



Planning Commission Minutes
Thursday, May 16, 2024 – 5:30 PM
City Hall Council Chambers, 520 E. Cascade Avenue, Sisters, OR 97759

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

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

Chairman Seymour called the public hearing to order at 5:30 pm.

A warm welcome to Daryl Tewalt who recently joined the Planning Commission.

A quorum was established. Adoption of Agenda – May 16, 2024.

Commissioner McDougall made a motion to approve the Agenda for May 16, 2024, as proposed.

Commissioner Dickman seconded. Motion passes.

II. VISITOR COMMUNICATION – None

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 1, 2024, and February 15, 2024.

Commissioner Ries made a motion to approve the minutes for February 1, 2024, and February 15, 2024, as presented.

Commissioner McDougall seconded the motion. Motion passes.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

Project Name: Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial Zone District Text Amendments
File Number(s): City File # TA 24-01
Applicant: Ernie Larrabee – Lake House Inn, LLC
Request: Text Amendments to the Sisters Development Code Chapter 1.3 – Definitions and Chapter 2.12 – Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial District. The purpose is to expand and clarify the types of uses allowed in the Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial District and other edits for consistency with the Sisters Development Code.

Chairman Seymour asked the Planning Commission if they had any conflicts of interest, bias, or ex-parte contact.

Commissioner Tewalt stated that he would step down for this hearing since he is new to the Planning Commission and does not have enough information to participate in the hearing.

Commissioner McDougall – None and plans to participate.

Commissioner Blumenkron – None and plans to participate.

Vice Chairman Dickman – None and plans to participate.

Commissioner Ries – None and plans to participate.

Commissioner Retzman – None and plans to participate.

Chairman Seymour – None and plans to participate.

Chairman Seymour asked if anyone in the audience would like to challenge the ability of any Commissioner to hear this matter.

Mark Dickens, 133 E. Black Crater Ave., Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Dickens stated that as he understands it Mr. Blumenkron owns property in Sun Ranch – multiple commercial buildings. It seems that there could be a conflict because the value of the property with those buildings and with additional development in that park would increase the value of the property. There are retail tenants that pay rent so any increased development in that corner of the area on Barclay would increase traffic, business, etc., and would have a direct impact on the building. He feels that is a potential conflict of interest.

Chairman Seymour asked Commissioner Blumenkron if he feels he can without bias, or conflict to hear the proceeding's tonight and render an appropriate decision.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated yes, he does.

Chairman Seymour asked for staff to come forward and present the staff report.

Planner Martin stated that as introduced and before you are some text amendments to Chapter 2.12 Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial District. He wanted to emphasize that these are proposed amendments to the Sisters Development Code, and no specific development proposal is before you tonight. These are changes to the language of the code that would facilitate any future development of the properties within the Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial District. Any subsequent development would be subject to a separate land use review process subject to the applicable review criteria and review process at the time of that application.

There have been some changes to the proposal and one specific aspect of it is there are no longer any proposed changes to Chapter 1.3, the definitions section. The applicant originally proposed a new definition to the code for Lodging Establishments and the proposal has since been revised and removed from consideration.

Planner Martin stated that this district is located at the northwest corner of Barclay Dr. and Camp Polk Rd. It encompasses a little over 6 acres and includes the entirety of one parcel and portions of two other parcels. It is bound by light industrial district properties to the west and North Sisters Business Park properties to the north and northwest, rural residential properties located outside the city limits to the east, and Sisters Eagle Air Airport is located to the northeast of the property and to the south is property zoned downtown commercial.

Proposal:

- Amendments to the Development Code Chapter 2.12
- Expand and clarify the types of uses allowed in the Tourist Commercial District (TC).
- Amend the development standards.
- Note:
“Lodging Establishment” Definition addition to Chapter 1.3 removed from the proposal.

Procedural Background:

- Original Public Hearing on April 18, 2024.
- Based on the Outcome of Original Hearing, the Applicant has Revised the Proposal.
- Removed Proposed Definition of “Lodging Establishment”.
- Limited amendment to Purpose Statement.
- Removed Reformatting and Most Non-Substantive Amendments.
- Added Special Use Standards for Neighborhood Market, Retail Sales Establishment, RV Park, and Lodging Facility.

Substantive Amendments:

Section 2.12.100 – Purpose

Proposed Change – Remove reference to rural ranch design standards.

Staff Comments – The amendment is warranted to reflect the removal of the 1900’s rural ranch design standards.

Section 2.12.300 – Permitted Uses

Proposed Change – Remove Cottages.

Staff Comment – Would be permitted as “Lodging Facility”.

Proposed Change – Add Retail sales establishment.

Staff Comment – Includes size limit under special use standards.

Proposed Change – Add Hostel

Staff Comment – Specifically defined lodging type of use.

Proposed Change – Add RV Park, including Caretaker’s Quarters.

Staff Comment – TC District specific special use standards apply along with existing specific use standards for any RV Parks (2.15.1700).

Section 2.12.600 – Setbacks and Buffering.

