



Planning Commission Minutes
Thursday, March 7, 2024 – 4:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers, 520 E. Cascade Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

Chairman: Jeff Seymour
Commissioners: Jeremy Dickman, Art Blumenkron, Rick Retzman, Tom Ries
Absent: Sarah McDougall
City Staff: Scott Woodford, Community Development Director, Matt Martin,
Principal Planner, Emme Shoup, Associate Planner
Recording Secretary: Emme Shoup, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM / ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Chairman Seymour called the workshop to order at 4:00 pm.
A quorum was established. Adoption of Agenda – March 7, 2024.
Commissioner Retzman made a motion to approve the Agenda for March 7, 2024, as proposed.
Commissioner Dickman seconded. Motion passes.

II. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Seymour nominated Jeremy Dickman as Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission. He has the experience, the temperament, and all the qualifications to be a very great Vice Chairman.
Chairman Seymour made the motion to have *Commissioner Dickman* be the Vice Chair for the duration of the term. *Commissioner Dickman* accepted the nomination.
Commission Retzman seconded. Motion passes.

III. VISITOR COMMUNICATION –

Zenia Kuzma, 914 E. Horseback Trail, Sisters, OR 97759

Ms. Kuzma wanted to address the Urban Growth Boundary in saying that it has doubled what people expected it to be, and affordable housing was the mission and the purpose. Only 30 percent of that is attributed to affordable housing, not all, and that should be made clear. What is out by the airport is in the Urban Growth Boundary and is not 30 percent. We are taking something in the Urban Growth Boundary that is not 30 percent contributing to the 260 acres and it is not a fair call.

IV. WORKSHOP – TA 24-01

A. Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial (TC) Zone District – Sisters Development Code Text Amendments – City File TA 24-01 (Exhibit A).

Planner Martin stated that this workshop is to prepare for the public hearing before the Planning Commission on March 21, 2024. The workshop is for informational purposes only and is not a forum for deliberating the merits of the proposal, but questions may be asked of staff by the Planning Commission for clarification on the proposal.

The Community Development Department received an application proposing text amendments to Chapters 1.3 and 2.12 of the Sisters Development Code (File TA 24-01). The purpose of this workshop is to introduce the proposal to the Planning Commission in preparation for a public hearing on March 21, 2024. The staff reports include the following: Application, Location, Applicable Criteria, District History and Purpose, Subsequent Land Use Review and Applicable Standards, Project Record, and Next Steps.

The Properties:

The entirety of Lot # 1: 69013 Camp Polk Rd.

A portion of Lot # 2: 575 E. Sun Ranch Drive; Lot # 3: Unaddressed.

District Area: +/-6.2 Acres

District History:

Ordinances 366/367 adopted April 26, 2007

Created Zone Districts:

Sun Ranch Residential District, Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial District, North Sisters Business Park.

District Purpose (Current):

- Establish landmark lodging, dining, and recreation destinations and gathering places for business travelers, tourists, and the residents of the area.
- For commercial properties in transition areas between residential, light industrial, and commercial uses.
- Commercial uses to complement adjacent mixed-use light industrial and residential districts.
- Provide flexibility for expansion of lodging facilities and improve accessory components of the commercial lodging establishment such as meeting facilities, restaurant, bar, neighborhood market, etc.
- The intent of the original concentration of districts was to provide employment land within the Business Park, residential lands for housing units in close proximity in conjunction with employees that work within the Business District and create a smaller industrial pocket that provided commercial opportunities such as dining, retail, and tourist accommodations with limited commercial opportunities rather than the proceeding general commercial district that was the zone designation of this area.
- It would have afforded the wide variety of commercial uses that are allowed in the highway commercial or downtown commercial.

Proposal:

- Define the term “Lodging Establishment” in Chapter 1.3
- Update the Purpose Statement in Chapter 2.12.
- Add permitted uses including lodging establishment, hostel, RV park including caretaker’s residence, and park. Lodging Facilities is an allowed use but not defined in the code. It remains ambiguous so while the intent was to allow a hotel as a lodging facility, that ambiguity of that term can leave room for interpretation.

