

Draft Code Amendments

February 12, 2018 Planning Commission Work Session

Purpose:

Explanation of code amendments on:

- Revisions to Lot Averaging
- Minor Code Clean Up
- Efficiencies

Please identify big picture concerns. Comments on minor spelling/wording/redlines are encouraged to be provided to staff.

Process

Notice of code amendments

Review by Development Stakeholders Group

Work Session with Planning Commission January 22nd

Citizen Involvement Committee February 5th

Continue Work Session with Planning Commission February 12th

Planning Commission Hearing February 26th

Definitions

- Revise “Family Day Care” definition to comply with ORS
- Add definition of “building”
- Add definition of “Net Leasable Area:” Actual square-footage of a building or outdoor area that may be leased or rented to tenants, which excludes parking lots, common areas, shared hallways, elevator shafts, stairways, and space devoted to cooling, heating, or other equipment.

Single Family and Duplex Uses in Mixed Use zones

- Clarify that single and two-family units are permitted when in conjunction with and located in the same building as another permitted use in the zone. This applies to NC, C, MUC-1, MUC-2 and MUD.

Natural Resource Overlay District Exemptions

- Clarify exemption for temporary minor disturbance areas

Clarify Decision Making Processes

- Update summary chart
- Update explanation language
- Clarify how to calculate days in a land use review process
- ~~Remove reconsideration process~~

Parking Reduction

- Minimum parking reduced by up to 10% when adjacent to a transit route or within 1,000 feet of a stop
- This was inadvertently removed from the code in 2014 during TSP update

Clarification of Applicability of Nonconforming Upgrades

- Nonconforming upgrades are required when a nonconforming site is being “expanded”
- Clarify that expansion in this case means increases in the square footage of a building and/or site improvements which include installation of any additional off-street parking stalls

Type I Site Plan

- Allow demolitions of any size
- Clarify tree removal applicability

Landscaping

- Exempt landscaping from submitting a plan by a landscape architect when species is on an approved tree list
- Allow certified landscape designer, arborist, or nurseryman to design projects less than 500 sq. ft. rather than a landscape architect.
- Remove requirement for 10% landscaping for major remodeling. (Instead, use landscaping minimums in specific zoning designations)

Site Plan & Design Review Standards

- Remove requirement which conflicts with code section requiring all commercial mechanical changes to be a Type I Site Plan and Design Review.
- Allow chain link fence around stormwater facilities
- Clarify connection between development and nonconforming upgrades.
- Remove redundant sections and conflicting standards.
- Remove light bulb type requirements.
- Remove standard related to light fixture requirements.

Communication Facilities

- All modifications and expansions to existing wireless communication facilities are permitted in every zone, subject to the requirements of this Section. Certain modifications are deemed minor in nature and are deemed “eligible modifications” These modifications include the addition, removal, and/or replacement of transmission equipment that do not make a substantial change to the physical dimensions (height, mass, width) of the existing tower, support structure, or base station. Replacement of an existing tower may also be considered an eligible modification.
- Complies with 2012 court ruling

Amendment to Lot Averaging Standards

Current Standards:

Lot sizes may be up to 20% less than the zoning designation if the subdivision as a whole averages the zoning minimum.

Draft Proposal:

- Lot sizes allowed to be 10% smaller than zone average rather than 20%.
- Cap the total number of lots that can be smaller than the zone minimum to less than 25%.

Amendment to Lot Averaging Standards

Other Subdivision lot standards - not proposed to change:

- Minimum lot width
- Minimum lot depth
- Maximum lot coverage of buildings (40% in most cases)
- Minimum Setbacks
- Minimum required density (80%)
- Maximum block length

Example: Central Point Crossing (2013 Subdivision)



“R-8” Single-Family Dwelling District
Minimum Average Lot size: 8000 sf

Example: Central Point Crossing (2013 Subdivision)



Net Developable area: 221,625 sf

$221,625 \text{ divided by } 8,000 = 27$


Maximum 27 lots

Proposed: 27 lots

Average lot size: 8,208 sf

Example: Central Point Crossing (2013 Subdivision)

Lot	Lot Area (Sq. Ft. Min.)
1	8,019
2	8,014
3	8,003
4	8,000
5	7,370
6	7,059
7	7,062
8	7,378
9	8,142
10	9,093
11	12,333
12	12,257
13	8,069
14	7,976
15	7,740
16	7,741
17	7,881
18	8,000
19	8,000
20	8,000
21	8,000
22	7,764
23	7,960
24	7,764
25	8,000
26	8,000
27	8,000



*Final plat shown varies from original lot sizes shown in table to right, but the statistics on this slide are the same for each


Proposed: 27 lots
Average lot size: 8,208 sf

Number of lots less than 8,000
sf: eight (30%)

Smallest Lot: 7,072 sf (11.6%
smaller than minimum
average

Number of lots more than
10% under the minimum
average: two (7%)

Example: Adeline Acres (2014 Subdivision)



Total area: 191,000 square feet

“R-8” Single-Family Dwelling District


Average Lot size: 8000 sf

Net Developable area: 140,257 sf

Maximum 17 lots

Average lot size: 8,127 sf

Example: Adeline Acres (2014 Subdivision)




Proposed: 16 lots
Average lot size: 8,127 sf

Number of lots less than 8,000 sf: ten (63%)

Smallest Lot: 6,404 sf (20% smaller than minimum average)


Number of lots more than 10% under the minimum average: nine (56%)

Lindsay Anne Too: Original



Maximum lots: 30 Minimum Lots: 24 Proposed lots: 28

Lindsay Anne Too: Under Proposed Code



23 lots (less than minimum of 24)

Design limited by pre-existing road connections to the south and PGE easement

Questions?