



**CITY OF CENTRAL POINT
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
June 2, 2009 - 6:00 p.m.**

Next Planning Commission
Resolution No. 765

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Connie Moczygemba, Chuck Piland, Pat Beck, Mike Oliver, Justin Hurley and Tim Schmeusser

III. CORRESPONDENCE

IV. MINUTES - Review and approval of March 3, 2009 Planning Commission Minutes

V. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

VI. BUSINESS

- Pgs. 1 - 3 A. **File No. 07038.** A public meeting to consider an Extension request of Site Plan approval for North Valley Center. **Applicant: Bank of the Cascades**
- Pgs. 4 - 5 B. **File No. 09025(1).** **Economic Element**
- Pgs. 6 - 7 C. **File No. 09025(2).** **Housing Element**
- Pgs. 8 - 64 D. **File No. 09025(3).** **Urbanization Element – Introduction and Schedule**

VII. DISCUSSION

- A. Senate Bill on extension
B. Co-location on Oregon State Police cell tower
C. The Crossing – Tommy Malot

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

IX. MISCELLANEOUS

X. ADJOURNMENT

**City of Central Point
Planning Commission Minutes
March 3, 2009**

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

II. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Connie Moczygemba, Chuck Piland, Mike Oliver, Justin Hurley, Pat Beck, Tim Schmeusser and Brett Funk were present.

Also in attendance were: Matt Samitore, Interim Community Development Director; Don Burt, Planning Manager; Dave Jacob, Community Planner; Connie Clune, Community Planner; and Didi Thomas, Planning Secretary.

III. CORRESPONDENCE

There were several items of correspondence distributed with regard to item A on the agenda.

IV. MINUTES

Justin Hurley made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 3, 2009 Planning Commission meeting. Pat Beck seconded the motion. **ROLL CALL:** Piland, yes; Oliver, abstained; Hurley, yes; Beck, yes; Schmeusser, yes; Funk, yes. Motion passed.

V. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

There were no public appearances.

VI. BUSINESS

- A. File No. 09004(1).** A public hearing to consider Determination of Similar Use in accordance with Section 17.60.140 of the City of Central Point Municipal Code. A Determination of Similar Use occurs when the Planning Commission considers whether a proposed use that is not listed as a permitted use in the zoning ordinance is "similar" to a use that is listed in the zoning ordinance. The purpose of this hearing is to decide if Membership Warehouse Clubs are a similar use to those uses currently allowed within the M-1 Industrial Zoning District. **Applicant: City of Central Point**

There were no conflicts or ex parte communications to disclose. Justin Hurley stated that he had had a conversation with John Renz, Dept. of Land Conservation & Development, and the planning staffs of the cities of Albany, Bend, Hillsboro, Medford, Salem, Tigard, and Wilsonville.

Connie Moczygemba, Chairman, acknowledged receipt of correspondence from David Pyles, Development Review Planner, ODOT; Cory Crebbin, Public Works Director, City of Medford; and John W. Hoke, Interim Planning Director, City of Medford.

Planning Manager Don Burt presented a power point presentation to commissioners in order to establish the similarity of membership warehouse clubs to other uses permitted in the M-1 zoning district. Mr. Burt reviewed the procedural requirements that staff is using to establish similarity, the municipal code sections that provide the basis for a decision, defining what a membership warehouse club is, and the unique characteristics that a membership warehouse club has.

Mr. Burt proceeded to discuss the similarity tests used to establish similarity of the proposed use to other permitted uses in the M-1 district:

1. Not listed in any zoning district;
2. Similar/closely related to and compatible with listed uses;
3. Not anticipated or known to exist on the effective date of the ordinance;
4. Treated under local, state and federal law the same as listed uses;
5. Consistent with the purpose of the zoning district; and
6. Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and policies.

For each of the similarity tests listed above, Mr. Burt explained how a membership warehouse club was qualified to meet the tests. Information on conditional use permit criteria was also presented and reviewed with commissioners as staff believes that allowing the use as a conditional use would give staff and commissioners the ability more adequately regulate conditions of approval for a proposed application, should one be made.

Following the presentation, Mr. Burt explained that notice of this meeting had been published in the newspaper and mailed to all property owners within 100 feet of any properties zoned M-1. Anyone who submits a letter or comes forward to speak on the issue would have standing in this matter and would be eligible to file an appeal to the City Council.

The public hearing was then opened.