- Remove many listed uses that qualify as “Accessory Uses”. Examples of this include saunas, laundry establishments focusing on providing for the needs of guests, and multi-use trails and paths.
- Remove special use standards for neighborhood markets, laundry establishments, and cottages.
- Remove the 1900s Rural Farm/Ranch House design theme. Western Frontier Architectural Design Theme would apply.
- Changes to the setback requirements.
- Format Chapter 2.12 for consistency with most district chapters of the Sisters Development Code (SDC).

Future Land Use Review – Land Use is subject to the applicable review process and development standards of the SDC:

- Chapter 4.2: Site Plan Review. Requires review of adequacy of facilities, traffic safety and circulation (vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian), noise and visual buffering, and conformance with other applicable standards (public works, building, fire, etc.).
- Chapter 3: Design Standards. Requires review of access and circulation (vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian), parking, (vehicle, bicycle), landscaping, and public improvements.
- RV Park: Subject to the special use standards of SDC 2.15.1700 that include standards for internal roadways, trash receptacles, parking, restrooms, and screening.

Commissioner Retzman asked if defining the term “lodging establishment” will affect the entire city and not just this small district.

Planner Martin stated that is correct and it would be applicable to all aspects of the city or the Development Code. We may have this encompassing definition of lodging establishments would not mean that if this were adopted that say in the downtown commercial district that allows for a hotel that would not supersede and prohibit a hotel but would be complementary at this point.

Commissioner Blumenkron asked for clarification when saying RV Park, is there going to be a further definition of that and is it for overnight stay, or like the one across from Five Pine where people can stay there for years.

Planner Martin stated that within the code, there is a definition of recreational vehicle or RV Park, and specific use standards for RV Parks, but neither one with definitions for the specific use standards have a limitation or cap on the duration of stay.

Director Woodford stated that in the definitions it is designated and meant for temporary use but does not define what the temporary use means.

Planner Martin stated that this is part of the review process and recommendation that you provide forward.

Commissioner Ries asked if some of the changes are for the entire city and if some of the changes are just for Tourist Commercial.

Planner Martin stated that the one change that is entire city wide is the definition of “Lodging Establishment” where the others are specific to the Tourist Commercial District.

Chairman Seymour asked if in the current Tourist Commercial District are RV Parks allowed in that zone. What is the current zone that does allow RV Parks?

Planner Martin stated no, and that would be an additional use that is being contemplated. What is allowed now is in the Highway Commercial District, and the Open Space Zoned District.

Commissioner Ries asked when it talks about defining “Lodging Establishments”, if understanding it correctly, would there then be a definition that this is the definition of a hotel, this is the definition of a motel, this is the definition of a Bed and Breakfast, and definition of an RV Park, and what qualifies it to be one of those. If it calls to define Lodging Establishments and RV Park, then becomes a Lodging Establishment and would we have criteria for being an RV Park.

Planner Martin stated that a hotel or motel are not defined in the Sisters Development Code currently. Whereas an RV Park and Bed and Breakfast have specifically defined terms. That is when we rely on general definitions and look at the dictionary for that. The Lodging Establishment does not incorporate an RV Park as part of the definition. The RV Park has a separate definition and specific criteria for RV Parks outside of the Tourist Commercial District so anywhere that it is allowed, it would be subject to those specific use standards.

Planner Martin stated that for most land uses that are identified in this district, and many of the commercial uses, most but not all commercial uses are subject to land use review. If this proposal is approved and adopted by the City Council, there will be a subsequent land use review required. As part of that review, we are looking for compliance with not only the district standards, but also the Site Plan Review standards that incorporate findings that there is adequacy of the public facilities, transportation, circulation of vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, noise, visual impacts, etc. Also design standards that incorporate landscaping, recreation, minimum parking and bicycle parking standards and other public improvements. Because the RV Park is prominent and has been identified publicly as a potential use on the property, above and beyond those general Site Plan and Design Standards that there are specific use standards that apply to RV Parks that consider internal circulation, roadways, the provision of trash receptacles, adequacy of parking, restrooms, and screening of the RV Park itself.

