



**CITY OF CENTRAL POINT
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
June 7, 2016 - 6:00 p.m.**

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Planning Commission members Chuck Piland (Chair), Mike Oliver, Tom Van Voorhees, Rob Hernandez, Elizabeth Powell, Craig Nelson Sr., and Kay Harrison

III. CORRESPONDENCE

IV. MINUTES

Review and approval of May 3, 2016 Minutes.

V. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

VI. BUSINESS

A. Consideration of miscellaneous amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance (Sections 17.08.410 TOD Definitions; 17.32.020 Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) District Permitted Uses; 17.64.040©, Off-Street Parking Requirements – Accessible Parking; and 17.67.050(M), TOD Site Design Standards – Signs. **Applicant:** City of Central Point.

VII. DISCUSSION

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

IX. MISCELLANEOUS

X. ADJOURNMENT

**City of Central Point
Planning Commission Minutes
May 3, 2016**

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Chuck Piland, Craig Nelson, Tom Van Voorhees, Kay Harrison, Rob Hernandez, Mike Oliver, and Elizabeth Powell were present. Also in attendance were: Tom Humphrey, Community Development Director, Stephanie Holtey, Community Planner, and Karin Skelton, Planning Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE

III. CORRESPONDENCE

None

IV. MINUTES

Rob Hernandez made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting as presented. Mike Oliver, seconded the motion: ROLL CALL: Mike Oliver, yes; Tom Van Voorhees, yes; Elizabeth Powell, abstain; Craig Nelson, yes; Kay Harrison, yes; Rob Hernandez, Yes. Motion passed.

V. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

None

VI. BUSINESS

A. Consideration of Resolution No. 830 forwarding a favorable recommendation to the City Council to approve a Conceptual Land Use and Transportation Plan for CP-3, An Urban Reserve Area of the City of Central Point, File No. 15030.

Tom Humphrey stated that this was the Planning Commission's third review of the CP-3 Conceptual Land Use Plan. He said that he had obtained input from the Citizen's Advisory Committee and had also requested comments from various agencies. He said that he had received no replies or comments. He

reminded the Commissioners that this is a conceptual plan to set out a vision for the area. Once a plan has been conceived, it would go through the process of conforming it to the Statewide Planning Goals, but at this point it is merely a concept of what might work well in the area.

He presented two plans showing the zoning that had been preferred by both the Planning Commission and the Citizen's Advisory Committee. The plans had utilized Open Space and the TOD zoning of GC as it was more broad than the C4 zoning. In addition there was a small component of residential space to accommodate existing residences. He presented four proposed traffic circulation patterns and asked the Planning Commission to choose their preferred two. One of the proposed traffic circulation patterns contained a roundabout. There was discussion about the need to accommodate trucks with horse trailers driving to the Expo for events and large RV's as there would be quite a few when the RV park was completed. It was generally thought that if the roundabout was large enough and the road straight enough it could work. They also discussed the need to keep traffic moving through the area with as few stops as possible. The Commissioners discussed the various options. Their decision was that the proposed traffic pattern number 3 was a workable option. Also that pattern number 4, with the roundabout would work if the road was straightened and the roundabout made large enough to accommodate trailers and RV's.

Mike Oliver made a motion to approve Resolution 830, forwarding a favorable recommendation to the City Council to approve a Conceptual Land Use and Transportation Plan for CP-3, An Urban Reserve Area of the City of Central Point. Tom Van Voorhees seconded.

Public Hearing was opened

Dan O'Connor, Attorney

Mr. O'Connor stated that he represented Naumes who owns most of the property in CP-3. He said that he would like to get input from Jackson County and the Expo regarding the proposed plans. His clients weren't really in favor of having a cul-de-sac located anywhere on the road as was depicted in the proposed plans, and he believed the Expo would not be in favor of a cul-de-sac. He said that with regard to the traffic circulation it would be important to try to make any intersections or turns as smooth and gradual as possible to accommodate the larger vehicles.