Mark Bartholemew, Attorney at Law, came forward and stated that he represented a property owner on Table Rock Road. Mr. Bartholomew stated that his client was in favor of the proposal to include membership warehouse clubs in the M-1 zoning district. He did, however, express concern over abutting property owners having to shoulder future

costs of road improvements and requested that any proposed development be required to prepare a traffic impact analysis.

David Pyles, ODOT, came forward and reviewed and explained the conditions set forth in his letter of March 3, 2009.

Several residents who had received notices of public hearing in the mail came forward to speak. One of them supported membership warehouse clubs in the M-1 district, another was curious to know if her business would be affected, another stated that he had not received a notice and wanted to sign in for the record, and another was concerned about buffering. All questions and concerns were answered.

The public portion of the hearing was closed.

Don Burt stated that staff was agreeable to working with ODOT on clarifying and making the requested modifications to the Central Point Municipal Code. Any changes to code should be good for all projects that will be required to have a traffic study.

Chuck Piland asked Matt Samitore if he thought staff could work with ODOT and Matt responded that staff had no problems with a condition of approval to work with agencies to be compliant with their concerns and addressing the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

Chuck Piland made a motion to approve Resolution 764 allowing Membership Warehouse Clubs as a conditional use in the M-1 zoning district and directing staff to work with affected agencies to address traffic concerns, based on the standards, findings, conclusions and recommendations stated in the staff report. Pat Beck seconded the motion. ROLL CALL: Piland, yes; Oliver, yes; Hurley, no; Beck, yes; Schmeusser, yes; and Funk, yes. Motion passed.

Planning Commissioners took a short break at 7:30 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

VII. DISCUSSION

Exit 35 Interchange Access Management Plan

Don Burt, Planning Manager, introduced John McDonald, Long Range Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation, who was in attendance to present a power point presentation for the Planning Commission with regard to Exit 35 and to discuss development in the area surrounding this exit. A copy of Mr. McDonald's presentation is attached to these minutes marked Exhibit "B". Mr. McDonald added that in the future, they will conduct open houses to explain concepts, development and analysis. An

Interchange Access Management Plan will guide development later on to ensure that whatever land uses are allowed won't overwhelm the interchange.

A similar plan is being discussed for Exit 33.

Rogue Valley I-5 Corridor Plan

Dave Jacob, Community Planner, stated that ODOT will be assessing safety and capacity issues along the I-5 corridor from Exit 11 to Exit 33. The Plan is intended to provide strategies and improvements to the corridor. The City of Central Point has been invited to participate in the process and will provide updates to commissioners from time-to-time.

Wilson Road UGB Expansion Plan Update

Community Planner Connie Clune advised that the proposed CP-2B urban reserve area had been selected to be a pilot project area for planning through a grant obtained by the Rogue Valley Council of Governments. A group of people attended a workshop held on March 2, 2009 in Council Chambers and worked on a variety of examples to be used for circulation in the area. The maps will be refined and presented with a final recommendation at some point in the future.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

IX. MISCELLANEOUS

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mike Oliver made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Brett Funk seconded the motion. Meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

The foregoing minutes of the March 3, 2009 Planning Commission meeting were approved by the Planning Commission at its meeting on the _____ day of _____, 2009.

Planning Commission Chair

**NORTH VALLEY CENTER
SITE PLAN EXTENSION**



STAFF REPORT

June 2, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: File No. 07038

Consideration of a request for extension of a site plan application for development of a mixed use commercial shopping facility known as the North Valley Center. The subject property is located on East Pine Street (Biddle Road) in the C-4, Tourist and Office Professional zoning district and identified on the Jackson County Assessor's map as 37S 2W 01C, Tax Lot 802. **Applicant: Bank of the Cascades.**

STAFF SOURCE:

Connie Clune, Community Planner

BACKGROUND:

By Resolution No. 723 dated April 3, 2007, the Planning Commission approved a site plan for development of a 4.87 acre shopping facility. On April 3, 2008 the Applicant requested and received a one year extension of the original site plan approval. On March 31, 2009 Bank of the Cascades received the property in lieu of foreclosure, and as such, is requesting the extension of the site plan to determine the most appropriate action. If granted, the revised expiration date would be April 1, 2010. On April 3, 2009, the applicant requested an additional one year extension of the site plan. The Planning Commission may extend the site plan approval for an additional period of one year as provided by CPMC Section 17.72.070.

Preceding the original approval of the site plan application, the Applicant applied for and received a tentative five (5) lot subdivision plan for the project (File No. 07030). The tentative plan has since expired. Any future proposals for subdividing the property will require a new tentative plan application.