Next Steps:

- March 21, 2024 – Planning Commission Public Hearing.
- The staff report will be available no less than seven (7) days prior to the hearing.
- At the conclusion of the hearing, the Planning Commission will provide a recommendation for consideration by the City Council.
- TBD – City Council Public Hearing. The City Council will consider the Planning Commissions recommendation and all other record submittals at a hearing.
- At the conclusion of the hearing, the City Council will make a final decision.

Director Woodford stated that for the benefit of the public who may be here and interested in the subject, this is just a work session, intended entirely to be informational only, and just questions for clarification by the Planning Commission to the staff to make sure they understand the proposal and can adequately review it when it comes back to the public

hearing on March 21, 2024, and is not the intent of this forum to be an opportunity to start deliberating on the merits of the proposal. It is up to the Chair whether we want to entertain any public comment on it because of not wanting to discuss the merits of the case at this point, and knowing that there will be plenty of opportunity both at the public hearing on the 21st and with City Council for public comments, etc.

Director Woodford stated that he wanted to address Commissioner Blumenkron's question about the Sister's RV Park, what the differences might be, and why it looks like an RV Park but is long-term. It is residential zoning, and it was looked at differently through the land use process and the allowance for those spaces to be used on a long-term basis was built into the approval because of what the use was before it was annexed, and part of the underlying zoning – residential as opposed to this site which is Tourist Commercial which would not allow long-term tendency. Although, the definition of temporary could be disputed in the definitions of the code.

Commissioner Ries asked about the combination of the three (3) different lots – one of the lots is the northeastern lot and does that include the building that now has the distillery in it.

Planner Martin stated that the distillery is located within the Tourist Commercial District and reviewed as an allowed use. The facility is located within the district and within the southern portion of that lot and within Lot # 2.

Commissioner Dickman asked with there was a conflict or contradiction in the Auto-Dependent Uses are prohibited, but we are going to allow recreational vehicles uses in that zone.

Planner Martin stated that it is for consideration by the Commission and from staff's opinion – Auto Dependent Uses are those of the parking of vehicles and any use that incorporates people coming to their site with a vehicle, and could be construed that it is Auto-Dependent because of scale, but staff's opinion that Auto-Dependent are those uses that are designed for solely the use of vehicles to access that business, drive thru – auto mechanic, gas station, etc. The sole reason for a vehicle to come to the site is not any different than a hotel itself with overnight accommodation driving a vehicle there to be here temporarily.

Planner Martin stated that we have created a website specific to this project incorporated in the City of Sisters website. The address is included in the presentation but being a lengthy address wanted to note to go under the subpage under Community Development and Notable Projects where you will find a description of the project, a schedule, and the entirety of the record.

Chairman Seymour stated that he is concerned about the process here and asked Planner Martin to put the proposal back up on the screen. He stated that in his time of being on the Commission, he has never experienced an applicant that is not the City of Sisters initiating code changes. He is not sure how he feels about that and typically the path by which the applicant accomplishes their project if the land they currently want to do their project on is not allowing for their intended use, but there is a different zone that allows for that – you typically go through a zone change rather than changing the rules. That is historically the way it has been done.

Chairman Seymour stated that it is not clear to him what we are changing the language to and is somewhat vague at this point. Historically, in the work sessions, staff have gotten feedback from us, and the language is then created, and brought to the Planning Commission in a work session where we can discuss it additionally, and once there is consensus, it is brought to a hearing. It feels like this is somewhat rushed and concerned that we are not giving the changes that are being proposed enough scrutiny. There are enough questions and is not in favor of having this get pushed to the next meeting as a hearing. It warrants other code changes that we made the last time around, and that took time, and as a result we probably have the best product put through. It is in the public's best interest and there should be a defined process to go about this. Not saying that this is wrong or bad, just saying that this is not the traditional way that has been done in the past and it warrants discussion.