Public Hearing was closed.

Commissioner Piland asked for a vote on the motion. Roll Call: Mike Oliver, yes; Tom Van Voorhees, yes; Elizabeth Powell, abstained; Craig Nelson, yes; Rob Hernandez, yes; Kay Harrison, yes. Motion passed.

VII. DISCUSSION

A. Urban Renewal – East Pine Street Streetscape

Mr. Humphrey updated the Planning Commission on the East Pine Street project. He said that the design would include 10 foot sidewalks and the addition of street trees. There were surveyors now mapping the area as to infrastructure location and identifying possible locations for the street trees. He said it was important that the trees did not block business signs and entryways. He added that there were going to be open houses to introduce the public to the project. Mr. Humphrey invited the Planning Commission to attend the meeting of the Development Commission on May 16th for more information.

B. Country Western Music Festival

Mr. Humphrey informed the Planning Commission that the Bi Mart Country Western Music event was moving to the Expo which would be good for Central Point. It would greatly benefit local hotels and restaurants. He said that currently, the City required concerts at the Expo to finish by 10:00 p.m. but the Council was considering extending that deadline for this event to 11:00 p.m. He said that normal attendance would be around 20,000 to 25,000 people.

Tom Van Voorhees suggested that it might be an idea to make improvements to Upton Road to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic for events at the Expo. He said that might take a lot of local traffic out of the mix if people could walk to the Expo for events. Mr. Humphrey said that the IAMP contained some bicycle and pedestrian components.

C. Costco

Mr. Humphrey stated that the Costco appeal was progressing. The Record has been sent to LUBA and there had been two motions to intervene filed. One for the Petitioners and one for the Respondents. Additionally the City's attorney had filed a Motion to Dismiss and we were currently awaiting a ruling on that motion.

He said that other news was that the LOMR for Twin Creeks had been approved. Also that the railroad crossing would be starting design work this year. He said the Battle of the Bones was going to be combined with the Harvest Festival at the Expo this year.

He informed the Commissioners that there would be some code amendments at the next meeting, but there did not appear to be any additional items for that agenda at this time.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

None

IX. MISCELLANEOUS

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mike Oliver made a motion to adjourn, Tom Van Voorhees seconded. All Commissioners said "aye". Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

The foregoing minutes of the May 3, 2016 Planning Commission meeting were approved by the Planning Commission at its meeting on the _____ day of June, 2016.

Planning Commission Chair



STAFF REPORT

STAFF REPORT

June 7, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: File No. 16011

Consideration of miscellaneous amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance (Sections 17.08.410 TOD Definitions; 17.32.020 Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) District Permitted Uses; 17.64.040(C), Off-Street Parking Requirements - Accessible Parking; and 17.67.050(M), TOD Site Design Standards - Signs.

Applicant: City of Central Point

STAFF SOURCE:

Tom Humphrey AICP, Community Development Director

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the proposed amendments are to modify the following code sections:

- 17.08.410 (H. Sign-Related Definitions), TOD District and Corridor Definitions and Uses by adding definitions for “Reader Board” and “Scoreboard”. Currently, the zoning code (17.67.050(M)(4). Prohibited Signs) prohibits Reader Boards, but does not define what constitutes a Reader Board. This proposed amendment is for clarification.

The question of allowing an electronic scoreboard at Crater High School has been asked. Currently, the zoning code does not define scoreboards and as such they are prohibited. The proposed amendment provides a definition of scoreboard thus acknowledging scoreboards as a type of sign, which then may, or may not be allowed elsewhere in the zoning ordinance.