ISSUES:

The request to extend the one year expiration date for the site plan application is the second such request. Section 17.72.070 is silent on the number of extensions allowed. Staff has prepared modifications to the code, however, these changes have been held in abeyance pending the outcome of state legislation regulating time extensions on planning actions.

FINDINGS:

The request for a one year extension was received in a timely manner. The bank's receipt of the property in lieu of foreclosure is referenced as justification for the extension. Conditions affecting the original approval of the site plan have not changed. The application conforms to the Transportation System Plan, and Comprehensive Plan policies have not been modified. CPMC requirements related to

extensions and tentative approvals may be reviewed and revised but will not have an impact on the current request.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment "A" – Request for extension letter dated April 3, 2009.

ACTION:

Consideration of the request for a one (1) year extension.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the request for a one (1) year extension.

ECONOMIC ELEMENT



STAFF REPORT

STAFF REPORT

June 2, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: File No. 09025(1)

Discussion of Comprehensive Plan – Economic Element

STAFF SOURCE:

Dave Jacob, Community Planner

BACKGROUND:

It's been over twenty years since the City has updated its Economic Element of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to the need to update the Economic Element, any consideration of expansion of the City's urban growth boundary will require updating the Economic Element.

The purpose of the Economic Element is to demonstrate compliance with Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) Statewide Planning Goal 9, Economy of the State, which calls for diversification and improvement of the state's economy. Goal 9 requires Comprehensive Plans to consider certain economic issues and incorporate policies designed to address those issues. Goal 9 requires that Comprehensive Plans include:

- An analysis of economic patterns, potentialities, strengths, and deficiencies as they relate to local, regional, state and national trends;
- An inventory of buildable lands for commercial and industrial growth;
- Policies concerning the economic development opportunities in the community; and
- Regulations limiting uses on or near sites zoned for specific industrial and commercial uses to those which are compatible with proposed uses.

The specific requirements to be addressed in the preparation of an economic element are set forth in Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR), Division 9, Economic Development. Those requirements are:

1. Economic Opportunities Analysis
 - a. Review national, state, regional, and local economic employment trends;
 - b. Identify sites;
 - c. Inventory of industrial and other employment lands;
 - d. Assessment of Community Economic Development Potential; and
 - e. Economic Development Visioning.
2. Industrial and Other Employment Development Policies
 - a. Economic Development Objectives;
 - b. Commitment to Provide a Competitive Short-Term Supply of Land;
 - c. Commitment to Provide Adequate Sites and Facilities.

3. Designation of Lands for Industrial and Other Employment Uses
 - a. Identification of Needed Sites;
 - b. Total Land Supply;
 - c. Short-Term Supply of Land;
 - d. Institutional Uses;
 - e. Compatibility;
 - f. Availability; and
 - g. Uses with Special Siting Characteristics.

Throughout this coming summer and fall the Planning Commission will be reviewing information on each of the above items. The tentative schedule for review of the Economic Element is:

June meeting: Introduction

July Meeting: Economic Opportunities Analysis, Part A

August Meeting: Economic Opportunities Analysis, Part B

September Meeting: Development Policies, Part A

October Meeting: Development Policies, Part B

November Meeting: Designation of Lands

FINDINGS:

There are no findings.

ISSUES:

For information and discussion only.

ATTACHMENTS:

No Attachments

ACTION:

No action required, discussion only.

HOUSING ELEMENT



STAFF REPORT

Community Development
Tom Humphrey, AICP,
Community Development Director

STAFF REPORT June 2, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: File No. 09025(2), Housing Element

Discussion of Comprehensive Plan – Housing Element, Goals and Policies

STAFF SOURCE:

Don Burt, AICP, EDFP
Planning Manager

BACKGROUND:

It's been over twenty years since the City has updated the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Aside from time, there are two additional driving forces behind updating the Housing Element; the Regional Plan, and the need to expand the City's urban growth boundary.

