

ASHLAND HISTORIC COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes

July 2, 2014

Community Development/Engineering Services Building Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

Call to Order: 6:00 p.m.

Historic Commissioners Present: Mr. Skibby, Mr. Swink, Mr. Giordano, Ms. Renwick, Mr. Shostrom

Commission Members Absent: Mr. Whitford (E), Ms. Law, Ms. KenCairn

Council Liaison: Mike Morris, absent

Staff Present: Staff Liaison: Amy Gunter, Clerk: Regan Trapp

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Historic Commission regular meeting of June 4, 2014. Mr. Giordano motioned that minutes be approved and Ms. Renwick seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC FORUM: There was no one wishing to speak.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: No council liaison was present to give the report.

PLANNING ACTION REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING: Mr. Skibby read aloud the requirements for public hearings.

PLANNING ACTION: (CONTINUANCE) 2014-00753

SUBJECT PROPERTY: 469 Allison Street

APPLICANT: Ben Treiger

OWNERS: Kirt VanDerZee and Lene Price

DESCRIPTION: A request for a Conditional Use Permit to expand / enlarge an existing non-conforming residence. The applicant is requesting approval to add approximately 280 square feet at the rear of the residence for the property located at 469 Allison Street. **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:** Low-Density Multi-Family; **ZONING:** R-2; **ASSESSOR'S MAP:** 39 1E 09 BD **TAX LOT:** 8300

Ms. Gunter reported that the previously submitted plans did not reflect the existing residence correctly. She stated that the applicants had submitted revised drawings. Ms. Gunter said the previously submitted elevations, the windows and the rooflines appeared out of scale and there were concerns that the building was not stepping down with the grade. She read the motion from the previous month's meeting as to what the applicants needed to amend. Mr. Skibby opened the public hearing.

Ben Treiger, of 237 Talent Ave, Talent OR. Mr. Treiger reported that the egress windows have been removed and they switched out the siding to comply with the historic standards. The ridgeline is still stepped up to match the ceiling heights inside. It was suggested by the Commission that the applicants get the larger bevel to match the existing siding. Mr. Treiger stated that the windows on the first floor are the original ones. It was asked how the applicants are strengthening the structure from racking or from any sort of seismic issues and Mr. Treiger responded that it would require a Simpson strong wall with a concrete seal. The stairway is in line with the existing window and the dimension of the window from the stairwell is 36 inches.

Ms. Lene Price, 469 Allison St, Ashland, OR. Ms. Price said that access is crucial from the studio to the backyard because she is an artist and has to have quick access to water. She also said that the new staircase will be bumped closer to the property line because the existing one is steep and dangerous. Mr. Shostrom asked about the deck detailing and Mr. Treiger stated that changing out the deck will be a future project, but no other details were provided

Kirt Van Der Zee, 469 Allison St. Ashland OR. Mr. Van Der Zee explained the detailing on the railing and said it's about 25 years old. Mr. Giordano asked if the new railing would match the existing one and Mr. Treiger replied that they were unsure of the design. There was much discussion between Mr. Van Der Zee and the Historic Commission on how the roofline should be. Mr. Shostrom found that continuing the ridgeline was consistent with standards because the ridgeline is from the 1988 addition and is not the historic ridgeline.

Colin Swales, 95 Coolidge St, Ashland, OR. Mr. Swales owns the property next door and stated the 1988 addition is really close to his boundary and severely impacts his privacy, being only 3 feet from his property line. Mr. Swales would like to see the addition built in the rear yard. Mr. Shostrom asked about the existing deck and the privacy issue and Mr. Swales said that some trees were planted but said the scale of the design is just too big. Any future developing could not happen if Mr. Van Der Zee and Ms. Price built their addition. Mr. Swales believes there are other options instead of building on a second story addition. Mr. Giordano asked the applicants about the possibility of them adding on in the back and Ms. Price said they would end up with a caboose style addition, not to mention already having lots of water issues in the backyard. Mr. Skibby asked about the stairs being moved into the setback area and Mr. Van Der Zee said that the stairs would go 18 inches into the setback area. Mr. Van Der Zee presented the Commission copies of aerial photos of the property for review. Mr. Skibby closed the public hearing and opened for staff comments.