- 17.32.020, C-N District Permitted Uses; modifies and removes restrictions placed on eating and drinking establishments in the Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) zoning district. Convenience stores in this zoning district are allowed the sale of beer and wine and an argument can be made that an eating establishment in this commercial zone should have the same privilege. Additionally, small craft breweries have expressed the desire to locate in Central Point in this zone.
- 17.64.040, (C. Accessible Parking Requirements), Off-Street Parking Requirements by replacing zoning language and Table 17.64.03 with standards in the Oregon Structural Specialty Code. The Building Division implements and regulates Accessible (ADA) Parking Requirements and it is not necessary to repeat these standards in the zoning code. This also removes the possibility of error or the inconvenience of updating the land use code when changes are made to standards in the Specialty Code.

- 17.67.050(M. Signs), Site Design Standards. This proposed amendment updates the table in Section M (17.67.050(1)) and subsections 1-4, establishing standards for signs in the TOD district or corridor. Revisions are made to accommodate scoreboards in the Civic zoning district, improve building/sign proportionality and to clarify uses of temporary signs such as A-frame signs and commercial banners.

ISSUES:

The Planning Commission is being presented with selected changes to Chapter 17 to either clarify definitions and uses in the code or to update it and make the document consistent with the state building code. Changes proposed in Chapter 17.08.410(H) and Chapter 17.67.050(M) are intended to address 'scoreboards' in the Civic zoning district but also to make changes to sign standards in general following focus group discussions with local sign makers.

Proposed changes address sign and letter dimensions and the way those dimensions are calculated. Sidewalk "A-Board" Signs and banners are proposed to be removed from the prohibited signs list and allowed with conditions. External illumination language is expanded to reflect what new businesses in the TOD have been allowed to do with 'back lit' or 'halo' lighting.

Changes in the Neighborhood Commercial zoning district (Chapter 17.32.020) are intended to relax outdated standards and permit restaurants which may choose to serve alcohol. There are several examples of family oriented restaurants in Central Point (Abby's, Bobbio's, etc.) that are in the vicinity of residential neighborhoods and serve wine and beer. The existing language in the code does not permit this in the C-N District. According to the Sustainable City Network e-newsletter, *"The neighborhood pub ... is coming back as millennials ditch their cars and demand amenities of urban life that include shopping, restaurants and bars within walking distance of their high-density homes."*

Changes that are proposed in Chapter 17.64.040(C) simply replace zoning code language with references to the Oregon Structural Specialty Code and its language which is applied and enforced by the Building Division.

FINDINGS:

The Planning Commission, when initiating amendments to the municipal code, makes their recommendation to the City Council in the form of a resolution. Findings and conclusions for arriving at their recommendation can be found in Attachment B.

EXHIBITS/ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment "A" – Proposed Zoning Code Amendments

Attachment "B" – Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Attachment "C" – Resolution No. 831

ACTION:

Consider proposed zoning amendments and 1) forward the ordinance to the Council for approval, 2) make revisions and forward the ordinance to the Council or 3) deny the ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution No. 831 forwarding a favorable recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed zoning code amendments

ATTACHMENT "A" Proposed Zoning Code Amendments, File No. 16011

Section 17.08.410 TOD District and Corridor Definitions and Uses

H. Sign-Related Definitions

20. Reader Board. A sign that conveys information about a variety of subjects, including advertising for products or services, travel, news or event information.

21. Scoreboard. A large internally illuminated sign located within a sports stadium or in conjunction with a sporting event field on which the score of the sporting event is shown and intended for viewing primarily by persons participating in such sporting events and/or spectators of such sporting events.

17.32.020 Permitted uses.

The following uses and their accessory uses are permitted outright, subject to compliance with all applicable municipal, state and federal environmental, health, and safety regulations as well as the requirements for site plans in Chapter 17.72:

- A. Professional and financial offices and personal service establishments;
- B. Retail stores, shops and offices supplying commodities or performing services other than vehicle and fuel sales;
- C. Eating and drinking establishments ~~that do not possess a liquor license~~;
- D. Desktop publishing, xerography, copy centers;
- E. Temporary tree sales, from November 1st to January 1st;
- F. Public and quasi-public utility and service buildings, structures and uses;
- G. Neighborhood shopping centers, which may include any of the permitted uses in this section;
- H. Other uses not specified in this or any other district, if the planning commission finds them to be similar to the uses listed above and compatible with other permitted uses and with the intent of the C-4 district as provided in Section 17.60.140, Authorization for similar uses. (Ord. 2014 §4, 2015; Ord. 1881 (part), 2006; Ord. 1709 §1(part), 1994).