Commissioner Dickman stated that he agrees that there is a fine distinction between changing a zone and changing the definition of a zone in the code. If changing a particular parcel to a different zone, is at least a zone that we are familiar with because it is a zone in the city, and changing the wording in that zone and not only affecting that zone and parcel and other parcels that are zoned that way, we have to consider the impact of future developments within that zone and the city allowing these changes.

Commissioner Retzman stated that this is the only parcel that has 6.2 acres and part of the city that is zoned like this. It is a unique zone, and the only thing that is changing is the "Lodging Establishment" that is going to be affected in the code, but the rest of what is being talked about is the 6.2 acres in that unique zone. Lodging is not an RV Park and is a separate thing. Lodging Establishments – hotels, motels, hostels, bed and breakfasts, etc., and there is a definition in the packet that says any building that houses somebody overnight to go back and read that definition again.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that this speaks to wanting to see and spending more time on the details before we push forward.

Commissioner Dickman asked if it is harder to apply for a zone change than to apply more changes to the code. He is wondering if we are setting a precedence by creating a specific zone which only exists for these 6.2 acres, etc.

Commissioner Retzman stated that zone is already there, and we are talking about rewording some of that zone and a lot of it was to cleanup that language, so it matched better with the city codes. A lot of it is to address the alignment with our current code.

Director Woodford stated that this is an opportunity to clean up the unique format in the code and make it flow like the other zone districts is one component, but not the primary thrust of it.

Planner Martin stated that realizing that it is a unique and rather rare process, acknowledging that the Sun Ranch District that were highlighted – the Tourist Commercial the residential district as well as the North Sisters Business Park where an applicant-initiated project and we do have other precedence of text amendments that were applicant initiated. We need to recognize that this is an applicant bringing these forward instead of city staff bringing forward amendments for consideration where we have that extensive process of identifying and

refining the criteria and standards, but rather an evaluation of an applicant's proposal to the changes.

Director Woodford stated that when considering a rezone, you also need to consider that you are opening it up to a whole host of other uses that may not be appropriate for this location. This is one reason for considering a proposal for a text amendment instead – it is not unusual, but not unprecedented in his experience to see an applicant bring forward a text amendment that is under consideration – it may not get approved, but often times these things can make sense and result in an oversight, or a change in circumstances and the Planning Commission or City Council may want to consider in terms of refinement to a particular zone district standards or allowed uses.

Director Woodford stated that we can certainly take more time and hold as many work sessions as possible that are needed. We do not want to rush this forward if the Commission is not ready to take this forward. It does get challenging and is different than a city initiated one where there is more free-form and the ability to discuss it more before going to public hearing.

Chairman Seymour stated that the underlying fact that we are looking to change the code, there are more similarities than differences and the same amount of scrutiny should be had. Just because it is a private applicant versus a municipal applicant, it doesn't change the fact that the code is looking to be changed. He would like to see concrete language but feels strongly that there needs to be additional review in a work session.

Chairman Seymour stated that when the city is the applicant that is what happens, and when it comes to the code regardless of who the applicant is – he believes this should be consistent. We are being asked to make a recommendation to change the code that potentially has ramifications that we cannot even consider right now. We do not know what could potentially happen and this warrants us to take a good hard look at it.

Planner Martin asked if there was an interest in walking through the scope of the changes in more detail at work sessions to understand that more. He stated that he will take responsibility for establishing the format of tonight's work session and providing a general overview instead of outlining the details of what is being proposed in the application.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that looking at each code change and discussing it in a work session first is a good idea.

Planner Martin stated that concerned about discussions because that could be construed as deliberations prior to a public hearing.