Mr. Shostrom asked Ms. Gunter about the details of the conditional use permit. Ms. Gunter said that it was looked at as a continuation of a non conforming setback. Ms. Gunter stated that there is nothing in the code that would give them direction in whether to call it a variance or a conditional use permit. Ms. Gunter explained the 1988 variance findings for this address and explained what the findings were at that time. Additionally, the historic district design standards were different at the time. Mr. Skibby asked Ms. Gunter to review the standards for additions in the historic district. Mr. Giordano stated that he is not concerned about the setbacks but is concerned about the design. After much discussion about the rooflines, Mr. Shostrom motioned to continue the original roofline over the new addition at the same level, matching the siding to blend with the front. Ms. Renwick seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. Ms. Gunter then explained what the next steps in the planning action process were to the applicants.

OLD BUSINESS: There was no old business to discuss.

NEW ITEMS: Ms. Gunter reported that she has not heard back from Travel Oregon about the application for the \$8000.00 matching funds grant.

DISCUSSION ITEMS: Mr. Shostrom asked about any new demolition permits. He stated that it's too easy to get a demolition permit and says we need to develop an ordinance. Mr. Giordano stated that there is intrinsic value in keeping these homes from being torn down. Ms. Gunter said that she is looking into getting the demo ordinance rewritten. She will be looking at other cities to see what they do in reference to the demolition process. She stated examples of houses in the area that have not been kept. Mr. Shostrom asked if the Travel Oregon grant would cover looking into changing the demolition ordinance. Ms. Gunter said we could add a demolition layer to the grant.

Ms. Gunter reported that there will be an audit of the City's CLG program on September 10th by representatives from SHPO at the Carnegie Building in Medford. The training, on Sept 9th regarding the CLG program is for all Historic Commissioners from local areas. Ms. Gunter will keep the Commission informed of the details as the dates get closer.

COMMISSION ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA: Mr. Skibby showed the Commission a picture of the Oak Street Tank and Steel building from the early 1960's in response to a development proposal earlier this year.

REVIEW BOARD SCHEDULE:

| | |
|-----------|----------------------|
| July 3rd | Allison, Tom, Sam |
| July 10th | Keith, Dale |
| July 17th | Allison, Kerry |
| July 24th | Terry, Sam |
| July 31st | Terry, Tom, Victoria |
| Aug 7th | Keith, Allison |

PROJECT ASSIGNMENTS FOR PLANNING ACTIONS:

PLANNING ACTION: PA-2014-00725
SUBJECT PROPERTY: 121 Manzanita
COMMISSION MEMBER ASSIGNED: Mr. Whitford

PLANNING ACTION: PA-2014-00753
SUBJECT PROPERTY: 469 Allison
COMMISSION MEMBER ASSIGNED: Mr. Swink

ANNOUNCEMENTS & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

Next meeting is scheduled for August 6, 2014, 6:00 pm.

There being no other items to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Regan Trapp

**CITY OF
ASHLAND**
ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
STUDY SESSION
MINUTES
June 24, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Richard Kaplan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

Commissioners Present:

Troy J. Brown, Jr.
Michael Dawkins
Richard Kaplan
Debbie Miller
Melanie Mindlin
Lynn Thompson

Staff Present:

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director

Absent Members:

Tracy Peddicord

Council Liaison:

Mike Morris, absent

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Bill Molnar announced next Tuesday the City Council will hear the Planning Commission's report on short term home rentals. Also on the agenda is the second reading of the medical marijuana dispensary ordinance.

AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES

SDC Review Committee: Commissioner Brown stated the group has completed their review of the water and sewer SDC charges but have not voted yet. Next up are the transportation SDCs.

Normal Neighborhood Plan Working Group: Commissioner Dawkins stated the group held its first meeting and discussed the scope of work. They intend to hold 5-6 meetings and the biggest issue appears to be the assumptions on density. Dawkins stated if the density does not go here, the City will need to decide where it should go. He noted the other items to be discussed include transportation connectivity, open space, and conservation easements.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one came forward to speak.

PRESENTATION

A. Presentation by the Ashland Fire Department on Amending the Wildfire Hazard Zone.

Community Development Director Bill Molnar explained much of land use planning at the city level is under the broad umbrella of the statewide planning goals, and one of those goals is to manage areas subject to natural hazards. He stated the City's comprehensive plan and zoning code are the tools used to implement state policies at the local level, and this particular goal requires cities to inventory hazardous areas, set policies, and adopt standards to protect property and citizens.

Fire Chief John Karns, Fire & Life Safety Division Chief Margueritte Hickman, and Forestry Division Chief Chris Chambers addressed the Commission and presented their proposal to expand the wildfire hazard zone in Ashland. Mr. Karns provided an overview of how the Ashland Fire Department conducted their review of the current wildfire hazard zone by using the standards set forth by the Oregon Department of Forestry, which look at weather,

typography, fuel model, and fuel concentration. He stated they came up with 16 different groups, applied the ODF standards, and determined all of Ashland qualifies as a wildfire hazard zone.

Margueritte Hickman displayed photos and provided descriptions of several fires that have occurred in Ashland in the last ten years. She commented on screening vegetation and explained certain types of vegetation directly impact the threat to structures and aid in the spreading of the fire. Ms. Hickman pointed out that the City's land use code requires screening materials be used in order to protect the privacy of neighbors, but suggested photinia be used in place of junipers and cypress plants since it is fire resistant and can grow very high. Commissioner Thompson commented that the deer like to eat photinia, which may be why it has not been widely used for screening. Ms. Hickman commented on the Oak Knoll fire and stated a leland cypress located directly against one of the homes assisted in its burning. She stated had that tree not been there, there is a good chance that house would have survived.

Chris Chambers explained their proposal to expand the wildfire hazard zone includes two other elements: 1) screening materials, and 2) hazard tree removals. He spoke to the latter and stated the current process for hazard tree removal is not easy. He explained they would like to develop a process where the Fire Department would have the authority to sign off on a plan and file it with the Community Development Department. Mr. Chambers stated there are not a lot of these situations, but when they have come up it has been a struggle to get the hazard trees removed in a fast, efficient, and low cost way for citizens.

A video of the Oak Knoll fire was played for the Commission. Mr. Karns stated this is one of those situations where you want to have those preplanned items in place including correct vegetation, no wood roofs, and a very aware citizenry that knows that the threat is there and are prepared to leave at a moment's notice. He stated they came very close to losing citizens in this fire and stated 11 homes burned within 45 minutes. He added every four minutes a home was consumed and stated the junipers, cypress, blackberries, and dry grass aided in the fast spreading nature of this fire.

Mr. Karns stated they have a long term strategy to increase the safety of the community and this is just one rung in the ladder. He noted the systems already in place, including the City's Firewise program, a mass reverse 911 notification system, the Ashland Forest Resiliency program, and the numerous emergency preparedness trainings held for staff, citizens, and businesses. He stated it is important to understand that Ashland has a significant wildfire threat throughout its boundaries and the expansion of the wildfire hazard zone will improve the overall safety for the community.