Section 17.64.040, Off-Street Parking Requirements

C. Accessible Parking Requirements. Where parking is provided accessory to a building, accessible parking shall be provided, constructed, striped, signed and maintained as required by ORS 447.233, and Section 1104.1106 of the latest Oregon Structural Specialty Code as set forth in this section.

1. The minimum number of accessible parking spaces shall be provided for all uses in accordance with the standards in Table 17.64.03 Oregon Structural Specialty Code, Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces. ~~Parking spaces used to meet the standards in Table 17.64.03, Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces,~~ shall be counted toward meeting off-street parking requirements in Tables 17.64.02A and 17.64.02B, Residential and Non-Residential Off-Street Parking Requirements. The accessible parking requirements ~~set forth in Table 17.64.03, Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces,~~ are minimum requirements and are not subject to reductions per subsection (B)(1) of this section;

~~2. Accessible parking shall be located in close proximity to building entrances and shall be designed to permit occupants of vehicles to reach the entrance on an unobstructed path or walkway; and~~

~~3. Accessible spaces shall be grouped in pairs where possible.~~

~~Required accessible parking spaces shall be identified with signs and pavement markings identifying them as reserved for persons with disabilities; signs shall be posted directly in front of the parking space at a height of no less than forty-two inches and no more than seventy-two inches above pavement level. Van spaces shall be specifically identified as such.~~

TABLE 17.64.03

MINIMUM NUMBER OF ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES

ORS 447.233

Total Number of Parking Spaces Provided (per lot)	Total Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces (with 60" access aisle, or 96" aisle for vans*)	Van Accessible Parking Spaces with min. 96" wide access aisle	Accessible Parking Spaces with min. 60" wide access aisle
1 to 25	1	1	0
26 to 50	2	1	1

TABLE 17.64.03

MINIMUM NUMBER OF ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACES

ORS 447.233

Total Number of Parking Spaces Provided (per lot)	Total Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces (with 60" access aisle, or 96" aisle for vans*)	Van Accessible Parking Spaces with min. 96" wide access aisle	Accessible Parking Spaces with min. 60" wide access aisle
51 to 75	3	1	2
76 to 100	4	1	3
101 to 150	5	1	4
151 to 200	6	1	5
201 to 300	7	1	6
301 to 400	8	1	7
401 to 500	9	2	7
501 to 1,000	2% of total parking provided in each lot	1/8 of Column A**	7/8 of Column A***
1,001	20 plus 1 for each 100 over 1,000	1/8 of Column A**	7/8 of Column A***
<p>*vans and cars may share access aisles **one out of every eight accessible spaces ***seven out of every eight accessible parking spaces</p>			

Section 17.67.050 Site Design Standards.

M. Signs.

1. The provisions of this section are to be used in conjunction with the city sign regulations in the Central Point Sign Code, Chapter 15.24. The sign requirements in Chapter 15.24 shall govern in the TOD district and corridor with the exception of the following:

a. The types of signs permitted shall be limited only to those signs described in this chapter.

~~b. All signs in the TOD district and corridor shall comply with the design standards described in this chapter.~~

~~eb.~~ Decorative exterior murals are allowed and are subject to review and criteria by planning commission or architectural review committee appointed by city council.

~~ec.~~ Signs that use images and icons to identify store uses and products are encouraged.

~~ed.~~ Projecting signs located to address the pedestrian are encouraged.

