

MINUTES
FINAL SALEM PLANNING COMMISSION Reviewer: Levin
February 9, 2021

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Dan Augustyn
Chane Griggs, President
Lisa Heller
Casey Kopcho
Ian Levin
Brian McKinley, Vice President
Joshlene Pollock
Ashley Schweickart
Michael Slater

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Austin Ross, Planner I
Eunice Kim, Long-Range Planning
Manager
Julie Warnke, Transportation
Planning Manager
Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie,
Deputy CD Director and
Planning Administrator
Shelby Guizar, Admin Analyst
Thomas Cupani, Deputy City
Attorney

Note: This meeting was held digitally during the home quarantine imposed by the Governor to stem the spread of the Covid-19 virus. All attendees were virtual.

1. CALL TO ORDER

President Chane Griggs called the meeting to order at 5:31 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL

Roll was taken and with quorum established, President Griggs proceeded with the meeting.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: This time is available for interested citizens to comment on specific agenda items other than public hearings, deliberations and the merits of land use issues that are reviewable by the Planning Commission at public hearings. Each person's comments will be limited to three minutes.

- Phil Carver, on behalf of 350 Salem OR, 1007 Newport Drive SE, Salem OR 97306

Commissioner Slater arrives at 5:34 pm

Questions or Comments by Commissioners: Commissioners Schweickart, Pollock

4. CONSENT CALENDAR:

4.1 Approval of Minutes

January 26, 2021 Minutes (Commissioner Pollock)

Recommended Action: Approve

Motion: Move to approve the minutes.

Motion by: Commissioner Pollock

Seconded by: Commissioner Augustyn

Questions or Comments by: None

Vote: Aye: Augustyn, Griggs, Heller, Kopcho, Levin, McKinley, Pollock, Schweickart, Slater

Nay: 0

Abstentions: 0

Absent: 0

Action: Moved to approve the minutes.

VOTE:

Yes 9 No 0 Abstain 0 Absent 0

4.2 Resolutions: None

4.3 Action Items: None

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

6. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS:

6.1 Our Salem Discussion

Eunice Kim, Long-Range Planning Manager, gave a brief update on the Our Salem draft vision.

Questions or Comments:

- Commissioner Pollock, referring to page 45 of the draft vision, asking for explanation of what middle-housing is
 - Ms. Kim explained it is townhouse, duplex, tri-plex, four-plex, and cottage cluster (defined in house bill 2001), is what we will have to allow in single-family zone
- Commissioner Kopcho, the six goals make sense as far as minimum density, but one thing he didn't see was setbacks so that variances wouldn't be required every time, could that be apart of this plan or is that more code related
 - Ms. Kim answered that setbacks and lot coverage would be looked at so people could fully develop sites with understanding impacts to surrounding areas
- Kopcho asked if the term "high-rise" will be renamed
 - Ms. Kim answered yes, will be renamed

- Commissioner Schweickart asked if when draft vision goes to council, what vision acceptance means and what is driving the timeline for adoption
 - Ms. Kim answered that we are specifically looking at the vision statement, goals and map. City is trying to understand priorities of the community and the State of Oregon that need to be sorted prior to adoption
- Schweickart said she wishes we could include more detailed language on how each of the efforts is benefiting each focus area
- Commissioner Slater says his focus has been on what will it take to make the plan successful, wants to discuss some of the percentages of new residents and jobs that are expected to be within the core network and within complete neighborhoods, as well as the total percentages of all families and all jobs within those two categories
 - Ms. Kim showed her slide that answered 74% of all households will live within complete neighborhoods and 53% of new households will live within complete neighborhoods. Answered that the indicator for this project is access to frequent transit, under the preferred scenario it shows new employment 22% of new housing will be within ¼ mile of 15-minute service and 36% of new employment, numbers are not for all, just for new.
- Commissioner Slater asks what percentage of all households will be in walkable neighborhoods in 2035 under the current scenario
 - Ms. Kim answers 74%
- Commissioner Slater asks the difference between complete neighborhoods and compact neighborhoods and mixed-use neighborhoods
 - Ms. Kim answers complete neighborhoods would be walkable neighborhoods whereas compact neighborhood would be a mix of duplex, triplex, four-plex within a single-family neighborhood versus only single-family homes on large lots. We would essentially get to compact neighborhoods with house bill 2001 requiring us to allow those middle-housing types within the single-family zone
- Commissioner Slater asked if our draft vision plan will get us to the 30% of a metro areas residence into compact neighborhoods that the state has set within the state transportation strategy plan, wondering if the zoning map alone is going to get us to the 30% goal
 - Ms. Kim says we need to incentivize to be able to move closer to that 30%, as of now, it is hard to answer if our map alone will reach the 30% because we have not analyzed that goal
- Commissioner Griggs mentions that the house bill 2001 seems to be a little loose with verbiage using terms like “may” do this or that whereas our goals seem stronger and feels like requiring something is not an incentive, is concerned about mandating certain things and is noticing the city taking a stronger stance than the state, wonders about other cities and if they have taken a stronger approach to reaching goals
 - Ms. Kim answered that research done on other cities has shown specific requirements based on their priorities
- Commissioner Pollock, referring to page 41 of draft vision, which mentions affordable housing and low and working households, asking if there will be standard criteria to determine what that is
 - Ms. Kim answered the policy language is meant to be inclusive and encourage broad mix of that type of housing