Proposed Change – Reduce Setback from Barclay Drive/Camp Polk Road from 20 feet to 10 feet.

Staff Comment – Proposed 10-foot street side setback same as other Commercial Districts.

Section 2.12.1000 – Special Standards for Certain Uses

Proposed Change – Neighborhood Market

- Remove reference to Laundry Establishment.
- Remove 50-foot setback from Camp Polk Road and Barclay Drive.
- Apply 1,000 square foot limit to use, not structures.

Staff Comments – Proposed 10-foot street setback would apply.

- Prevents larger scale markets.

Proposed Change – Retail Sales Establishment.

- Apply 1,000 square foot limit to use.

Staff Comment – Prevents larger scale retail uses and multiple smaller tenant spaces.

Section 2.12.1000 – Special Standards for Certain Uses

Proposed Change – RV Park

- Maximum stay in an RV space is 30 days in any 90-day period.
- A maximum of 65 percent of the gross area of any property in the TC District shall be developed for RV Park use.
- At least two (2) amenities shall be provided and occupy at least 10,000 square feet combined.

Staff Comment – the proposed special use standards will prevent long-term, residential occupancy of an RV, except for that of a caretaker.

- The maximum area will limit the overall development footprint on a property.
- The requirement of amenities will ensure variety use and visual aesthetic within the development beyond RV pads and minimum development standards.

Proposed Change – Lodging Facility Definition

- New special standards section added and includes definition of “Lodging Facility”.

Staff Comment – This definition is only applicable to the TC District and is intended to provide for variety and flexibility of overnight accommodation.

Section 2.12.1100 – Design Standards

Proposed Change – Remove the 1900’s Rural Farm/Ranch House Design Standards.

Staff Comment – 1880’s Western Frontier Design Standards would apply.

Next Steps:

At the conclusion of the testimony, the Planning Commission can consider the following options:

- Continue the hearing to a date certain.
- Close the hearing and leave the written record open to a date certain.
- Close the hearing and set a date for deliberations, or
- Close the hearing and commence deliberations.

Commission Recommendation:

The Planning Commission recommendation options to consider:

- Approve as Drafted
- Approve Portions as Drafted
- Approve with Amendments
- Deny as Drafted

The task before the Planning Commission is to provide a recommendation to the City Council at a subsequent public hearing where additional public testimony and opportunities for that will be provided and accommodated resulting in a final decision by the City Council with the adoption of an ordinance.

Chairman Seymour asked if there has been additional correspondence other than those included with the agenda materials.

Planner Martin stated that there has been additional correspondence – they were emailed previously to the Commission up until earlier this afternoon and printed hard copies have been provided. There have been seven (7) additional submittals since the meeting packet was issued beginning with May 14th – Stephens’ email, May 16th – Barnes email, May 16th – Bergstrom email, May 16th – Evans email, May 16th – Humpal email, May 16th – Livsey email, and May 16th – Phillips email.

Commissioner Blumenkron asked for clarification on the Lodging Establishment definition and would that apply throughout Sisters.

Planner Martin stated that the original Lodging Establishment definition that was proposed has been removed from consideration. That would only apply to the Tourists Commercial District.

Commissioner Ries stated that he is confused on the footprint of the neighborhood market. He asked if it could be bigger than 1,000 feet or smaller than 1,000 feet based on projects around it.

Planner Martin stated that he wanted to acknowledge that it is a maximum of 1,000 square feet for that neighborhood market on the property. Originally, the language spoke to structures housing neighborhood markets shall not exceed 1,000 square feet excluding storerooms. He stated that he wanted to get away from the structures reference and apply it to the use itself and not be confused that multiple structures could be established and house multiple markets on the property.

Commissioner Ries asked for clarification on the 1,000 square foot retail – could that be combined in a 2,000 square foot building.

Planner Martin said yes.

Chairman Seymour asked for the applicant to come forward and give their presentation.

Jon Skidmore, on behalf of Lake House LLC.

Mr. Skidmore stated that their clients wanted to express their continued appreciation for staff and the Planning Commissions attention to this, and wanted to add and demonstrate active listening, we heard the comments, and with this latest addendum tried to address several concerns that were raised. Some of the highlighted changes:

- The maximum length of stay in the RV Park.
- Limit the area on which an RV could be sited.
- RV Park would include the spaces, the circulation, bathroom, and kitchen facilities, etc.
- The 65 percent limit assures there would be a smaller RV Park.
- The boutique RV Park concept, mixed-use component with high aesthetic value and higher set of amenities provided with other commercial uses such as the taphouse, restaurant, food carts, etc.
- Two amenities to be developed with the RV Park – small dog park, sports court, small stage, etc.
- Eating and drinking establishments, setbacks, square footage limitations, neighborhood market and retail establishment.
- Lodging Facility – define it specifically for the Tourist Commercial District.

- Hostel Use and additional regulations.