As with most comprehensive plan elements, Statewide Planning Goals require their preparation. In the case of the Housing Element, it is Statewide Planning Goal 10, Housing. It is the purpose of Goal 10 to assure that the housing needs of the citizens of the State are met. Goal 10 provides guidelines for the development of a Housing Element. The requirements for a Housing Element are set forth in Goal 10, and include:

1. **Needs Analysis.** Housing elements of a comprehensive plan should, at a minimum, include:
 - a. A comparison of the distribution of the existing population by income with the distribution of available housing units by cost;
 - b. A determination of vacancy rates, both overall and at varying rent ranges and cost levels;
 - c. A determination of expected housing demand at varying rent ranges and cost levels;
 - d. Allowance for a variety of densities and types of residences in each community; and
 - e. An inventory of sound housing in urban areas including units capable of being rehabilitated.
2. **Urban Growth Boundary.** Plans should be developed in a manner that insures the provision of appropriate types and amounts of land within urban growth boundaries. Such land should be necessary and suitable for housing that meets the housing needs of households of all income levels.
3. **Public Facilities Analysis.** Plans should provide for the appropriate type, location and phasing of public facilities and services sufficient to support housing development in areas presently developed or undergoing development or redevelopment.
4. **Environmental Planning.** Plans providing for housing needs should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), Division 8, Interpretation of Housing Goal 10 provides additional instructions regarding the preparation of a housing element.

As noted above, the preparation of the Housing Element will be coordinated with the Regional Plan/Urbanization Element process. The overall density standards for the City's future urban growth areas are driven by the Regional Plan. As an example, the current average residential density within the City's existing UGB is 5.4 dwelling units per gross acre. In the future, the expanded UGB will be required to develop at an average density of 6 – 7.26 dwelling units per gross acre.

The following is a tentative schedule for the Planning Commission's review of the Housing Element:

- June meeting: Introduction
- July Meeting: Needs Analysis
- August Meeting: Urban Growth Boundary
- September Meeting: Public Facilities Analysis
- October Meeting: Environmental Planning
- January Meeting: Consideration of Draft Housing Element (Public Hearing)

During the Planning Commission's review, the staff will also be coordinating review of the Housing Element with the Citizens Advisory Committee. The final Housing Element will be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation by both the Planning Commission and the Citizens Advisory Committee. This is expected to occur March 2010.

FINDINGS:

There are no findings.

ISSUES:

For information and discussion only.

ATTACHMENTS:

No Attachments

ACTION:

No action required; discussion only.

RECOMMENDATION:

**REGIONAL PROBLEM SOLVING
UPDATE**



Community Development
Tom Humphrey, AICP
Community Development Director

STAFF REPORT

STAFF REPORT
June 2, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: File No. 09025(3)

Discussion of Comprehensive Plan – Urbanization Element

STAFF SOURCE:

Don Burt, AICP, EDFP
Planning Manager

BACKGROUND:

As a requirement of the Regional Plan adoption, it will be necessary for each participating city to amend the Urbanization Element of their comprehensive plans, along with any supporting elements and documents. It is anticipated that the formal review process for the draft Regional Plan will begin sometime this summer, pending approval by the County and LCDC of the Participants Agreement. Regardless of the scheduling for the Regional Plan, it is timely and necessary for the City to consider updating its Urbanization Element.

The development and maintenance of an urbanization element is a requirement of Statewide Planning Goal 14, Urbanization, wherein it is required that a sufficient land inventory be maintained to support the growth needs of a community for a minimum 20 year planning horizon. The City's current Urbanization Element was last acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in 1984. As can be expected, over the course of the past twenty-five years the City has grown and is in need of additional land in all land use categories.

As noted above, preparation of the Urbanization Element will be coordinated with review of the draft Regional Plan, which is scheduled to commence this summer. On June 3, 2009 the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Commission will be attending an organizational meeting with the planning representatives from other participating cities. The purpose of that meeting will be to discuss the process for receiving and acting on the draft Regional Plan.

The purpose of the Regional Plan is to coordinate growth among participating jurisdictions over the next approximate 50 years through the creation of coordinated regional policies, urban reserve areas (URA), and implementation strategies. It is in the Urbanization Element that the goals, policies, and urban reserve areas of the Regional Plan will be incorporated by each participating city.

The following is a tentative schedule for the Planning Commission's review of the Housing Element:

- June meeting: Introduction
- September Meeting: Need and Urban Reserve Areas, Part A
- October Meeting: Need and Urban Reserve Areas, Part B
- September Meeting: Policies and Implementation
- October Meeting: Forward Recommendation to City Council

During the Planning Commission's review, the staff will also be coordinating review of the Urbanization Element with the Citizens Advisory Committee. The final Urbanization Element and recommendation on the draft Regional Plan will be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation by both the Planning Commission and the Citizens Advisory Committee. This is expected to occur in October 2009.

FINDINGS:

There are no findings at this time.