2. Sign Requirements. Signs within the TOD district or corridor shall comply with the standards in Table 17.67.050(1).

Table 17.67.050 (1) Sign Requirements

Sign Type	ZONING DISTRICT			
	LMR and MMR	HMR (a)(b)	C and OS	EC and GC
Freestanding/Monument				
Permitted	Yes			
Internally Illuminated	Prohibited			
Max. Number	1			
Max. Height (measured from finished grade)	4 feet	8 feet	8 feet	20 feet
Sign Area/Building Face	16 sq. ft.	20 feet	20 feet	50 sq. ft.
Total Sign Area - all building faces	32 sq. ft.	48 feet	48 feet	100 sq. ft.
Location	At entry point to housing complex or subdivision			Outside of public right-of-way
Wall and Projecting				
Permitted	Yes			
Internally Illuminated	Prohibited			
Max. Number	1			No Limit
Max. Height	Lowest part not less than 8 feet above underlying finished grade for projecting signs			
Sign Area/Building Face	8 sq. ft.			Principal façade; 1.5 sq. ft. for each linear foot of business frontage, not to exceed 2 sq. ft. of frontage if 20' r-o-w.
Sign Area/Building Face	8 sq. ft.			Secondary façade; 2 sq. ft. of linear business frontage
Total Sign Area - all building faces	16 sq. ft.			Determined by linear distance of building frontage
Location	Signs shall not project more than 4 feet from a building wall unless attached to a canopy			
Temporary				
Permitted	Yes			
Internally Illuminated	Prohibited			
Max. Number	2			4
Max. Height	3 feet			
Sign Area/Building Face	6 sq. ft.			32 sq. ft.
Total Sign Area - all building faces	24 sq. ft.			64 sq. ft.
Location	Outside of street right-of-way			
Time Limit	120 days			
Directional				
Permitted	Yes			
Internally Illuminated	Prohibited			
Max. Number	1 per driveway			2 per driveway
Max. Height	3 feet			
Sign Area/Building Face	6 sq. ft.			
Total Sign Area - all building faces	24 sq. ft.			
Location	Adjacent to private driveway or sidewalk			
Scoreboard (c)				
Permitted	No	No	CUP	No
Internally Illuminated	NA	NA	Per CUP	NA
Max. Number	NA	NA	Per CUP	NA
Max. Height	NA	NA	30 feet	NA
Maximum Sign Area	NA	NA	500 sq. ft.	NA
Location	NA	NA	Per CUP	NA

Notes:

- (a) For ground commercial uses in the HMR District
- (b) For residential uses in the HMR District
- (c) Scoreboards allowed only as a conditional use within the Civic District. Standards in Section 17.67.050(M)(3) may be waived at the discretion of the Planning Commission
- (d) Sidewalk A-Frame Boards (1) within fixed dimensions and not obstructing public right of way
- (e) Temporary commercial banners to promote grand openings, 30-60 days per year maximum with planning permit

Sign Type	LMR, MMR, HMR (a), (b), C, and OS Zones	EC and GC Zones
Freestanding		
Maximum	-	-
Number	4	4
Height	4 feet.	20 feet.
Sign area per building face	16 square feet.	50 square feet.
Total sign area—all building faces	32 square feet.	100 square feet.
Location	At entry point(s) to housing complex or subdivision.	Outside of the public right-of-way.
Wall and Projecting		
Maximum	-	-
Number	4	No limit.
Height	Lowest part at least 8 feet above underlying grade for projecting signs.	Lowest part at least 8 feet above underlying grade for projecting signs.
Sign area per building face	8 square feet.	1-1/2 square feet with a maximum of 50 square feet per sign.
Total sign area—all building faces	16 square feet.	0.25 square feet per lineal foot of building perimeter.
Location	Signs shall not project more than 4 feet from a building wall unless attached to a canopy.	Signs shall not project more than 4 feet from a building unless attached to a canopy.
Temporary		
Maximum	-	-
Number	A maximum of 2 lawn signs are permitted. All other temporary signs are not permitted.	4
Height	3-foot maximum.	4 feet for freestanding signs and up to parapet or roof eaves for wall signs.
Sign area per face	6 square feet.	32 square feet.
Total sign area—all	24 square feet.	64 square feet.