Adam Smith, 360 SW Bond St., Bend, OR 97702

Mr. Smith stated that the product in front of the Commission, the changes that have been made since the last hearing are a product of several different things. We listened, we tried to understand and hear what the Planning Commission was telling us, the need to simplify, the need to clarify the intent, and move away from some of the housekeeping amendments that were modeling what we are trying to accomplish for our clients. There was a collaboration with staff, and we did not work in isolation. We spent a lot of time working with both our clients understanding the core concepts trying to capture, working with County staff to make sure that still worked with the broader vision of the code and how this would work with other chapters on this site. Lastly, we feel that we have put forward, we have not deviated, and are honoring the original intent of this unique Tourist Commercial District. He encouraged the Commission to go back and review the purpose statement and ask for a key consideration whether or not what they are proposing is still honoring that original intent. We feel that it is but offer that to the Planning Commission for your consideration.

Mr. Skidmore stated that Sisters has a good track record of local entrepreneur's taking chances on projects, working with the city to massage development code language such as Five Pine, Sun Ranch, and the Barn are great examples of folks who have worked with the city and created very unique, attractive, and successful businesses that have contributed to the culture of Sisters and help create a sense of place here and this is just one more of those opportunities.

Chairman Seymour opened the public testimony portion of the hearing. He wanted to remind the Commission and the audience that tonight we are not voting whether an RV Park is going to happen. We are voting on the language to be changed in the Development Code.

Steven King, 15185 Windigo Trail, Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. King stated that he wanted to make three (3) points – first by some history of moving here 30 years ago and is originally from England. His next-door neighbor's name was Ted Eady. Ted Eady purchased the Barclay Ranch. From people pestering him, he managed to turn that from a ranch into commercial – he said that he turned it from dollars per acre to dollars per foot. Since that time there has been a Post Office, a Police Station, Light Industrial, and Storage, and the only thing that was not envisioned back in that day were houses, which was the exception. After conversations with Mr. Eady, he never mentioned that RVs were going to be excluded from this commercial zoning. Second, the Barclay Family was very important to this town – that building is up there with the School House and the Saloon. According to Mr. Larrabee that original building will get put back together at least in some way functionally and not get destroyed where it has almost completely deteriorated at this point. Lastly, what happens if this is turned down – someone else will come along and purchase it, and the only way to make it work is to level it just like the place behind Takotas, or the Woodlands, or any high-density new developments, etc.

Mike Whitlatch, 70094 Appaloosa Drive, Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Whitlatch stated that he owns and operates Sisters Heating and Air. He is here tonight to discuss the proposal for a high-end boutique style RV Park with special amenities. Several key points that were not reviewed by this committee such as higher spending tourists, high end RV Parks attract tourists with higher disposable incomes who spend more on dining, shopping, and recreational activities. Extended stays, premium amenities, and services encourage longer stays leading to more consistent economic contributions. Direct Employment - The RV Park would need staff for maintenance, guest services, housekeeping, and administration. Indirect Employment – increase tourism creates demand for more jobs and local businesses that support the park and the guests. He discussed partnership opportunities, collaboration between the RV Park and local businesses can drive mutual growth. Supply chain impacts, the RV Park would require regular supplies of food, cleaning products, landscaping services, etc. Developing the RV Park would lead to improvements in local infrastructure such as roads, utilities, and public services. Increased property values – enhanced amenities with improved infrastructure can raise property values in the surrounding areas. Eco Friendly Investments – high end RV Parks can often incorporate sustainable practices that can set a standard for local businesses. Environmental Awareness – attracting eco conscience tourists can foster a great appreciation for the preservation of natural resources. Increased Participation – RV Park guests would likely participate in local events boosting attendance and revenue. The RV Park could host its own events, drawing more visitors to the area. Repeat visits and loyalty – high satisfaction rates from a well-managed RV Park can lead to repeat visitors and long-term loyalty. The benefits of a high-end RV Park and amenities could significantly contribute to the prosperity and development of Sisters, OR.

Jennifer Haken, 200 W. Cascade Ave., P.O. Box 1611, Sisters, OR 97759

Ms. Haken stated that they own the Garden of Eden in town. Rodeo weekend will be 27 years for us there. In the beginning, there was an RV Park where Ray's is now and because that is not there, we get customers constantly mentioning that they wished they had a decent RV Park in town where they could park, walk, shop, go to the restaurants, go to the bars, etc. and not have to drive their big vehicle into town and take up a lot of parking. Their customers want to have a boutique and something higher scale. Over 25 years, we have heard our customers say how much they miss the old place.

Charlie Stevens, 1086 W. Collier Glacier Dr., Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Stevens stated that there are many comments on the record from the community group, but he will focus on one thing – the RV Park addition as a permitted use in that zone. If this is being approved as an RV Park in this place, it is a campground in the middle of a residential and commercial developing and core part of the city. As the applicant might have it – a glamp ground. It will not provide a lot of tax revenue to the city relative to a more typical lodging facility – it is focused on a sub-group of tourists those who travel in RV's, etc. He discussed the winter months and most of them are almost empty or empty. That is not helpful to the year-round tourists' goals of the city. We opposed all the changes to the purpose section of this code because it eliminated all of the rationale for the wide variety of potential uses that would serve not only all tourists, but business travelers, and the community alike. He stated that that he has never seen an RV Park where the amenities served anyone except for the people camping in the campground. The current code which we thought was quite well and thoughtfully drafted originally does a good job

of allowing a wide variety of potential uses that would meet all those criteria that were stated in the original purpose and are now being proposed to be removed. This is an exceptionally poor use of a piece of property that is located where it is in the city that is still developing. We are not sure why the Commission would approve all this, but it is up to you folks.

