



**SCIO PLANNING COMMISSION ELECTRONIC MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, September 30, 2020**

7:00 PM

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Beau Buganski, Commissioners Richard Androes, Katrina Clouse, Ron Loewen and Nicole Zedwick, were all present via video. Commissioner Ellie Ferguson was present via phone.

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Consultant Dave Kinney, Assistant City Attorney Jeffrey Clayson and Administrative Assistant Cathy Martin were present via video.

CALL TO ORDER: Planning Chairman Beau Buganski called the Scio Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Roll call was taken with all members present. There is one vacancy.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ray Rebmann

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the July 29, 2020 meeting were reviewed.

Commissioner Clouse moved, Commissioner Androes seconded, to approve the July 29, 2020 minutes as presented. A voice and hand vote was taken. Motion passed 6/0.

CORRESPONDENCE: A Letter was received from the Fair Housing Council of Oregon and will be included in tonight's public hearing.

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

BUSINESS:

1. Public Hearing: PL2020-08– City of Scio – Scio Zoning Code Text Amendments – Parking - Presented by Dave Kinney, Planning Consultant –

Buganski asked if there was a script that he should be following for this hearing. Kinney stated that this is a Legislative amendment so the planning commission will go through a more normal hearing process, staff report, proponents, opponents, questions from the audience or planning commission members, and once the hearing is closed then the planning commission will go through the decision process.

Chairman Buganski open public hearing at 7:06 pm to consider Land Use File #2020-08, Scio Zoning Code amendments.

Planning Consultant, Dave Kinney presented the staff report. Kinney stated that this proposal is to amend the parking standards of the City of Scio Zoning Ordinance. The city received an inquiry from a property owner that operates a business on North Main Street regarding some of the parking requirements, in addition Ginger Allen, City Manager, has been working on some of the planning work with the consultants for the new City Hall facility. We have identified that the standards that are there really don't address properties that are in the commercial zone that are built on 80-100% of the lot. There is no space there to do "onsite parking". The code does not clearly permit there to be off-site parking or joint parking or clear standards to deal with those types of business opportunities. We took a look at the entire parking section of the City of Scio Zoning Code. This proposal was provided to the planning commission, posted on the city's website and notice of the hearing was sent to the entire community. Kinney stated that he used the City of Albany's code as well as the Model Development Code for Small Cities, to go through the city's regulations and develop this proposal.

Kinney stated that the biggest change is that it allows for more flexibility in the code and reduced for many of the commercial uses the number of spaces required for a single development. These changes are designed to try to get a more compact design in an urban area. In a small town, there is not the demand for retail space and more people are doing a lot more online shopping. Fewer parking space requirements are more realistic for a small town like Scio. The code does not change the parking requirements for residential developments. Where the city did not have requirements for different types of living centers, those regulations have been added. The other changes are the development standards, to change the definition of a parking space. The size has been removed from the definition, and allow for some compact parking spaces as well as larger spaces to handle pickups. We also added language requiring people to comply with ADA parking requirements, particularly having those spaces located close to an entry to a building as well as dimension requirements that are part of the federal standards. Lastly, for someone developing a larger parking lot they will have to provide some landscaping, lighting and striping of the parking spaces and buffers if the commercial property is located adjacent to a residential area. Also requires a performance guarantee that if someone has to put in a new parking lot, they have to either, install it before they take occupancy of the building or they have to provide the city with the performance guarantee that is a financial commitment to complete the project.

Commissioner Clouse asked if any of the changes would assist businesses during trash day, for no one to park in certain areas.

Kinney stated that this ordinance does not directly address this.

Clouse stated that the issue is that trash doesn't get picked up because of people parking in front of the places the receptacles are placed.

Kinney stated that the city could add in provisions for placement of trash receptacles in new development, so it doesn't compete with parking. Recognizing there is an issue with

existing buildings, he stated that this is not really a zoning issue, rather a parking regulatory issue. Kinney asked City Attorney Clayson if this was something that could be addressed from their office. Clayson stated that the city could look into the issue and possibly come up with something to address situation.

Loewen stated that the exception that goes on North Main Street does not include the auto parts store, ZCBJ Hall, the old laundry mat, telephone company, Macro Solutions, nor the old bus barn. The lot size for the old bus barn property is the same size as the building. Kinney asked if he was suggesting that the area be extended further. Loewen stated that he thought it should cover all of the old commercial buildings as they all have the same problem as the downtown core area.