Sign Type	LMR, MMR, HMR (a), (b), C, and OS Zones	EC and GC Zones
faces		
Location	Outside of the street right-of-way.	Outside of the street right-of-way.
Time limit	120 days.	120 days.
Directional		
Maximum	-	-
Number	1 sign per driveway.	2 signs per driveway.
Height	3 feet.	3 feet.
Sign area per building face	6 square feet.	6 square feet.
Total sign area--all building faces	24 square feet.	32 square feet.
Location	Adjacent to private driveway or sidewalk.	Adjacent to private driveway or sidewalk.
Total Sign Area Per Lot	8 square feet in LMR 32 square feet in MMR, HMR, C, and OS.	0.25 square feet per lineal foot of building perimeter.
All sign faces		

3. Sign Materials. Unless otherwise exempt, or authorized by the Planning Commission, all signs must comply with the following design criteria:

a. The base materials for a freestanding sign shall be natural materials including stone, brick, or aggregate.

~~b. Signs and supporting structural elements shall be constructed of metal or stone with wood or metal informational lettering. No plastics or synthetic material shall be allowed, except for projecting awning signs, which may be canvas or similar fabric.~~

~~eb.. Sign lettering shall be limited to sixteen inches maximum in height. Building/sign proportionality.~~

~~ec. Sign illumination shall be limited to external illumination to include conventional lighting and neon, if neon is applied to the sign plane area. External illumination is understood to include 'back lit' or 'halo' lighting. Internally illuminated signs are prohibited.~~

4. Prohibited Signs.

- a. Internally illuminated signs;
- b. Roof signs;
- c. Reader boards;
- ~~d. Sidewalk A-board signs;~~
- ~~ed.~~ Flashing signs
- ~~fe.~~ Electronic message/image signs **on which copy is created through the use of a pattern of lights in a dot matrix configuration, which may be changed intermittently;**
- ~~gf.~~ Bench signs;
- ~~hg.~~ Balloons or streamers;
- ~~i. Temporary commercial banners.~~ (Ord. 1971 §4 (Exh. C) (part), 2013; Ord. 1815 §1(part), Exh. C(part), 2000).

**FINDINGS OF FACT
AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
File No: 16011**

INTRODUCTION

The text amendments to Sections 17.08.410; 17.32.020; 17.64.040 and 17.67.050 constitute major text amendments to the Central Point Municipal Code because they are legislative policy decisions and not an application of policy to a specific development application. The amendments are intended to add clarity in some sections and remove redundancy in others.

These findings are prepared in four (4) parts to address the statewide planning goals, the applicable elements of City's Comprehensive Plan, public facilities and the Transportation Planning Rule as required by CPMC 17.05.500 and 17.10.600.

PART 1 CPMC LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENT

17.10.200 Legislative amendments.

Legislative amendments are policy decisions made by city council. They are reviewed using the Type IV procedure in Section 17.05.500 and shall conform to the statewide planning goals, the Central Point comprehensive plan, the Central Point zoning ordinance and the transportation planning rule provisions in Section 17.10.600, as applicable.

Finding: The Central Point Planning Commission initiated the proposed code amendments by resolution to clarify language in the zoning chapter relative to signs in the TOD district; permitted uses in the C-N, Neighborhood Commercial district and requirements for Accessible Parking.

Conclusion: A text amendment is reviewed as a Type IV, Legislative decision.

17.05.500 Type IV procedure (legislative).

G. Decision-Making Criteria. The recommendation by the planning commission and the decision by the city council shall be based on the following factors:

- 1. Whether the request is consistent with the applicable statewide planning goals;*
- 2. Whether the request is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and*
- 3. If the proposed legislative change is particular to a particular site, the property and affected area is presently provided with adequate public facilities, services and transportation networks to support the use, or such facilities, services and transportation networks are planned to be provided concurrently with the development of the property.*

PART 2 STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS:

17.05.500 G. 1. *Whether the request is consistent with the applicable statewide planning goals;*

GOAL 1. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT - *To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.*

Finding, Goal 1: The proposed text amendment does not enhance, or detract, from citizen participation in the City's planning process. A duly noticed public hearing is scheduled for June 7, 2016 to review the proposed text amendment.