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

Mr. Bachtel stated that we keep getting told that there is no proposal, but we keep talking about high-end RV Parks and frankly does not see a definition of a high-end RV Park anywhere in the Development Code. All you have are the RV Parks and it is a wish to get a high-end RV Park, but then again, we are not supposed to be talking about those things anyway. One concern is there is a max of 65 percent of the gross area of the Tourist Commercial and some of that area is not buildable. What is the real percentage of the area that is going to be occupied by RV's – if there are setbacks, if there are airport exclusion zones that cannot be built on, how much buildable property is going to be occupied by the RV's. If you want RV's to be able to come in and shop in the town, then make a parking area that you can use for RV's and use that for special events and be able to stay overnight.

W. Joe Weick, 511 E. Diamond Peak Ave., Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Weick stated that his house is due north about 600 yards from this property site and looking out of my dining room, living room, and bedroom windows which are 20ft. of glass, we are looking right at this property. He has concerns about the impact that having a commercialized district as proposed which would include an RV Park would have on property values of myself and neighbors in the area. He is concerned about light pollution because there will be parking lights, dark skies, some properties in the Light Industrial have had to change their lighting because of violating those laws. Bird Gard has lighting that is way too high for their small parking lot and it lights up the area where the water pump station and our neighborhood. There is no way to eliminate that because of the height of the lights. He is concerned about the lights in the parking area, the RV Park area, and around the proposed commercial buildings. The roundabout will significantly increase the traffic on Locust, Camp Polk, and Barclay Dr. and a lot of that traffic will be heavy vehicles. He agrees that a nice size market on this side of town would be nice. He is concerned about noise pollution, diesel vehicles, the amenities and a stage, microphones and sound systems will only reduce the property values in the Grand Peaks and Clear Pine areas. The Conklin House is one of the oldest buildings in Sisters and should be a Historical Building and year-around usage and not just spring, summer, and fall usage and then dead in the winter. He would like to see alternative uses for that property than what has been proposed.

Borys Tkacz, 914 E. Horse Back Trail, Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Tkacz stated that he wonders if this is the right place for an RV Park. He discussed glamping, easy access, highway access, and not in the middle of a major throughfares that will be one once the roundabouts are completed. He is concerned about the use not being year-round use, etc. He is concerned about hearing that the code for RV's is changing for the whole town. The historic structure and hearing support and opposition both – is it going to stay there and be there even if it does not have the official state designation and anything over 50 years is considered historic and this would qualify for that. He is concerned about how this would change the nature of our backyards of our neighborhood.

Mark Dickens, 133 E. Black Crater Ave., Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Dickens asked if anyone remembers the Crane Shed building in Bend 20 years ago when the developers from southern California promised this wonderful project – went in the middle of the night on a weekend, demolished it, tore it to the ground, broke it up, and the company quickly went bankrupt, and nothing ever happened of it. In his gut, he feels this is the same with big promises, restore the building, preserve the character and charm of Sisters, and then six months down the road, it just does not pencil out and is not profitable enough. Another one, the Elk Ranch – the owners bought it, southern California big advertising company wanted to preserve the property at the very same time they were publicly saying that they had a consultant down at the County trying to do some due diligence and turning it into a big guest and dude ranch. They were blocked because they could not get a wilderness permit from the Federal Government because Black Butte Ranch holds it. He said that this is a pattern of this city bending and caving to these developers and big money interests. He encouraged the city and public to read an article dated April 9, 2007, in the Bend Bulletin with Jon Skidmore proposing this development in Sun Ranch. All the arguments, and all the things made at that time contradict what is being said right now. They want to preserve the live/work spaces, make it for the community and businesses and jobs and 20 years later departed from that. For 30 years, he has been asking the same question of City Hall and the Planning Commission – are we going to be a Sunriver Resort, or a community. We need to be very cautious and look at the long-term ramifications, long-range thinking and preservation of that building and put the emphasis on the community.

Nadine Sims, 150 W. Heising Dr., Sisters, OR 97759

Ms. Sims stated that she wrote something after the last meeting and wanted to mention that in this past weeks' Nugget Newspaper, the proposed development was described as a boutique RV Park. One glaring observation noticed after the last meeting was if this is supposed to be a high-end RV Park why are they packed in so tightly according to the plan. There are no trees out there and it is cramping not glamping. Their plan is to get as many rigs into the space as possible. There is not enough acreage to come off with a high-end RV Park and you need to have space. The dog park idea – the citizens have said they would like to have a dog park when the Elementary School was being discussed. Dogs and water wreck the place and who is going to oversee that the dog park was kept in an orderly fashion. She discussed concerts, loud music, and that this high-end RV Park would do nothing of benefit for the Sisters' community which is the bottom line. There are other spacious camping sites in the immediate area already overflowing and is there really a need for this even if they change the design and space for these high-end vacationers, etc. She stated she is opposed to the setbacks being reduced, it is a spacious, beautiful sky-loving area and why would we change the setbacks.