Commissioner Questions:

- *What are the implications for property owners with existing structures?*
Mr. Karns explained there will not be any retroactive regulations. He stated if a property owner puts a new roof on their home the City would require a material other than wood shingles. He stated new developments and subdivisions would be required to provide a fire control plan approved by the Fire Department, and owners who put additions onto their existing structures could be required to complete a fuels reduction process. Mr. Karns commented on insurance rates and stated classifying the entire City as wildfire hazard lands would not impact citizens' insurance rates.
- *Will this change come back before the Planning Commission?*
Mr. Molnar clarified the wildfire hazard zone is an official zone adopted by the City and any changes would require the approval of an ordinance, with public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.
- *Did the Fire Department consider what the wildfire threat will be when the large, flatter, grassy areas in town are eventually built out?*
Mr. Karns stated they can reevaluate certain areas when they are developed and determine the risk factor at that time.
- *Will this impact the Fire Department's staffing levels?*
Mr. Karns said No, although they will try to move the part-time Fire Adaptive Communities Coordinator to a full time position.

- *Will this impact the City's annexation process?*

Mr. Molnar clarified once annexed the area will be subject to the provisions of the Ashland municipal code.

Mr. Molnar commented on the transportation of embers and asked about county lands that are either adjacent to Ashland or within our urban growth boundary but outside the City limits. Mr. Karns stated the Fire Department has had a number of conversations with the County, however none have been very productive and stated it will be one of the bigger challenges to work out some sort of arrangement. He pointed out that the Oak Knoll fire did not start in Ashland and was started in the County where weed abatement is not required. Mr. Chambers commented that the most important thing the City can do to reduce loss of structure and life is to manage its structures and vegetation within the city limits.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

*Submitted by,
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor*

**CITY OF
ASHLAND**
ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
July 8, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Richard Kaplan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

Commissioners Present:

Troy J. Brown, Jr.
Michael Dawkins
Richard Kaplan
Debbie Miller
Melanie Mindlin
Tracy Peddicord
Lynn Thompson

Staff Present:

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director
Maria Harris, Planning Manager
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor

Absent Members:

None

Council Liaison:

Mike Morris, absent

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Community Development Director Bill Molnar stated the City Council's goal setting session is scheduled for this weekend. He also announced the Council passed second reading of the medical marijuana dispensary ordinance and voted 3-1 to have staff prepare an ordinance on short term home rentals and take it to the Planning Commission for a public hearing.

AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES

Downtown Parking Management and Circulation Ad Hoc Advisory Committee: Commissioner Kaplan stated at the July meeting the committee reviewed the consultant's draft report and the key take-a-ways were that parking is at capacity most of the time, although it is not uniform with some areas under capacity and others at or above; and that employee parking is not as severe as originally thought, with many workers parking in residential areas. Kaplan stated there are six policy options the group will be discussing, including: better signage, incentive programs for employee parking, regulations, satellite lots and trolleys, and pricing/paid parking.

SDC Review Committee: Commissioner Brown announced the group has finished their work on water sdc's and sewer and transportation are still pending. Their next meeting is scheduled for August 4, 2014.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes.

1. June 10, 2014 Regular Meeting.

Commissioners Brown/Miller m/s to approve the Consent Agenda. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.
[Commissioner Thompson abstained]

PUBLIC FORUM

No one came forward to speak.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Approval of Findings for PA-2014-00307, 777 Oak Street.

Commissioner Thompson questioned if the Findings should better address the code requirement in 18.62.070.E, which states to the maximum extent feasible structures will be placed outside floodplain corridor lands.

Commissioner Peddicord noted the tree protection zone factored heavily into why the applicants could not move the home further away. Commissioner Mindlin felt this was addressed appropriately in the findings and stated the Commission's other rationale was that putting the home further from the floodplain could cause water to back up.

Thompson commented that by omitting this code section someone could argue that the Commission was not aware of this requirement. Mr. Molnar suggested adding "with respect to the standard in 18.62.070.E" to the end of the first sentence in Section 2.2 of the Findings document and the group voiced their support for this amendment.