Conclusion, Goal 1: Consistent.

GOAL 2. LAND USE PLANNING - *To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decision and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.*

Finding Goal 2: Element I of the Central Point Comprehensive Plan addresses the Goal 2 requirement that plans and implementing ordinances be revised on a periodic cycle to take into account changing public policies, community attitudes and other circumstances; as such the proposed code amendment provides a process and policy framework as a basis for land use decisions.

Finding Goal 2: The proposed text amendment is in accordance with CPMC Section 17.10.200 and therefore, does not modify or otherwise affect the City's planning process as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed text amendments serve to provide clarity and design flexibility and are complimentary to the policy direction of the use of both mixed-use zoning and conventional zoning.

Conclusion Goal 2: Consistent.

Goal 3. AGRICULTURAL LANDS - *To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.*

Finding Goal 3: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect lands designated for agricultural use.

Conclusion Goal 3: Not applicable.

Goal 4. FOREST LANDS - *To conserve forest lands by maintaining the forest land base and to protect the state's forest economy by making possible economically efficient forest practices that assure the continuous growing and harvesting of forest tree species as the leading use on forest land consistent with sound management of soil, air, water, and fish and wildlife resources and to provide for recreational opportunities and agriculture.*

Finding, Goal 4: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect lands designated for forest use.

Conclusion, Goal 4: Not applicable.

GOAL 5. OPEN SPACE, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS, AND NATURAL RESOURCES - *To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.*

Finding Goal 5: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect lands designated as natural, scenic, or historic resources.

Conclusion Goal 5: Not applicable.

GOAL 6. AIR, WATER, AND LAND RESOURCES QUALITY - *To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state.*

Finding Goal 6: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect regulations managing the quality of air, water and land resources.

Conclusion Goal 6: Not applicable.

GOAL 7. AREAS SUBJECT TO NATURAL HAZARDS AND DISASTERS - *To protect people and property from natural hazards.*

Finding Goal 7: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect regulations protecting the citizens of Central Point from natural hazards.

Conclusion Goal 7: Consistent.

GOAL 8. RECREATION NEEDS - *To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.*

Finding Goal 8: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect the City's provision of necessary recreational facilities.

Conclusion Goal 8: Not applicable.

GOAL 9. ECONOMY OF THE STATE – *To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.*

Finding Goal 9: The proposed text amendments do not alter the City's provision of adequate economic opportunities. The text amendment as a choice, affords design options that can be better suited to the city and the available market.

Conclusion Goal 9: Consistent.

GOAL 10. HOUSING - *To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.*

Finding Goal 10: Aside from providing a choice of existing and adopted development standards, the proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect regulations that address the City's housing needs.

Conclusion Goal 10: Consistent.

GOAL 11. PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES - *To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.*

Finding Goal 11: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect the City's provision of timely, orderly and efficient public facilities and services. The proposed text amendment does not cause an increase in the demand for public facilities. Water service is available within the City.

Conclusion Goal 11: Consistent.

GOAL 12. TRANSPORTATION - *To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.*

Finding Goal 12: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect the City of Central Point Transportation System Plan or modify CPMC Section 17.05.900, Traffic impact analysis.

Conclusion Goal 12: Consistent.

GOAL 13 ENERGY - *To conserve energy.*

Finding Goal 13: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect and development standards or regulations that address conservation of energy.

Conclusion Goal 13: Not applicable.

GOAL 14. URBANIZATION - *To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.*

Finding Goal 14: The proposed text amendment does not involve, or otherwise affect, regulations addressing and regulating the transition from rural to urban lands.