Director Woodford stated that those discussions could happen if you are comfortable enough to take it to a public hearing and that presents the opportunity to hear the public comments, hear the applicant's presentation, take it all in, and then deliberate through that process if you need more time and continue it. Because it is applicant initiated, it only applies to a few lots and puts it in the quasi-judicial environment where it should be done in a public hearing format. In hearing from our legal counsel at the last meeting in terms of how we might be

treating this legislative amendment different than we would one that applies city wide given that it only applies to three (3) parcels.

Planner Martin stated that staff did acknowledge or identified that the original application materials did not appear to be consistent between the track changes version and the final clean version. Staff did reach out to the applicant, and they have since supplemented the application and provided a printed copy as well as an electronic copy to the Commission of the updated version which is consistent from the track changes to the clean. The materials that have been provided to you today at this meeting is the applicant's effort to clarify and provide consistent exhibits.

Commissioner Dickman asked for clarification about the setbacks changing from a Barclay Dr. or Camp Polk Rd a 20-ft. setback to no setback.

Planner Martin stated that is changing to no side or rear setback, however, front yard setbacks are those drawn from those lot lines adjacent to streets.

Chairman Seymour opened the work session up to public comments, there will be no questions asked of the Commissioners, but we are here to listen.

David Bachtel, 1310 W. Hill Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Bachtel stated that with respect to confusion about the definitions, he thinks it is useful to look at the Development Code and paragraph 1.3.100 says 'meaning of words generally' Websters Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, etc. sets the definitions and if it is defined there, there is no need to redefine it again unless the definition is different than what is in Websters. Websters does define hotels, Websters does define motels, you have defined a recreational vehicle park which is in your definition as "two or more recreational vehicles located on one (1) lot and as permitted by the underlying zoning district. That is what it is – maybe looking at the zoning rules maybe it is defined differently there but in terms of what is in the Development Code – that is what it is.

Mr. Bachtel stated that with respect to lodging, there is an implication that RV's are the same as lodging, and in doing some research there is a fundamental difference between lodging and RV's. Lodging includes a structure with a room and associated with that are people coming, and staying for a short amount of time and they leave, maids, service involved in changing bedding, etc. Hostels can provide breakfast only, hotels can provide breakfast, lunch, etc. None of these things are consistent with an RV Park. He would like for the Commission to keep that in mind when looking at this – they are trying to create an equivalency between hotels, motels, cottages, lodging establishments, and an RV – they are not the same and very, very much different.

Mr. Bachtel stated that he is hearing that we need to update the city code because of all the changes in the businesses, etc. There was a nice study that they did back in July of 2021 which happens to be right in the middle of the pandemic when everybody was locked down. The only way to go anywhere is in an RV. At that point in time, there was a huge increase in the sales of RV's. A couple years later, RV sales are down about 43 percent. The idea that the entire world is shifting to RV's that they are presenting in the packet is a little bit self-servicing

and done by an RV advisory group. All the things that they can do to that property add value to them – to us, we do not get any of that. There are plenty of definitions that are perfectly adequate, and they are trying to get you to open a can of worms, etc.

Tom Newman, 68996 Camp Polk Rd., Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Newman stated that he lives directly across from that Tourists Commercial zone and does not want an RV Park directly across the street from his house. It is 515 feet from his front door to that property line. It is a loose definition of an RV Park to him and looking at the plan published in the Nugget Newspaper, he sees 28 van stalls compared to 14 actual RV stalls. The vans outnumber the RV's 2-1 and seeing 10 airstream stalls, and will they be exclusively for airstreams, or are there going to be any bumper pull travel trailers allowed to park there. He asked if there would be pop-up campers with canvas walls, small, classy motorhomes, being held only for vans or airstreams while others may be turned away. He addressed light pollution where Sisters has a Dark Skies Ordinance and hopefully that RV Park will be held to those standards like every other business in town where they use LED lights, etc.