Commissioners Dawkins/Peddicord m/s to approve the Findings for PA-2014-00307 as amended. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Approval of Findings for PA-2014-00734, 1163 Iowa Street.

Commissioners Mindlin/Dawkins m/s to approve the Findings for PA-2014-00734. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Approval of Findings for PA-2014-00737, Oak Street Right-of-Way.

Commissioners Miller/Mindlin m/s to approved the Findings for PA-2014-00737. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Pre-Adoption Review of the Unified Land Use Code.

Planning Manager Maria Harris handed out Section 18-4 and provided a matrix with the latest recommended language changes. She clarified this is the adoption ready draft and all the comment boxes, strike-outs and highlights have been removed. She noted the Commission last reviewed this document in March and since that point staff has revised the document to ensure consistent use of terms, consistent formatting, added and verified cross references, and added new graphics and tables.

Ms. Harris provided a short review of the changes made to the Unified Land Use Code since the last draft:

- **Nonconforming Developments:** Added the text "except for non-residential nonconforming development subject to Site Design Review." Ms. Harris clarified this is an existing standard.
- **Vision Clearance Area Requirements:** Added the text "Street lights, posts or poles supporting streets signs, traffic control signs or devices, utility poles, on-street parking, and street trees exceeding 2.5 feet may be located in vision clearance areas, unless the cumulative impact of the placement results in an obstruction to vision." Ms. Harris clarified this language was taken from the state model code.
- **Porous Pavement Exemption from Lot Coverage for Residential Zones:** Ms. Harris stated the focus group brought up this issue and the Planning Commission recommended staff make this change.
- **Density Calculation for Multi-Family Residential Zones:** Ms. Harris stated staff recommends striking the fractional portion language, which makes this requirement clearer and less confusing.
- **Building Height Exemption in Commercial and Employment Zones:** New language has been added which states "Parapets may be erected up to 3 ft. above the maximum building height." Ms. Harris clarified this was recommended by the focus group and noted this is not entirely new language and similar language already applies to the Croman Mill District.
- **Allowed Uses in Croman Mill District:** Language from the state model code was included in this section to provide consistency with the other districts addressed in 18-2.2.030.
- **Development in Pedestrian Place Overlay in Residential Zone:** "Mixed-Use Buildings" was added to clarify that if a property develops in solely residential uses, the building and intensity should reflect the base residential zone requirements.

- **Single Family Dwelling Parking Requirements:** The language “Except for single family dwellings” was added to clarify current requirements.
- **Private Drive Requirements:** The language “that serves three or less lots” was added to clarify that residential units can be located on flag lots.
- **Ashland Street Corridor Standards:** Ms. Harris clarified the street tree area and sidewalk widths listed in the code were updated to ensure consistency with the existing street design standards for a boulevard.
- **Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan:** Ms. Harris clarified the language regarding temporary and permanent erosion control measures was moved to grading plan requirements, rather than the landscape plan requirements as recommended by the focus group.
- **Preliminary Partition Plat Criteria – Exterior Unimproved Streets and Accessways and Enforcement Fee for Tree Removal Violation:** These sections were deleted because they are repetitive and are already addressed in the code requirements.
- **District, Zone, and Land Use Ordinance Definitions:** Definitions for these three terms have been added to the code.

Ms. Harris commented on the upcoming public hearing on July 22 and clarified the Commission will receive a matrix that lists all of the substantive changes, a staff report, and any written comments that are submitted. She noted staff will be sending out postcards to approximately 300 people and the newest materials have been posted to the project page on the city’s website (www.ashland.or.us/unifiedcode).

Commissioner Mindlin noted a correction to page 2-21, 4.b; the third line down should read “waive the requirement to dedicate and construct a public street...”. She also questioned if the wording in 4.h would prohibit garden fences. Ms. Harris stated she would check into this and offered to include a cross reference to the deer fencing section.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

*Submitted by, April Lucas
Administrative Supervisor*

**CITY OF
ASHLAND**
ASHLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES
July 22, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Richard Kaplan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers, 1175 East Main Street.