Joe Weick, 511 E. Diamond Peak Ave., Sisters, OR 97759

Mr. Weick stated that if we allowed an RV Park and if this is for high-end RVs, then one has to have some mechanism for screening for those high-end RVs to go into the RV park. Personally, he cannot figure out how you will do all of that screening and limit who comes in and who goes out – this is not the Sister's way.

Torin Moray, 490 E. Diamond Peak Ave., Sisters, OR 97759

Ms. Moray stated that she wanted to echo the sentiments and the points that were made by Charlie, David, Joe, Borys, and Nadine. She is concerned about these code changes that have been proposed by the developers that seem to accommodate their proposed project. She is very concerned about the change in setbacks on both Barclay Dr., Locust St., and Camp Polk Rd. She worries about the traffic impacts, and any noise and light pollution as stated by Joe. Because it is a seasonal business she worries about if there is an economic benefit for the community.

Chairman Seymour asked if the applicant would like to come forward with an opportunity for rebuttal.

Amy Larrabee, Lake House, LLC

Ms. Larrabee wanted to address some of the concerns of the citizens that are opposed today. She wants to make it very clear that this is not a seasonal business and they do understand that if we do have some say in an RV Park that the revenue will be lower in the wintertime. However, there are no RV Parks inside Sisters currently that are open during the winter since Creekside Park is closed. Also, as City Commission members, the city owns Creekside Park so it can be verified if wanting to look into the amount of people that rent the Creekside Park once it is open – reservations are almost completely booked for the entire time it is open which should tell you that there is a great need for that in our city. Once Creekside Park is closed for the winter, we would be the only spot for tourists who come and stay inside Sisters. We work extremely hard, paid off the property with our own money, and are not California commercial developers who are going to come in and destroy the Sisters' community. We do understand the significance of the house and that is what drew me to the property. She would love to revolutionize that home and that was our dream. If we can do that, it is still up in the air since we have had multiple structural engineers telling us they would not touch it. The reason we do not have the house on the plans is because we do not know if we can do it and we do not want to promise something that we cannot do. We want what is best for the community. We do want it open year-round and will be a significant amount of revenue that comes from the people in the RVs that are able to stay in our town during the winter. It is a tourist commercial property plain and simple, and we are excited about the mixed use of providing something to the tourists, but also something for the residents.

Adam Smith, 360 SW Bond St., Bend, OR 97702

Mr. Smith stated that he took down a bunch of notes and wanted go through them quickly. For the record, he does not mean to be adversarial, and to respond point to point on some of the things that members of the public raised, but he does feel it is important to clarify a couple of things for the record. First, there was testimony from multiple people today – one person in support of the project argued that RV Parks have always been allowed in this zone. A couple other people testified against the idea of adding RV Parks to the zone. That is recognizing that there was ambiguity in the original code. Our perspective here is to clarify that ambiguity. It could have been done in several different ways, but we chose a text amendment because it is the most corporative process. Lodging facilities do not preclude RV Parks, it is not even defined, etc. There were some comments about this not being the right place for adding an RV Park – it is incompatible with residential and commercial, etc. RV Parks for the most part are considered an urban use in Oregon and directed to within UGB's.

There were some comments about the Purpose statement where people were opposed. A lot of the original proposed changes to the Purpose statement were to just be consistent with other Purpose statements throughout the code. We brought that all back and the only thing changed is the Purpose statement regarding the design standards. A comment was made that what we really need in Sisters is a parking lot where RVs can park and stay overnight – that is what we are proposing to add in this zone and exactly what an RV Park is. There was testimony about light and noise pollution, traffic concerns, and a lot of those concerns come up with any development of the property. It is important for the Planning Commission to keep in mind the difference from comparing a vacant lot to development to what are the different types of development that can be proposed under the code amendments that are before you.

On traffic concerns, traffic is a classic issue throughout Oregon, and we defer it to the experts. We have brought in the experts, we have produced those documents, and shown that any of the proposed changes are not going to cause traffic concerns. One comment is that we do not need to accommodate the tourists in this zone, and we do because that is the whole point of this zone – to be a multi-function piece of property where we are providing accommodations to tourists who are coming into the City of Sisters where we are increasing tourism and providing amenities to the neighbors and the community. Lastly, we are not proposing a development but feel obliged to defend our clients where people say that we are trying to build a trashy trailer park. That is not our client's intent and not what they are trying to do. Our clients have a right to seek development of this property. It is their legal right as the owners of a vacant piece of property.

