

LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
5TH FLOOR COPPER ROOM, MULTNOMAH BUILDING
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD, PORTLAND OR
APRIL 22, 2015 3:00-5:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

In attendance:

Subcommittee members

Catherine Dishion
Tim Larson
Will Rasmussen

Project Team

Kevin Cook
Matt Hastie
Rich Faith
Rithy Khut

Absent:

Kathy Taggart

Public: Carol Chesarek; Charles Swindell, Stephanie Nystrom (CAC member), George Sowder (CAC member), Paula Savageau (CAC member), Casey Filice (BOCC Chair's office)

The committee, staff members, and visitors introduced themselves.

Rich Faith informed the subcommittee that Kathy Taggart is no longer able to make afternoon meetings now that her garden center is open for the season. She could make meetings if they started at 6:00 PM. Can the other members meet in the evening to accommodate her schedule? Will Rasmussen said that would be difficult for him. Catherine and Tim were OK with it. Will said he could meet in the evening for one of the two remaining subcommittee meetings if necessary. Because Tim will not be able to make the May meeting now scheduled for May 20th, it was agreed to hold the next subcommittee meeting on May 13 from 3:00 to 5:00 and to move the June meeting to June 17 from 6:00 to 8:00 to enable Kathy to attend.

II. Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Policies

Matt Hastie referred to the Memorandum on Land Use Policy Recommendations dated April 14, 2014 included in the meeting packet. He stated that no policy on ADU has been drafted because the subcommittee wanted to check with Springdale community members about this topic before offering any recommendations. Due to either state or county law, the Springdale RC zone is the only place where ADU are possible.

Catherine Dishion reported that a community meeting was held in Springdale on April 15 at the Corbett Grange Hall. Three CAC members attended as did three county planning staff. There were 18 citizens, most from the Corbett area. Almost everyone there was opposed to allowing ADU in Springdale for a variety of reasons. She stated that she recommends against allowing them based on the outcome of the community meeting. The other members agreed with her recommendation.

A summary of the Springdale meeting is attached to this meeting summary.

Action Item:

Matt said a policy should be drafted to reflect that recommendation and to explain why ADU should not be allowed in Springdale. He will bring policy language for the subcommittee's to review at its next meeting.

III. Parcel Aggregation Policies

Matt summarized the discussion from the last meeting that shaped the proposed policy and strategies on this subject. A subcommittee member stated that they sound just like what the subcommittee had asked for. Another member asked whether the County Assessor's office could assign new tax lot numbers or a single number for aggregated parcels. The answer is that it is not always possible because there are sometimes reasons that aggregated parcels cannot be given a single tax lot number, such as when the consolidated parcel is partially within a special taxing district.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the new policy and strategies as written.

IV. Uses and Design Standards in Rural Centers Policies

Matt explained the proposed policy language based on direction given at the last subcommittee meeting. The policy and strategy are additions to existing language found either in the comprehensive plan or rural area plans.

One member said that the first revised policy should not only allow for maximum use of existing lawfully established buildings but for maximum use of existing parking area associated with the building. The second policy should be clearer that differentiating between urban and rural designs standards includes parking and landscaping standards.

There was further discussion and questions about the policies and what they mean. One member would like to see gravel parking areas permitted rather than paved surface in some circumstances. It was determined that this is a topic to put on the parking lot list for later discussion.

Recommendation:

The subcommittee recommends the policies and strategy but with the following revisions: 1) the first policy should call out use of existing parking areas in addition to maximum use of floor area of existing established buildings as part of the economic and employment opportunities; 2) add language about flexibility in parking and landscaping standards to the end of the second policy.

V. Land Use Permitting Policies

Matt reviewed the proposed new policies based on direction from the last meeting. Member comments were that when permitting requirements are periodically reviewed, it should be done in consultation with affected businesses and other stakeholders. Either the proposed strategy could be revised or a separate strategy written to ensure that affected residents and businesses are consulted when reviewing and refining permitting requirements. Other member comments were that this review process should not involve a lot of meetings and cost. Funds should go toward code compliance rather than studying permit processes.

Recommendation:

Staff will come back to the next meeting with a slightly revised policy that addresses comments raised by the subcommittee.

VI. Tree Protection Policies

Matt went over the highpoints of the last meeting discussion that provided direction on the proposed tree protection policies. That direction led to the two proposed new policies and two strategies presented in the memorandum. Some subcommittee members thought the strategy about monitoring developments for replanting or tree replacement should specify a time period to complete this -- perhaps two years. Others spoke to the need to have strong language about landscape plan requirements and monitoring of them. There was also discussion about expanding the scenic view SEC overlay to the west slope of the West Hills where it does not currently apply. This might reduce the amount of tree cutting that occurs there for the sake of better views and reduce the clearing associated with overly large houses. A final comment was that the County needs to establish large fines for cutting trees that are not supposed to be cut. Some property owners are not deterred by the current fines because the amount of money they can make on the sale of timber is far greater than the cost of a fine, so it's worth cutting the trees regardless of the fine.

Recommendation:

Revise the first new policy to place "or replanting of trees" at the end of the policy so that protection of existing trees is the primary focus, and replanting is a secondary focus.

The words "where feasible" in the first strategy could open up a huge loop hole. Can it be removed or stated differently.

Include a specified timeframe for completing replanting requirements under the second strategy.

Explore a policy about expanding the SEC-v overlay zone to include the west slope of the West Hills.

VII. Other Land Use Policies

Matt explained how the document in the packet showing current land use policies for retention and elimination was prepared. Those policies proposed for retention may have some slight changes from how they are now written. Most of the changes are for consistency, better organization, or more clarity. Not much in the way of substantive changes has been made. Also, some policies from the comprehensive framework plan have been moved and reorganized to be in line with how we think the new comprehensive plan will be structured.

Existing policies proposed for deletion are because the policy has already been implemented, it is merely a restatement of statutes or administrative rules, or it duplicates or is very nearly the same as a policy from another plan. In all these cases, staff does not believe the policy or strategy is necessary to keep.

There was not enough time to begin a review of these policies, so these will be discussed at the next meeting. Matt asked the subcommittee members to spend some time reviewing them for the next meeting.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 pm.

East of the Sandy River Community Meeting

Columbia Grange - April 15, 2015

Local members of the Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan Citizen Advisory Committee present: Linden Burke, Catherine Dishion, Stephanie Nystrom

Members of the Multnomah County Planning Staff present: Rich Faith, Rithy Khut, Don Kienholz

Members of the Community present: Michael Alford, Barb Adams, Rod Barker, Ron Cannon, John Christensen, Karen Croston, David DeFauw, Kit Dixon, Kathie Freund, Klaus Heyne, Pat Horne, Clair Klock, Karen Schaaf, Debbie Schneider, Roy Sendek, David & Kathleen Shelman, Ericka Stork

Thank you to the Columbia Grange for letting us use this wonderful space.

Overview: The Multnomah County Comprehensive Plan is a framework which guides development in the rural parts of our County. The County is in the process of reviewing and updating the entire Comprehensive Plan for the first time since it was adopted nearly 40 years ago. The County held open houses in November, 2014 to get citizen input into the process. A 16-member Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) began meeting in January, 2015 to provide additional input. The CAC will continue meeting monthly throughout 2015, generally on the 4th Wednesday of each month in the Multnomah Building in Portland. These meetings are open to the public. More info can be found at <https://multco.us/landuse/comprehensive-plan-update>.

There are 6 members of the CAC who live east of the Sandy River. We are holding this and subsequent meetings to share information about the process and to get feedback from the community. Members of the Multnomah Planning Staff were invited and are in attendance to answer questions. The main issue to be discussed tonight, "Should Multnomah County allow Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's) in Springdale?"

Community Discussion:

- The issue of ADU's came up during the public open houses last November, though not specifically in Springdale. State law prevents ADU's in most of rural Multnomah County. The only location where ADU's might be allowable

is in the Springdale Community Center.

- The infrastructure in Springdale is already overburdened and may not support additional dwelling units. The hydrology of the area (multiple springs, high water table, etc.) may prevent additional or enlarged septic drain fields.
- Increased numbers of residential units creates a higher burden on infrastructure (schools, roads, water, etc.) but would not adequately fund necessary improvements to the infrastructure.
- An ADU would not create a separate taxable lot of record.
- Additional dwelling units, though providing some lower cost options for individuals and families wishing to live in the area, could create a less desirable neighborhood impacting the livability of the community depending on the design standards and allowable uses.
- A better use of land in the Springdale Community Center would be additional commercial businesses that would “serve the community and surrounding rural area or the travel needs of people passing through the area” as authorized under Goal 3.
- To help guide the discussion, we should review the East of Sandy River Rural Area Plan (<https://multco.us/file/27455/download>) and the Springdale Unincorporated Community Plan (<https://multco.us/file/24577/download>).
- By a show of hands, a large majority of those in attendance were not in favor of allowing ADU’s in Springdale.

Other issues that were discussed:

- How should we handle the illegal ADU’s that are in the community now?
- We need adequate signage in Springdale, especially around the school.
- Should adjacent parcels under the same ownership be allowed to separate (disaggregate) their parcels into multiple buildable lots?

Future meetings: Community members said that this meeting was useful and that they would be interested in attending additional meetings to discuss specific issues throughout the year. 3rd Wednesdays don’t work for many, so a different day is preferable.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Nystrom