that he thinks this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Benedict asked the structure size to which this objective refers. He further stated that he does not think this should be considered.

Chairman Flowers stated that he thinks this should be kept as an option.

The commission took a five-minute break at 8:09 p.m.

Objective 2.2.d: All members agreed that this should be implemented now.

Objective 2.2e: All members agreed that this objective should not be considered.

Commissioner Piaskowski asked where in Silverton tiny homes are allowed. Director Gottgetreu and the members responded.

Commissioner Matzka asked the difference between a cottage and a tiny home. Director Gottgetreu responded that a cottage will be site built and a tiny home may be on wheels.

Objective 2.2f

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Benedict stated that this should not be considered.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that this should not be considered.

Commissioner Jones stated that this should not be considered.

Chairman Flowers stated that this should be kept as an option.

Objective 2.3a: All members agreed that this objective should not be considered.

Objective 2.3b

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that this should be done later.

Commissioner Jones stated this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be done later.

Commissioner Benedict stated this should be implemented now.

Chairman Flowers stated this should be implemented now.

Objective 2.3c

Commissioner Matzka this should not be considered. He further stated that the size change is fine, but the tiny house/RV as a residence is not something that he would want in his neighborhood and feels it would create too many issues.

Commissioner Benedict stated that 1) should be implemented now; 2) should be implemented now; 3) should not be considered. He stated that he does not think that a tiny home/RV is an ADU.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks this is an implement now because it states to evaluate the options.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks this should be implement now.

Chairman Flowers stated that he thinks this should be implement now.

The question was asked of Director Gottgetreu if the options could be separated. Director Gottgetreu answered yes and that he was noting the breakdown that the members provided. All members agreed that number 3) allowing tiny homes as ADUs should not be considered.

Objective 2.3.d

Chairman Flowers asked Director Gottgetreu who explained to the members that garages are not a requirement for single or multi family developments.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he does not like the idea, but thinks this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Jones thinks this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that to him this falls into the same category as a planter stripe. He thinks that it would be nice if there would need to be a variance, but he decided to keep it as an option.

Commissioner Benedict agreed with Commissioner Matzka about the variance. He sees this as a safety issue and thinks that this should not be considered.

Chairman Flowers stated keep as an option.

Objective 2.3.e

Director Gottgetreu explained that this objective would create more guidance and improve standards for the process.

Commissioner Piaskowski thinks this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Jones thinks this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be done later. He likes the idea of providing guidance for what the commission is looking for in a development.

Commissioner Benedict thinks this should be implemented now.

Chairman Flowers thinks this should be implemented now.

Objective 2.3.f

Chairman Flowers asked how House Bill 2001 will effect a planned unit development. Director Gottgetreu stated that he would need to consult the state.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he doesn't think that matters because this objective is to evaluate incentives.

After discussion, all members agreed that this should be implemented now.

Objective 2.3.g

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks this should be done later.

Commissioner Jones asked if this means that developers could put a house on the flood plain or wetlands. Director Gottgetreu and Chairman Flowers explained that the land adjacent to the wetlands could be denser in order to maintain the integrity of the wetlands.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks it should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that he thinks it should be kept as an option and implemented now,

as needed.

Commissioner Benedict thinks it should be kept as option.

Chairman Flowers agrees that it should be kept as option.

Objective 2.3h

Chairman Flowers asked who would do the audit. Director Gottgetreu responded that the city would contract a firm to perform the audit in order to identify any policies that could be considered discriminatory.

Commissioner Benedict stated that he thinks that processes are in place to prevent discrimination and doesn't think that the city can afford to do this. If there were a history of discrimination in this town, this should be considered, but he thinks that there are checks and balances in place to prevent discrimination. He thinks that this should not be considered or kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be done later in case it hasn't been done in a long time.

Commissioner Jones stated that this should not be considered because there are a lot of checks and balances in place.

Commissioner Piaskowski agreed with Commissioner Jones that this should not be considered.

Chairman Flowers stated that he sees this as a low-end keep option for transparency purposes.

Objective 2.4.a

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks there are better ideas further down the list and this should not be considered.

Commissioner Jones asked for clarification about the objective. Director Gottgetreu provided an explanation with examples from other cities.

Commissioner Jones stated that this should be kept as an option.

Chairman Flowers stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Benedict stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should not be considered because of the way that the objective is worded.

Objective 2.4.b

The members discussed the language used in the objective.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Jones stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Benedict reiterated Commissioner Piaskowski's point that Silverton already has residential areas within a short distance from commercial areas. So, he thinks that this should not be considered because there is not a need for.

Chairman Flowers stated that he was convinced to not consider by Commissioner Benedict's argument.

Objective 2.4.c: All members agreed that this should be kept as an option.

Objective 2.4.d

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Jones stated that this should be kept as an option.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be implemented now.

Commissioner Benedict stated that normally he would be against this because the two zones should be separate, but that if there are small pockets, this should be kept as an option and evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Chairman Flowers agreed that this should be kept as an option.

Objective 2.4.e

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that this should be kept as an option, but he'd like to know if there is a demand for this.

Commissioner Jones state that this objective should not be considered.

Commissioner Matzka stated that this should be kept as an option on a limited basis.

Commissioner Benedict stated that this should not be considered because of the opportunities for people to be taken advantage of by their employers and that this is a slippery slope.

Chairman Flowers agreed with do not consider.

Policy 3

The members discussed whether or not the Planning Commission should comment on Policy 3 objectives. Commissioner Benedict made an argument that the Planning Commission should give their opinion to the City Council on the objectives in Policy 3.

Commissioner Piaskowski stated that he thinks the Planning Commission should not make a recommendation on the objectives in Policy 3, except objective 3.1.c.

Commissioner Matzka stated that he doesn't agree with just passing because he thinks that the policy should be re-written because it is disjointed and is not comprehensive for all income levels. He later stated that he would like to know how many workers work in Silverton and drive from other areas because they cannot afford to live in Silverton.

Director Gottgetreu stated that the Planning Commission could make a recommendation that the language in Objective 3.1.a be changed to "Evaluate" instead of "Support".

All of the members agreed to recommend that the language in Objective 3.1 be changed from "Support" to "Evaluate".

After thorough discussion, all members agreed to make no recommendations on Policy 3 and Policy 4, including all sub-sections, because it is not the role of the Planning Commission.

III. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Director Gottgetreu announced that there would not be a meeting on August 25th because he will be out of town.

There will be a joint work session with City Council on October 19th to discuss potential ideas and options for the Westfield site.

There will be a regular meeting in September.

The contract is being negotiated for the consultant for the House Bill 2001 code modifications.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Flowers adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kate Schlee,
Planning and Permit Assistant