Mr. Skidmore stated that the only item he would raise was in terms of rebuttal – a member of the public did mention that 20 years ago he said something in the Bulletin about a mixed-use development and the mixed-use development has done well. There is a residential component, a boutique industrial, having residential uses in an industrial area allowing coffee shops, and other more service commercial uses were something that folks did not understand, but it seems to work very well. To suggest that there is a bait and switch tactic because we are clarifying and updating the commercial component of that mixed-use development is not a bait and switch whatsoever. The property has sat vacant for quite a while, there has been a lot of development on the lands around it. Perhaps there was an issue with the tourists' commercial zoning that needed updating to allow for financially feasible commercial development. At no point in time was there any interest in deviating from bringing tourists and locals onto the site.

Chairman Seymour asked if the Commissioners had any questions for staff.

Commissioner Ries asked for clarification that there is not a definition of a boutique high-end RV Park. There is a definition for RV Parks, a definition for Mobile Home Parks, and a definition for campgrounds. He asked if Creekside Park campground has RV spots, and it seems that there are more camping sites than there are RV hookups. Down the street and across from Five Pines is Sisters Mobile Home Park that has overnight RV spots, but not an RV Park.

Planner Martin stated that the Development Code does not include a definition in that level of detail. It is labeled as Sisters RV Park and there are portions of that development that are accommodating for short-term occupancy, but the broader portion of the RV Park, the expansion that happened in the last few years was that the additional expansion area is multi-family residential use. That is under an Oregon Revised Statue that accommodated or described RV

occupancy as an opportunity for a multi-family residential occupancy. The larger portion of that RV park is a multi-family residential development in the residential district.

Commissioner Ries asked if a Mobile Home Park is permanent, and people do not drive them away. If an RV Park in town was to have permanent airstreams that people rented, would those be considered Short-Term Rentals, and would that be a permitted use as an RV Park to have permanent airstreams that do not move.

Planner Martin stated that in practice they are sited long-term. Yes, and Short-Term Rental is a single-family dwelling, or a dwelling unit that is used for short-term occupancy which is a dwelling unit. In this instance, an airstream that is sited permanently as part of a development in the tourist commercial district, the applicant has proposed a definition for lodging facility that would incorporate that permanent placement of an airstream, or other structure for short-term occupancy, or overnight accommodations. The applicant has proposed a limited duration of stay of 30 days within 90 days.

Commissioner Ries asked if the possibility could be that all the sites within an RV Park have permanent airstreams. He asked if there is a number on the number of RVs on a site – being an RV Park it needs to have this many RVs, etc. The tourist commercial property that allows lodging could have a motel/hotel and RV sites of at least two.

Planner Martin stated that if they were set up as permanent airstreams or similar structures, they would fall under that lodging facility definition that they have proposed. The RV Park is for that transient aspect of RVs moving, etc. As an example, there are those transient where the RVs are coming and going is a portion of the site, there are permanent structures, cabins, or RVs that are set up to come visit and stay in. It could also include a mix of the restaurant or neighborhood commercial and/or retail as part of a mixed-use facility.

Planner Martin stated that a Recreational Vehicle Park is defined in the Development Code as two or more recreational vehicles located on one lot and as permitted by the underlying zoning district.

Chairman Seymour closed the public testimony portion of this hearing.

Chairman Seymour stated that we have now closed the public hearing and must deliberate towards a decision. Our options are to recommend – Approval as proposed, Approval with changes, or Denial.

Chairman Seymour stated that the Commissioners are going to have an open conversation for this proposal.

Commissioner Ries stated that his problem is that there is not a definition for a high-end boutique RV Parks. High-end RV Parks have more room and are called RV Resorts with more amenities, but they have 1600-2000 square feet of sites, the site itself is huge, and that is what makes it high-end because RV people do not like to cram in next to each other. His other problem is that he knows that we are not adding RVs to the lodging establishments, but we are adding RVs to that piece of property and does not consider RVs lodging.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that the other point besides the RV changing is the definition of what it should look like and getting rid of the ranch and going back to the 1880's. He stated that he has no issue with that part of it.

Vice Chairman Dickman stated that he has an issue with the fact that we have a prohibition on auto dependent uses in this area and we want to keep that, and then include an RV Park. He stated that he gets on some level the difference – mechanics, gas stations, drive-thru McDonalds and how that is different from an RV Park. Keeping auto dependent businesses away is like fumes, noise, oil spots, gas spills, etc. and do we have the same sort of thinking with RVs and are we not looking at the same issues there when it comes to that zone and is that a conflict.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that it is a tourist commercial zone, and it is just a matter of what you want to allow in a tourist commercial zone.

Commissioner Ries stated that he is not crazy about changing the setbacks on the market and the overall setbacks from 20ft. to 10ft.

Commissioner McDougall stated that she has noted that on her comments as well. She stated that she heard that the 50ft. was there originally because of the setback of the house that is currently on the property. The owners of that property have no commitment as landowners to keep that house and are not sure if that 50ft. is still valid. She does like the 20ft. setback.