Conclusion Goal 14: Not applicable.

PART 3 CITY OF CENTRAL POINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

17.05.500 (G) (2)(m) *The request is consistent with the Central Point comprehensive plan;*

Finding: The amendments to Sections 17.08.410; 17.32.020; 17.64.040 and 17.67.050 are consistent with CPMC and the comprehensive plan. This modification is complimentary to the policy direction of the use of both mixed-use zoning and conventional zoning.

Conclusion: Consistent

1. Transportation

Finding: The City of Central Point Transportation System Plan 2030 (TSP) replaces Chapter XI, Circulation/Transportation of the Comprehensive Plan. The TSP provides an inventory of the City's existing transportation system, including street standards. This element of the Comprehensive Plan addresses Statewide Planning Goal 12, Transportation.

Finding: The proposed text amendment will not cause an increase in land uses that would result in levels of travel or access that would be inconsistent with the City's functional street classification system for existing and planned transportation facilities.

Conclusion: Consistent

PART 4 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE

17.10.600 Transportation planning rule compliance.

Section 660-012-0060(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:

a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or

c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:

(A) Allow types or levels of land uses that would result in levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;

(B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or

(C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.

Finding 660-012-0060(1)(a): The proposed text amendment serves to provide CPMC consistency, review process and measurable code standards. The proposed text amendment will not cause any changes to the functional classification of any existing or planned transportation facilities.

Conclusion 660-012-0060(1)(a): No significant affect.

Finding 660-012-0060(1)(b): The proposed text amendment serves to maintain the density standard of residential property consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed text amendment will not cause a change to standards implementing the City's transportation system.

Conclusion 660-012-0060(1)(b): No significant affect.

Finding 660-012-0060(1)(c)(A): The proposed text amendment will not cause an increase in land uses that would result in levels of travel or access that would be inconsistent with the City's functional street classification system for existing and planned transportation facilities.

Conclusion 660-012-0060(1)(c)(A): No significant affect.

Finding 660-012-0060(1)(c)(B): The proposed text amendment will not cause a reduction in the performance of any existing or planned transportation facilities below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or Comprehensive Plan.

Conclusion 660-012-0060(1)(c)(B): No significant affect.

Finding 660-012-0060(1)(c)(C): The proposed text amendment will not cause the worsening of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or Comprehensive Plan.

Conclusion 660-012-0060(1)(c)(C): No significant affect.

Summary Conclusion: As proposed, the text amendments are in conformance with the acknowledged Comprehensive Plan, Transportation System Plan and Central Point Municipal Code.

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 831

A RESOLUTION APPROVING MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 17 ZONING

FILE NO. 15016

Applicant: City of Central Point

WHEREAS, on June 7, 2016 the Planning Commission, at a duly scheduled public hearing, considered minor amendments to Chapter 17 Zoning of the Central Point Municipal Code (“CPMC”) as follows, and as specifically identified in Attachment “A – Staff Report dated June 7, 2016):

1. Section 17.08.410 TOD District and Corridor Definitions and Use, specific;
2. Section 17.32.020 C-N, Neighborhood Commercial District, Permitted Uses;
3. Section 17.64.040 (C) Off-Street Parking and Loading, Accessible Parking Requirements; and
4. Section 17.67.050 (M) Design Standards for TOD, Site Design Standards, Signs.

WHEREAS, it is the finding of the Planning Commission that the above referenced code amendments only serve to clarify administration of Chapter 17 and as such are considered minor amendments and as such do not alter current land use policy or modify standards.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Central Point Planning Commission, by this Resolution No. 831, does hereby forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council to approve the amendments as set forth in the Staff Report dated June 7, 2016 attached hereto by reference as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein.

PASSED by the Planning Commission and signed by me in authentication of its passage this 7th day of June 2016.

Planning Commission Chair

ATTEST:

City Representative
Approved by me this 7th day of June 2016.