Commissioners Present:

Troy J. Brown, Jr.
Michael Dawkins
Richard Kaplan
Debbie Miller
Melanie Mindlin
Tracy Peddicord
Lynn Thompson

Staff Present:

Bill Molnar, Community Development Director
Maria Harris, Planning Manager
April Lucas, Administrative Supervisor

Absent Members:

None

Council Liaison:

Mike Morris, absent

AD-HOC COMMITTEE UPDATES

Normal Neighborhood Plan Working Group: Commissioner Kaplan stated 15-20 members of the public attended the last meeting and the group shared their preferences on where the densities, roads, and open space should be located. He stated there were some areas of agreement, but also a lot of differences. The group discussed density, affordable housing requirements, and the NN-03-C commercial zone. Areas of consensus seemed to be moving the higher densities closer to Ashland Street and away from East Main, placing the NN-02 zone in the interior of the plan area, and making the streets more grid like. There was also a request to not use the NN zoning designations and use the City's existing zones (R-1, R-2, R-3, etc.) instead.

Commissioner Kaplan was asked if the plan put forward by the Commission has been rejected and if the Council was starting over. Kaplan replied that the plan will likely be amended before it is approved by the City Council. Comment was made expressing concern that the Council is just moving the discomfort around. Additional comment was made that no member of the public indicated to them that they wanted the density placed in the center of the plan area.

Downtown Beautification Committee: Commissioner Dawkins stated this group's work is coming to an end and provided a list of identified projects, including: the walkway by Earthly Goods (lighting/artwork), Lithia/Pioneer sidewalks, historical markers, OSF/Black Swan area, and bringing furnishings onto the Plaza. Dawkins added there is still funding available to complete some of these items.

PUBLIC FORUM

Colin Swales/95 Coolidge/Commented on the ULUO process and remarked that the stated intent is to provide predictability to the planning process, but disagreed with this and stated the process is not suppose to be predictable, but fair. Mr. Swales voiced his disappointment with how the focus groups and open houses were done and stated the professionals who participated put forward a wish list of what they would like to see to maximize their investments. He stated he was also disappointed with the 2006 Siegel Report which took away citizen input and allowed more actions to be approved at the staff level. Mr. Swales asked the Commission to consider the Comprehensive Plan and goals for the City as they review the proposed changes to the land use code.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING

A. PLANNING ACTION: 2014-00529

DESCRIPTION: A request to modify Title 18 of the Ashland Municipal Code to combine the land use ordinance language and related development standards into one document with improved organization, wording, formatting, and graphics. Amendments are included to address outstanding items from the [2006 Land Use Ordinance Review by Siegel Planning Services LLC](#), recommendations from the planning application procedure and green development audits, inconsistencies, and ambiguous wording. The land use ordinance implement the community's vision as expressed in the Ashland Comprehensive Plan and governs the development of property within the City limits.

Staff Report

Planning Manager Maria Harris explained this action replaces Title 18 of the Ashland Municipal Code in its entirety with a revised land use ordinance that includes the Site Design & Use Standards and the Street Standards and improves the organization, formatting and graphics. The proposed document also includes amendments addressed in the 2006 Siegel land use ordinance review, recommendations from the application procedures and green development audits, and inconsistencies and ambiguous wording. Ms. Harris noted there have been approximately 30 meetings on this project over the last two years and clarified the Planning Commission is tasked with making a recommendation to the City Council, who will make the final decision.