Chairman Seymour stated that just as a point of comparison such as in other zones in the downtown commercial there are zero setbacks.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that there are people in those housing areas nearby, but there is nothing contiguous with this because there is the distillery, the post office, Camp Polk Rd., the airport, no housing that goes up to the site, it is zoned tourist commercial, and does not see an issue with this. It is going to be a main arterial – Barclay Dr. and Camp Polk and people going to the roundabout and keeps it out of the center of town.

Vice Chairman Dickman stated that it did strike him with one of the speakers in favor of the great things that have been done with tourism in this town. This speaker mentioned Five Pines, the Barn, and as a resident of Sisters cannot imagine going to an RV Park, which is another good point. He stated that he is not sure this is going to be for people who live in Sisters. This is a tourist commercial district, so he gets that not everything is for the people who live in Sisters and is this to the point where it is almost exclusive of the people in Sisters.

Commissioner McDougall asked if we are going to add RV Park and that is the biggest question on the table tonight, but that needs to be defined in a way that if we say yes – RV Park is allowed, if it comes back with an application that we would feel comfortable being able to work within the framework that we have approved to get something that we would like to have there. All we are looking at right now are the standards that we would have in place should there be an RV Park.

Chairman Seymour stated that the fundamental question that we are trying to answer is would we allow RV Parks in this zone.

Vice Chairman Dickman stated that we need to consider what would be the impact of an RV Park if we are going to allow it.

Commissioner Ries stated so if there was a definition of an RV Park, we heard that it is two or more RVs parked on a piece of property. The code should be changed to say that they need to be this far apart, etc.

Chairman Seymour stated that when the zone was created originally, maybe this use was not included, not considered, and maybe not a thing. He asks now, and with all the items included in tourist commercial now should an RV Park under the circumstances be included today. He answered 'yes' and there are fundamental things to be considered. It is in the highway commercial zone and open space, and it seems logical.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that people were talking about there being no trees and there are no trees there now it is just an open field. It has been like that since he's lived here. No one is cutting down a forest to do this.

Commissioner Retzman stated that this whole thing is supposed to be the tourist's commercial zone. We need to be careful what we add or take away from the code so that when the developer gets ready to develop it, we have a proper yardstick for them to judge against.

Vice Chairman Dickman stated that tourists also like to stay in tents and are we going to allow that kind of tourist activity in that zone.

Commissioner McDougall stated that she has the same question and feels that it falls under 2.12.1000 (D) where it says for purposes of the Sun Ranch Tourist Commercial zone lodging facilities means any building, structure, or improvement used to provide sleeping accommodations to the public for charge. This language seems vague, but it could be a structure (deck) and then put something on it.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated that it would be an element of stationary airstreams which they have done in other parts of Oregon and has worked very well.

The Commissioners discussed the application process within the code, sizes of sites, 65 percent of the property, different RV Parks with gravel areas, benches, picnic tables, and hook up spots. In reviewing the application, we would at that time apply standards like was done with the gas station. The seasonal aspect of the proposal, actual code language, efficient and non-efficient use of the land, etc.

Chairman Seymour stated that an RV Park in any capacity would be a better use of the property than it is now. One could argue that our entire town is seasonal, etc.

Chairman Seymour asked about the removal of the rural ranch design and what are the thoughts on this. The removal of cottages and permitted as lodging facilities.

Chairman Seymour asked the Commission their feelings on the removal of the rural ranch design, the removal of cottages and permitted as lodging facilities, and the retail sales establishment, etc.

Commissioner Ries stated that it seems interesting from the standpoint that it is added and now the combination market and retail could be a 2000 square foot building instead the market originally being 1000 square feet. It is twice as big and it was up to 6000 square feet in the original zone, reduced to 1000 square feet, and since then been revised to 1000 square feet on the market and 1000 square feet on the retail sales combined amount of 2000 square feet.

Planner Martin stated that the current code has the 1000 square foot limit on any structures housing a neighborhood market. The original proposal included striking that 1000 square foot limitation therefore the citywide 6000 square foot limit for neighborhood markets would have been applicable. Now, the applicant has revised that to retain the 1000 square foot limit for neighborhood market uses.

Commissioner McDougall stated that she would not be opposed to two establishments – one for a neighborhood market and one a retail sale in that space in the 2000 square feet which is about the size of most houses. It does not seem extremely large to her.

Chairman Seymour asked the Commissioners how they feel about hostels. There have been zero comments.

Commissioner Retzman stated that it is funny that no one talked about hostels because they were hostile about the RV Park because hostels are very transient, etc.

Vice Chairman Dickman stated that in his view they do not have a running engine perhaps all night with a generator and that is where he gets hung up on with auto dependent uses in an RV Park.

Planner Martin stated that this is a unique situation where in the Tourist Commercial District, we have lodging facilities, and one could argue that a hostel falls under a lodging facility in that definition. The intent of the applicant was to acknowledge that the overnight accommodation use that is in the code – a hostel is already available and listed.

Director Woodford stated that the definition of a hostel is a budget orientated accommodation where guests can rent a bed, usually a bunk bed in a dormitory and share a bathroom, lounge, and sometimes a kitchen limited to 25-person occupancy per night excluding manager and/or employees. Rooms can be mixed or single sex although private rooms may also be available. Hostels may include a hot meal in the price.