- Commissioner Pollock, referring to page 63 of the draft vision, asked if there is some kind of historic agreement stating that if the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is to be expanded the first property to be included is an 1982 property and is asking where that land is located
 - Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie answered that there is something worked out in the comprehensive plan where there were certain owners that wanted to be in the UGB previously, but were not able to, and the agreement was that those properties would be looked at first but there is a lot of criterion to meet still
- Commissioner Pollock brought up greenhouse gases and transportation, 2/3 of missions in the plan stem from commute of traffic, wants us to figure out incentives that we can put into the plan to help local business with the commuter issues
- Commissioner Kopcho asked about future rail compatibility, for not just industrial and freight, and how there are so many parking lots associated, seems like it would be a neat concept to plan a mixed-use area around the rails
- Commissioner Slater asked to what extent our street improvement plans are driven by planning comprehensive plans, if the Planning Administrator or any planning staff have any say on what gets improved
 - Ms. Anderson-Ogilvie answered that transportation improvements today are part of the transportation system plan but that there will be a prioritization that help further the vision so that everything can work together to be a successful vision, ideally the prioritization will help determine the funding needed, the Planning Division does not have any say in the decisions relating to street improvements or how they are ranked
 - Julie Warnke, Transportation Planning Manager, states that Planning staff do participate in the group that helps determine how the regional transportation funds get allocated to projects
- Commissioner Schweickart says that the 12th and 13th Street corridors should change to mixed-use, feels like it is a way to utilize transportation mechanisms as an economic engine and how it relates to land use. Also felt like the draft vision plan lacked a goal that gave assistance to small and minority-owned businesses through creation of spaces where they could thrive
- Commissioner Slater asked how the Public Works department takes into account the Planning decisions and the comprehensive map to help make decisions for transportation improvements
 - Ms. Warnke answered that Public Works is supportive of a strong bicycle network and walking support, feels like it is currently represented in plans, but can be expanded upon. Feels like they could work with the community to determine where they feel the priorities lie. Public Works does not have a large funding stream for bicycle network, but is working towards grant opportunities, but are really tied to bond measures and have not had one since 2008. Do anticipate through state transportation rule changes, that the state might make the plans financially constrained which means instead of a broader look at all transportation needs, that the city will need to show if there will be enough funding per project.
- Commissioner Slater would like to know what everyone's general opinion is on the plan

- Commissioner Pollock says she likes the goals to aim high and not short the city on possible achievements, seems like the biggest restraint will be financial
- Commissioner Kopcho says it seems like it's moving in the right direction, but also seems too early to say how it will pan out. When the Our Salem journey started, things were very different, but agrees on pushing the envelope rather than regretting it in the future.
- Commissioner Schweickart says she feels the purpose of a document like this is to aim high because of the potential, wants the city to be bold in what they want to achieve
- Commissioner Heller says she agrees with aiming high and not undercutting ourselves
- Commissioner Griggs agrees with previous commissioners and has no issues with the draft vision

Motion: Move for the Planning Commission to encourage the City Council to accept the Vision and to direct staff to begin work on bold policies and zoning that address climate change.

Motion by: Commissioner Slater
Seconded by: Commissioner Pollock

Questions or Comments by: None

Vote: *Aye:* Augustyn, Griggs, Heller, Kopcho, Levin, Pollock, Schweickart, Slater
 Nay: 1 (McKinley)
 Abstentions: 0
 Absent: 0

Action: Moved for the Planning Commission to encourage the City Council to accept the Vision and to direct staff to begin work on bold policies and zoning that address climate change.

VOTE:

Yes 8 No 1 Abstain 0 Absent 0

7. INFORMATION REPORTS: None

8. PUBLIC COMMENT (other than agenda items): None

9. PLANNING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:

- February 23rd Salem Planning Commission meeting is cancelled
- Council meeting on the 22nd for the Our Salem Draft Vision
- We do not have to cancel a Planning Commission meeting if there are no cases coming for public hearing, if a commissioner has something they want to discuss, we can still hold a meeting
- Commissioner Kopcho asked about upcoming UDC revisions and Ms. Anderson-Ogilvie answered that the hope is to come to Planning Commission in April for a

work session that includes public testimony. It will be the beginning of multiple work sessions.


10. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER:

Commissioner Pollock mentioned the ODOT notice for Wallace Road being worked on, wanted to bring up that over 35,000 people use that road every day, and that she is going to do more research and come up with a proposal of areas on Marine Drive to be focused on and discussed with City Council. Pollock does not want to give up a round-a-bout in the area. Commissioner Schweickart asked about re-appointment, Ms. Anderson-Ogilvie answered that at the City Council meeting last night (February 8th) members were appointed for the boards and commissioners committee who will work on appointments and re-appointments to boards and commissions. Commissioner Kopcho stated he was working on a flag submission.

11. ADJOURNMENT:


There being no further business for the record, the meeting was adjourned at 7:12 P.M.

SUBMITTED:



Chane Griggs, President

ATTESTED:



Lisa Anderson-Ogilvie, AICP
Deputy Community Development Director and
Planning Administrator