Ms. Harris provided a presentation that covered the key proposed amendments:

- ***Building Heights in Downtown Ashland.*** Currently the maximum height is 40 ft. with the potential to go up to 55 ft. with a conditional use permit. The proposal is to keep the 40 ft. maximum, but if the structure is more than 100 ft. from a residential zone they can go up to 55 ft. There is also an exemption from the plaza space requirement for the fourth floor (large scale developments only); an exemption of the C-1 zone from the solar setback standards (except for properties that are within 100 ft of a residential zone); and an exemption for parapets.
- ***Building Street Frontage.*** For non-residential development there is currently a disconnect between the written standards and the concept plans. The proposed amendments require parking to be located either behind or on one side of the building, and for the building's façade to occupy the majority of the street frontage. Ms. Harris added more building frontage on the street will improve the pedestrian environment and be more in line with current standards. Additional changes to the design standards that apply to non-residential zones include the vision clearance exemption, building separation requirements, and the hotel/motel definitions.
- ***Cottage Housing.*** The proposed language makes it possible to do cottage housing in single family zones, and allows for two small cottages for every regular single family home.
- ***Solar Orientation.*** This amendment applies to land divisions in residential zones and requires the layout of new streets to be as close as possible to a north-south and east-west axis; to orient buildings so that the long sides face north and south; and to design habitable structures so the primary living space is located on the south side of the building.
- ***Building Separation.*** The proposed language applies the building separation standard uniformly in residential zones and requires the minimum separation between buildings to equal half the height of the tallest building, where building height is measured at the two closest exterior walls. The maximum required separation is 12 ft.
- ***Accessory Residential Units.*** The proposed change removes the conditional use requirement and makes accessory residential units a site design review application.
- ***Other Changes to the Design Standards in Residential Zones*** include the porous pavement exemption, half story setback, side and rear yard exceptions, single-family parking, and solar setback exemption for architectural projections.
- ***Procedural Amendments.*** In the Basic Site Review Zone, a public hearing would be required if the building is more than 15,000 sq.ft. (instead of current 10,000 sq.ft.) or if the proposed addition is more than 50% of the existing buildings square footage.

- **Other Changes to Procedures** include planning approval expiration and extension, affordable housing density bonus, maximum density bonus, conditional use permit approval criteria, and variance approval criteria.

Questions of Staff

Staff was asked if outdoor lighting is required. Ms. Harris clarified street lights are required along sidewalks and stated within the site light cannot spill over into residential zones. In order to meet the latter requirement, staff needs to know where the lights will be placed.

Staff was asked whether the performance standards option (PSO) would be applied throughout town. Ms. Harris clarified this was originally recommended, but it was determined that this was a bigger issue that would require more discussion. She added this could be controversial, especially as it applies to flag lots. Comment was made that this was good idea and recommending it not be abandoned. Mr. Molnar commented that the performance standards option already applies to a number of areas in town, and noted there is existing criteria that allows staff to approve a performance standards development even if it is not within a PSO overlay.

Public Testimony

Colin Swales/95 Coolidge/Recommended the code allow for variability to the solar access requirement and the manner in which subdivisions are oriented in order to deal with topography. Mr. Swales expressed concern with the vision clearance amendment for commercial zones in the downtown and stated the current requirement makes for safer and more attractive buildings. He shared his concern with the increased building height allowance and the parapet exemption. Mr. Swales stated his objection to the fourth floor plaza space exemption and the change in the hotel/motel definition. He also recommended the variance language be changed to specify that the circumstances have not been self imposed by the property owner OR the previous owner.

Discussions and Deliberations

Commissioner Thompson questioned the proposed wording regarding residential uses in commercial and employment zones in developments with more than one building on the same site. Ms. Harris clarified the language was meant to clarify what you count as residential and non residential. Mr. Molnar added this applies to developments that have multiple buildings with a standalone residence building. Thompson recommended staff make this clearer in the way it is written and received unanimous support from the Commission.

Commissioner Thompson asked about the building separation requirements and whether this is consistent with the character of the historic districts. Ms. Harris clarified that the proposed standard has been used in performance standards options subdivisions throughout Ashland, including in the historic districts, for more than 20 years.