ISSUES:

During review of the Urbanization Element, the City will need to recognize and coordinate efforts to adopt the Regional Plan, as well as establishing a basis for expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary. This is likely to occur in two sequential steps, with the Urban Growth Boundary related amendments following the final adoption of the Regional Plan. As an example, the first action of the City would be to amend the Urbanization Element as necessary to adopt the Regional Plan (New Urbanization Element), and then to amend the New Urbanization Amendment to include findings and policies for expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary. This sequence is necessary in that the New Urbanization Element, through the Regional Plan, establishes basic parameters to be used in expanding urban growth boundaries. Attached are sections from the draft Regional Plan that will apply to Central Point, unless modified.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment "A - Draft Regional Plan (Central Point)". For a full copy of the draft Regional Plan go to:
http://www.rvcog.org/mn.asp?pg=rps_main_page

ACTION:

No action required. Discussion only.

RECOMMENDATION:

Executive Summary

PROJECT BACKGROUND

During the past few decades, Jackson County's growth rates have rivaled those seen during the gold rush of the 1880s. Although the most recent trends have shown some slowdown in that growth, the region's population is still expected to double over the next half-century. As has occurred over more than 100 years, the majority of the county's new population will settle in the Greater Bear Creek Valley, which has a number of unique physical and social characteristics that have served to amplify the impacts of its recent growth:

- The geography of the region compresses the majority of the county's population into a narrow ribbon of land bracketing the Bear Creek Valley. Some of the Valley's communities are actually contiguous (Central Point—Medford), or very nearly so (Eagle Point—White City—Medford—Phoenix). As the population grows, rural and urban uses compete for land in an increasingly tighter box.
- The presence of I-5 has further accentuated the concentration of population along the valley floor. Along the 15-mile stretch of highway from Ashland to Central Point there are five incorporated cities that are bisected by or border the interstate.
- Historic settlement patterns created population centers in the midst of the Bear Creek Valley's best agricultural lands. As these population centers expanded over the last century, productive resource land was steadily converted to urban uses.
- Numerous exception lands (residential areas in rural areas) exist throughout the Valley's agricultural areas, many of them close to, and sometimes contiguous with, cities. Their presence has had the effect of pulling growth out onto productive farmland.
- The region has become a destination of choice for retirees, primarily from western states, and especially from California. This is a demographic group that makes economic choices free of the constraints experienced by working families, leading to distortions of the local economy, especially in the demand for large single-family homes on larger lots, and considerable growth in lower-paying service sector jobs.

2 Regional Problem Solving - The Background

- There is a dramatic difference in the value of urban land in the region as compared to the value of resource land. The resulting speculation around urban areas has created development pressures which may or may not fit community plans for the future.

While the county and individual cities in the Greater Bear Creek Valley have been able to meet the challenges of the last several decades and successfully accommodate growth within their own boundaries, they also acknowledge that the cumulative regional effects of that growth have created issues that are better dealt with through cooperation, collaboration, and a degree of shared process. The mechanism of Regional Problem Solving, established by the Oregon Legislature to address difficult regional land use issues through creative means, provided the region with an opportunity to do just that. It was an attractive mechanism to the region because it provided the opportunity to establish a high level of structured cooperation on regional planning with state agencies, it offered the potential for flexibility from certain Oregon Administrative Rules which were seen to be ill-fitted to the local circumstances for very region-specific reasons, and it provided funding for the planning process.

Early in 2000 the region was awarded a grant under Regional Problem Solving on the strength of three main factors:

- The jurisdictions of the greater Bear Creek Valley had shown an ability to cooperate amongst themselves on issues of regional importance, especially in transportation and air and water quality;
- The region had shown significant progress on its own with several early efforts at aspects of regional planning (OurRegion and the Multijurisdictional Committee on Urban Reserves); and
- The problems identified for resolution through RPS were important and compelling:
 - Lack of a Mechanism for Coordinated Regional Growth Planning – The region proposed that it would continue to be subjected in the future to land use issues that would require the active collaboration of jurisdictions, and that a process needed to be established that would facilitate that collaboration.
 - Loss of Valuable Farm and Forest Land Caused by Urban Expansion – The region identified the loss of farmland as a significant issue in the recent past, and a threat to the quality of life and economy in the future if it could not be mitigated.
 - Loss of Community Identity – The region identified the decreasing rural land separation between some of the communities as jeopardizing important aspects of these jurisdictions' sense of community and identity.

Once the region was awarded Regional Problem Solving status, the problem statements above were addressed with a set of three corresponding goals:

Manage Future Regional Growth for the Greater Public Good – including policies calling for the use of intergovernmental agreements and amendments to comprehensive