The Planning Commissioners agreed on the hostels.

Commissioner Retzman asked if the setbacks have been addressed yet because that seems to be part of the animated discussion here.

Chairman Seymour stated that there is a reduction from Barclay Dr. and Camp Polk Rd. from 20ft. to 10ft. is the proposed change. Staff concurs with the 10ft. There will also be a right-of-way coming off Camp Polk Rd. and Barclay Dr. and while there will be a 10ft. setback it will not appear to be 10ft. it will seem greater than that.

The Commissioners agreed on the 10ft. setback.

Planner Martin stated that he did want to acknowledge other elements of the code that do apply to screening perhaps, and noting this is for setbacks for buildings and structures from property lines that any parking, street trees, landscaping standards along streets as well as adjacent parking, etc. This is related to structures and buildings and although an RV Park is proposed there are additional buffering and setback requirements beyond building setbacks that would apply to RV Parks.

Director Woodford stated that just for reference - the Distillery building is about 46ft. from the Camp Polk Rd. property line. In the way that the Tourist Commercial is written now that are both the same for Camp Polk Rd. and Barclay Dr.

Planner Martin stated that there is some merit to having structures and other obstructions or features within a streetscape that artificially slow people down while the travel lane may be the same width in a wide open, and having those features artificially influence people to slow down. That is why having the structures rather than parking areas or open spaces along street corridors because there is a benefit to that.

Chairman Seymour stated that he is inclined to support what the applicant is proposing for both Barclay Dr. and Camp Polk Rd. Again, it is a commercialized zone property and reducing their ability to conduct commerce – there needs to be the opportunity for the property owner to maximize their productivity.

Chairman Seymour stated that for those Commissioners who are not necessarily supportive approving it outright, are there conditions or changes that could be proposed and consider or is it more along the lines of needing to take a vote or find where people are at.

Chairman Seymour asked for a vote –

Commissioner Ries stated that he is not in favor of an RV Park.

Commissioner McDougall stated that the original wording was ambiguous where it had lodging facility, specifically hotel/motel, etc., and this is not a conflict with what the land use is. We are looking for more diverse lodgings in town since it is so expensive to stay here, and this is another opportunity for people who want to stay here is a good idea. Later, we can look at the application that comes in and find it appropriate or not.

Commissioner Retzman asked for clarification that if we do approve the RV Park today, when they do come in do, we have any say to what it is going to look like. If we want to say what they can build as an RV Park – we cannot wait until later, but be more specific now, etc.

Planner Martin stated that any recommendation if it were to include an RV Park as an allowed use, we do have this opportunity through these Special Use Standards to continue to refine how and in what way an RV Park would be developed on the property. An initial effort would be the duration of stay, the 65 percent coverage of the RV, and the requirement of at least two amenities encompassing 10,000 square feet. There is further refinement that is available before the Planning Commission as part of a recommendation.

Commissioner Blumenkron stated he is ok with the language as proposed.

Vice Chairman Dickman stated that he is not in favor of auto dependent uses and something we need to further cater to in a city that is plagued by big rigs, trucks, and RV's going through it all the time anyway.

Planner Martin stated that a split vote is ok, and we will carry that forward to the City Council. Certainly, any staff report he provides will acknowledge the conversation and the depth of conversation and details regarding this particular use that the Planning Commission discussed, the concerns, etc.

Chairman Seymour stated that all this language is already in the code, and you can already do RV Parks in the Downtown Commercial and Highway Commercial. This is an outright use. They would not be subject to additional requirements if they were to do it. The only reason this Tourist Commercial would have to go above and beyond what somebody else would have to do is because we implemented it. In this situation it is as good or better as Open Space or Highway Commercial.

Chairman Seymour asked for a motion from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Blumenkron made a motion to accept this proposal as proposed. For the record, he stated that he moves to recommend to the City Council approval of city file TA 24-01 as drafted.

Commissioner Retzman seconded.

Commissioner Blumenkron – YAY.

Commissioner Retzman – YAY.

Commissioner McDougall – YAY.

Chairman Seymour – YAY.

Commissioner Ries – NAY.

Vice Chairman Dickman – NAY.

Chairman Seymour stated the vote is 4 in favor and 2 opposed – motion passes.

V. STAFF AND COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Director Woodford stated that the next meeting will be on Thursday, June 6, 2024, at 4:00 pm with a presentation on the Urban Growth Boundary amendment – the first presentation for the Planning Commission and more informational in nature and giving an overview of process and the next steps and what has been done so far in terms of community outreach, etc. We are going out for steering committee members for the UGB process, looking for six citizens at large, and that applicant process goes through May 24, 2024. They will be a portion of the steering committee in addition to having a farm and forest interest, potentially two landowners that have property within the study area, and two Planning Commissioners, as well as two City Council members. There will be four (4) meetings over the course of 18 months.

VI. ADJOURN

Chairman Seymour adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jenkins, Recording Secretary