Commissioner Thompson questioned the solar orientation standards and expressed concern with the rigidity of this standard. Mr. Molnar commented that the City adopted the solar access ordinance in the early 1980s and stated if you don't consider solar orientation in the beginning stages of a development you may lose this option entirely. Several commissions voiced support retaining the solar standards. Comment was made that this is a simple way to take advantage of the environment and retain all options for the future.

Commissioner Dawkins questioned the proposed change to the vision clearance standard. Ms. Harris clarified the vision clearance standard currently applies to the C-1-D zone (not C-1 or E-1), and the proposed change would make C-1-D exempt like the other two commercial zones. Dawkins voiced his concern and stated that extra space provides the driver of a vehicle a little more room to see, rather than pulling into the sidewalk. Commissioner Peddicord commented that this may need to be a case-by-case evaluation, rather than a flat exemption. Commissioner Brown noted that large vehicles parked on the street can also impact the driver's vision clearance, and this is not something the business owner has control over. Commissioner Miller questioned if they should be evaluating this standard for other areas of town as well. Due to the various concerns expressed by the Commission, general consensus was reached to pull the vision clearance amendment in order to study the larger issue.

Commissioner Mindlin questioned the reasoning for changing the corner lot size requirements. Mr. Molnar clarified

the current lot size requirements for corner lots in the R-1-5 zone is 1,000 sq.ft. larger than interior lots and the proposed amendment would keep all lots the same with a 5,000 sq.ft. minimum. He added this was one of the Siegel Report recommendations. Mindlin stated the Commission has had applications come before them where because of a smaller lot size, applicants felt entitled to a variance approval to build the large house they want. She stated she would rather stick with the 6,000 sq.ft. minimum for corner lots and added the reasoning behind the original requirement is still sound. The Commission voiced their support with Mindlin and consensus was reached to keep corner lots in the R-1-5 zone at a 6,000 sq.ft. minimum and to not put forward this amendment.

Commissioner Mindlin voiced her concern with changing the setbacks in commercial and employment zones from abutting residential zones. She commented that the separation between commercial and residential should be at least the same as they get from residence to residence and stated she is not in favor of reducing this to five feet per story. She added she is in favor of growing up and not out, but does not support a five foot per story setback for side and rear yards. The Commission voiced their support with Mindlin and consensus was reached for the required setbacks in the C-1, C-1-D and E-1 zones from residential zones to be 10 ft. per story for rear yards, and 10 ft. for side yards.

Commissioner Mindlin questioned why the flag lot interpretation is not included in this project. Ms. Harris clarified that staff did introduce potential language earlier on in the process, but the Commission tabled it in order have further community discussion. Staff indicated that this could be brought back for discussion at a later date. Recommendation was made for staff to add this as a discussion item at the Commission's next goal setting session.

Commissioners Miller/Kaplan m/s to extend the meeting to 10 p.m. Voice Vote: all AYES.

Deliberations and Decision

Planning Secretary April Lucas read aloud the agreed upon modifications to the proposed code:

- 1) Clarify the language regarding residential uses in commercial and employment zones in developments with more than one building on the same site (Amendment Matrix, pg. 1)
- 2) Remove the proposed vision clearance standard exemption for the C-1-D zone and study the larger issue (Amendment Matrix, pg. 10)
- 3) Retain the current 6,000 sq.ft. minimum lot size for corner lots in the R-1-5 zone (Amendment Matrix, pg. 2)
- 4) Require 10 ft. per story rear yard setbacks and 10 ft. side yard setbacks from residential zones in the C-1, C-1-D, and E-1 zones (Amendment Matrix, pg. 3)

Commissioners Mindlin/Dawkins m/s to recommend approval of the unified land use code with the modification just read. Roll Call Vote: Commissioners Brown, Miller, Dawkins, Mindlin, Thompson, Peddicord, and Kaplan, YES. Motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

*Submitted by, April Lucas
Administrative Supervisor*