Kinney stated that he would draft another map for review and comments. Martin interjected that there are currently exceptions in the code for North Main Street. Kinney stated that he would need to look at the code and the existing commercial area south of Thomas Creek to come up with the map.

Ray Rebmann, stated that Mr. Loewen addressed one of his questions which was why this proposal did not extend south of Thomas Creek. He further stated that he was trying to get an understanding of how the citizens feel about the area down in front of the Museum. The Historical Society owns a 20' strip of land on NE 1st between feed mill and Chapin Park. He is trying to determine they need to do something different for parking. Commissioner Androes asked if Mr. Rebmann could identify himself for the record. Mr. Rebmann gave his name and address and stated that he was the President of Scio Historical Society.

Mr. Rebmann stated that he doesn't disagree with the proposal he is just trying to make sure that the changes do not impact the Historical Society and the Museum, in regards to their parking strip. Part of that strip is in the paved street area.

Kinney stated that he does not anticipate that these changes will be detrimental to use. He thought that they might make things easier if the Museum is expanded in the future. However, Mr. Kinney stated that he would do some more checking to make sure that it was not detrimental to the use.

Mr. Rebmann asked about the striping requirement. Kinney stated that this requirement is only for new development, it would not be retroactive. Mr. Rebmann asked if they added a small storage facility, would this force them to changes. Kinney stated that because it is storage, and not publically accessible space it would not. However, he will make sure the proposed regulations address this concern.

Buganski stated that the commission members did not declare any Exparte contact at the beginning of the hearing and asked if they should go through this as well. Kinney stated that he could, that it does apply generically to any property owner within the city. So if you own property within the city it should be declared.

Commissioners Buganski and Clouse stated that they own commercial buildings on N Main Street, Loewen stated that he owns three buildings in the commercial and industrial zones on the south side of town. Androes stated that he has a home in the commercial zone and Zedwick stated that she owns residential property within the city. Kinney stated that for all of the commission members that own property which is zoned commercial or industrial property, that these regulations could apply, and asked if the fact that they own that property render it difficult or impossible for you to make an impartial decision. They all indicated that they could make an unbiased decision on this application.

Martin read the correspondence received from the Fair Housing Council of Oregon into the record. (see Attached)

Buganski asked what they are actually concerned with.

Kinney stated that FHCO raised the issue that cities are required to provide findings whenever they adopt plan amendment map change or a zoning map change. That is not what is being proposed here. Kinney stated that he doesn't believe that the housing needs analysis and the buildable lands inventory are issues that need to be addressed in detail. The city has to adopt findings that address all of DLCD's Goals when it take action to approve or amend the development code. Kinney stated that he did not provide the planning commission with a findings document that addressed all of the goal issues in the packet. He had anticipated that the planning commission would hold this first hearing and then he would develop a full set findings in anticipation of the council hearing. In light of two things: 1) The requested changes to the map area for the commercial exceptions for some of the standards; and 2) the need to develop a set findings that address all of the goal issues, Kinney stated that the FHCO letter raised legitimate comments.

Buganski asked if there were any additional comments or questions. There were no further questions at this time.

Kinney asked if there were issues with having a continuance on the hearing. Assistant City Attorney Clayson stated that he has no issues with a continuance, that it is a better way to go by leaving the hearing open to the next meeting.

Kinney recommended continuing the hearing to October meeting @ 7:00 pm.

Buganski stated that the hearing will be continued to the October 28th meeting, at which time the planning commission will consider any new testimony, review the findings and make a recommendation to the city council. The hearing was continued at 7:36 pm.

2. Scio Planning Commission Approval to Vacate City Owned Properties – Presented by Dave Kinney, Planning Consultant –

Planning Consultant, Dave Kinney stated that the planning commission had looked at the vacation of various alley's and sections of Right-of-ways that were not being used by the city at the February 22, 2017 meeting. This was forwarded on to the council, however the minutes from meeting not as clear at what they should have been to pass on a recommendation that the council proceed with vacation. City Manager Allen is requesting that the original motion be amended to add the words "as needed" to properly reflect the decision of the commission at that time, as recommendation was forwarded on to the council for final decision.

Kinney asked Clayson if a simple motion would suffice to correct the minutes. Clayson stated that it would.

Commissioner Clouse moved, Commissioner Loewen seconded, to amend the minutes of the February 22, 2017, in order for the motion to read "recommend that the city council keep or vacate the 16 parcels as needed per the consensus of the Commission." Motion passed 6/0.

Next meeting is October 28, 2020, at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Cathy Martin
Administrative Assistant