Mr. Newman asked if there will be someone on site for 24 hours to enforce the lights and noise, and it is not a good idea to mix recreational with residential. He talked about the noise pollution where those vans and RV are rolling tin cans once the temperature hits about 65 degrees on a sunny day. They bake in the sun and potentially 44 RV's running air conditioners and generators all day to keep cool. Central Oregon is hot and sunny in the summertime. Also, the stage and what it is going to be used for, security 24/7 and what are the rules these people will have to follow, what are the rules for the full RV hookup and dumping, background checks, timeline on seasonal RV use, food trucks, etc.

Zenia Kuzma, 914 E. Horseback Trail, Sisters, OR 97759

Ms. Kuzma asked about the property being three (3) lots and that is a historic home and fits into historic designation. If it does, it is a historic property and there are some rules about historic property if not local, but State.

Elise Wolf, 69700 Lake Dr., Sisters, OR 97759

Ms. Wolf stated that in looking at what this application is trying to do seems to attempt to change rules and definitions rather than requesting zone changes which she feels is inappropriate because it seems to skirt the usual process of land use changing. That would be her biggest comment for right now, but there is nothing but negative commentary about whether or not anyone wants an RV Park in the middle of Sisters city, but there are no RV Parks allowed in that zone right now, so that would also need to be changed. It seems like a not very forthright attempt to change rules and zones without going through the normal process which would require more public comment and more evaluation. It is a historic building and a shame that Sisters cannot buy that property and turn it into a museum, or something more appropriate for a building that is a part of our heritage.

Jon Skidmore, 211 NW Wilmington Ave, Bend, OR on behalf of the applicant, Lake House Inn, LLC.

Mr. Skidmore stated that he wanted to address a few items that were raised and save most of the conversation for a public hearing at a future date. It is not the old Conklin Bed and Breakfast, it is not a historic structure, and not on the Historic Registry. He wanted to address some of the history and why we are doing a text amendment versus a zone change. Eighteen years ago, he worked with the ownership that did the entire Sun Ranch Master Plan – we worked with the County and the City to bring this particular property into the city limits since it was in the Deschutes County at that point in time. The idea was that Sun Ranch was to create a mixed-use community that was reliant on the various components of it. The residential district on the north portion where the intent that people could live there and work in the boutique industrial park. To the point of amending specific zoning districts, we created all those zoning districts up there and he wrote most of them. We took the Light Industrial District and x-out specific uses because we were concerned about the impact of the neighbors.

Mr. Skidmore stated that we were also concerned about the cohesive nature of the development. We did not want the smokestacks in the industrial area because we wanted residential, and we wanted commercial. When we came into the city through a UGB expansion process, the initial zoning that was put on the property was a general Highway Commercial District and that would peddle out RV Parks. What we did at that point in time was to tailor the commercial zoning district to a vision that the developer had back in 2005 and Sisters was in a much different place. Five Pine did not have any cabins yet, no lodging establishments that were in place and we focused on taking the old structure, converting that into a restaurant, potential additional lodging facilities, and cottages that would be around the pond. A lot has happened since 2005, a great recession, a pandemic, things have changed, and Sisters have doubled in size and more since then. We have seen a very ample supply of traditional lodging facilities, cabins, etc.

Mr. Skidmore stated that the owner contacted him about dusting off the old Tourist Commercial zone and very tailored to this idea of 30 cabins around the pond. We talked about the lodging facilities use in the Tourist Commercial zone with staff and thought that would include the ability to do an RV Park. Staff informed us that the interpretation we make is different and why not go through a text amendment process and clean up the zoning districts. What we need to keep in mind moving forward is that the ownership of 4.6 acres and this is not going to be a 4.6-acre RV Park. Another item that keeps coming up is that it is not going to be a manufactured home park, not a trailer park, but an RV Park with length of stay limits most likely of 30 days.

Mr. Skidmore stated that the property itself, we wanted to make some uses that we listed in the old Tourist Commercial zone consistent with what there are in other zones throughout the city. An example would be eating and drinking establishments – it was taking a lot of these concepts and very intentional at the time with a vision of wanting to come in a clean this up to allow the flexibility to match what there is in other commercial zones, etc. We were trying to follow what is allowed in other zones. In terms of the RV Park, it is not going to be a 4.6-acre RV Park there. There is a very intentional mixed-use approach to this by having some RV spaces, more traditional lodging establishments like cabins, or more traditional hotel, a hostel, eating and drinking establishments – we added a park use, a pickle ball court, gathering space

for the City of Sisters, etc. We need to be cognoscente of the changing reality in terms of tourism, and travel – like it or not sprinter vans and RVs are a growing sector of tourism and wanting to provide flexibility so that Sisters can meet the demand of the traveling public. The RV concept addresses the needs for people wanting to stay here in Sisters, but again we understand this is a mix-use concept we are moving forward with, and you will not see wall to wall RVs, but we need to get through this conversation on what uses are permitted before we would come back with any specific application. We are willing to talk and negotiate on the various types of uses potentially putting in additional sideboards so that we meet the intent of not having a more traditional commercial zoning district impact on the neighbors.

V. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Director Woodford asked if it is the will of the Commission to do another work session, and the point of that would be to continue clarification of what the proposal is, and not an intention to deliberate. Or move into the public hearing format where you could have more of the public comments, close the public hearing, have that deliberation, talk about the merits of the proposal, and refine it as you move forward. We want to come out of this with the Commission preferred direction on that to help us out.

Commissioner Dickman stated that he agrees with Chairman Seymour in that he would like to see a more definitive ‘what is in and what is out’ kind of summary of the code that is changing and maybe another work session might be worth that.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that if we have the public hearing with the thought that it may be continued once some of these details get ironed out. The tricky part is not being able to discuss the merits at the same time of going through the definitions.

Commissioner Retzman asked if another work session is going to give us anything additional than what we have in the packet tonight.

Planner Martin stated that what would be in addition would be a detailed outline and presentation and discussion on the line by line-item discussion. Also, any additional record submittals that come in between now and then.

Chairman Seymour stated that we are going to get the detailed application proposal at the public hearing and have an opportunity to ask questions then and deliberate at that point in time. It could be continued if we need more deliberation, it could go to a vote, and potentially be denied and that is not the way the applicant wants to go. If this was anything but code changes, he would be fine with having it go to a public hearing. He stated that he personally needs time to think it through and think about what the potential consequences are of changing the language and be able to share that in a less formal setting where the procedure is not so tight. He would rather be safe than sorry, and we owe it to the public to scrutinize it at the highest level.

Planner Martin asked if it is the pleasure of the Commission to have another work session, we can accommodate that and work through our procedures to make sure we are on track with the appropriate notices regarding the hearing and formal steps.

Chairman Seymour stated that the consensus is to have another work session.

Director Woodford stated that with Council approval next Wednesday, we are looking at a kickoff in late March of that project for the Urban Growth Boundary that is anticipated based on the consultant's proposal and would last through September 2025. There will be kickoff meetings, websites, public outreach opportunities, and is a very prescribed process from the State and will be doing a lot of education in the community about what it all means, etc. This is a one-time thing, and you have criteria that you need to prove and meet to take advantage of this. There was public comment and about 30 percent of affordable housing requirement and a stipulation that goes along with that process.

Director Woodford stated that the next meeting will be on Thursday, March 21, 2024, whether it will be a public hearing or a work session, we will get back to the Commission once those details have been worked out.

Commissioner Ries asked about a handout that was given to the Commission on Table 2.12.2 the second page where 'Landscaping' is a minimum of 10 percent gross site area shall be landscaped – is that a change or what is our system right now.

Planner Martin stated that it is a minimum of 10 percent of the gross site area and incorporating it into a table format.

VI. ADJOURN

Chairman Seymour adjourned the meeting at 5:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary

