

The Junction City Planning Commission met on Wednesday, January 17, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City Oregon.

Present were: Planning Commissioners, Stuart Holderby (Chair), Ken Wells, Shaylor Scalf, Patricia Phelan, Jeff Haag, James Hukill (Vice-Chair), and Sandra Dunn; Planning Commission Alternate Alicia Beymer; City Planner, Jordan Cogburn; and Secretary, Tere Andrews.

Absent: None

1. OPEN MEETING AND REVIEW AGENDA

Chair Holderby opened the meeting at 6:30 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None

3. PUBLIC COMMENT (FOR ITEMS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA)

None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- December 20, 2017

Motion: Commissioner Scalf made a motion to approve the revised December 20, 2017 minutes as written. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 6:0:1. Chair Holderby, Commissioners, Dunn, Scalf, Wells, Hukill, and Phelan voted in favor. Commissioner Haag abstained as he was not present at the December 20, 2017 meeting.

5. PUBLIC HEARING: AMD-17-02 – BOARDING, ROOMING, AND LODGING HOUSE IN THE C2 (CENTRAL COMMERCIAL) ZONE

Chair Holderby opened the public hearing for AMD-17-02. He asked the Commission if they had any bias, conflicts of interest, or ex parte contacts.

There were none. Commissioner Scalf noted he visited areas in the C2 zone in order to educate himself on the proposal.

Planner Cogburn stated the applicant, Corey Walker proposed Code Text Amendments to the Junction City Municipal Code (JCMC), Title 17, Chapters 17.05 – Introduction and Definitions, and 17.30 – Central Commercial Zone (C2).

The proposed amendments re-defined Boarding, Lodging, and Rooming House as buildings that lodged not more than two adults per bedroom, with or without meals.

The proposed language allowed Boarding, Lodging, and Rooming Houses in the Central Commercial Zone (C2) as Conditional Uses, and further defined the use as limited to an existing stick built, residentially used structure with existing shower and kitchen.

Commissioner Haag asked about the reason for stick built and a shower and kitchen.

Commissioner Phelan asked if the proposed amendment fit with the City vision for the downtown area.

Planner Cogburn stated the city's comp plan certainly looked to having affordable housing.

Commissioner Phelan asked if it only applied to C2.

Planner Cogburn stated as proposed, and with existing language in the code, the Conditional Use could apply to any commercial zone.

Commissioner Phelan expressed concern about the proposed language and the effect that might have on available inventory of commercial spaces. She asked if a home in the C2 had been used as an allowable business, then went out of business, the building could then become a boarding house.

Commissioner Scalf commented that the State Building Codes had their own provisions regarding a Change of Use in a building. He then asked if the Police Department had been asked about the potential for an increase in crime with this type of housing.

Planner Cogburn replied, not at this time.

Chair Holderby commented there was quite a bit of 2nd floor residential housing in the downtown area already.

Commissioner Phelan expressed concern about parking.

Commissioner Haag asked about the stick built home requirement. If it were to be allowed, it should be available to buildings other than a residential stick built home. He suggested that provision was not needed. The fact that it would be a conditional use process offered protections.

Commissioner Haag asked Planner Cogburn if he would have written it the same.

Planner Cogburn responded that in such an instance, it would be under the direction of the Planning Commission. The level of research would have been the same, just under the direction of the Planning Commission.

Chair Holderby said construction of a new boarding house would be more costly than an apartment complex. He felt there was an opportunity to use existing structures.

Commissioner Haag felt the proposed language was too restrictive.

Planner Cogburn added the code currently allowed for residential uses above the ground level in C2 zones.

Commissioner Phelan expressed concern about the impact of too many people living in tight quarters.

The Commission held a discussion which included the number of occupants, the definition that included the term 'stick-built', and the conditional use review process and how to craft measurable standards, such as the appropriate number of rooms.

Chair Holderby recapped the discussion, the Commission was basically comfortable with the language minus the sentence which contained reference to "stick-built" structures with prior residential use.

Commissioner Haag suggested the definition be something such as minimum bedroom square footage was 100 sq. ft. per bedroom.

Chair Holderby stated the State Building Code minimum bedroom size was 70 sq. ft.

Testimony

Proponent

The applicant's representative, John Gambia, 264 W 6th Avenue, Junction City Oregon 97448, thanked the Commission for their time. He explained the issue first came about in June, it was kicked around at the Council level. In August it was kicked to the Planning Commission by the City Council. It came to the Planning Commission in October, 2017. At that time, the Planning Commission directed staff to bring back more information. The applicant, Corey Walker, submitted an application and paid the fee. In all that time, from June to September, the language was proposed as written because they took into account comments they heard at various meetings. The reason the term 'stick-built' was included, was that it limited the use to 12 buildings in the C2 zone. He agreed with comments from Commissioner Haag. At some point there had been another boarding house in

what is now the C2 zone, at 467 Front Street. He said there were 25 people who benefited from the existing boarding house.

Opponents

There were none.

Neutral Parties

Cheryl Glasser 770 Spruce Street, Junction City Oregon 97448 expressed concern about the health and welfare of children who might live in a boarding house.

The Commission held a brief discussion about children living in a boarding house. The commission consensus was that children should be included.

Chair Holderby asked Planner Cogburn if he saw any sort of a sticking point with the question about children in boarding houses as it related to the proposed language which limited the number of adults to two per bedroom.

Planner Cogburn responded that the proposed standard of two adults in each bedroom was not an enforceable code provision. There was no way for the City to see that as a check in terms of the objective processes at the Planning Commission level for a Type II Conditional Use. In regard to Building Code issues, the State already mandated the square footage per person, per bedroom, that included children. Additionally, going further, Lane County Health and Safety would also have an opportunity to get involved. What he was hearing was that the Commission was comfortable with the use as a Conditional Use. The language in regard to stick-built versus non-stick-built did not seem to resonate with the Commission. He also heard the Commission had trouble with the two adults per bedroom. He suggested the use be permitted as a Conditional Use, no additional language. The Commission might be interested in the definition used by the City of Lincoln City. Their definition for Boarding/Lodging/Rooming Houses was: *Boarding, Lodging, and Rooming Houses meant a building or portion thereof, other than a hotel, where meals and/or lodging were provided for compensation, for five or more persons that were not temporary occupants.* It provided an objective standard from which a Planning Commission decision could be made.

Chair Holderby added that was fine if that was the direction the Planning Commission wished to go however, he did not see a problem with the limitation of two adults per bedroom.

Commissioner Haag did not either. He did not like language about the structure having to be stick-built with existing kitchen, or shower, and had to have been a

residence at some point in its life. That language would not help anyone who wanted to establish a boarding or rooming house.

Chair Holderby asked Commissioner Haag how he felt about striking that language. As proposed it would be a conditional use which meant the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to review each such proposal.

Commissioner Haag responded that made sense.

Commissioner Scalf agreed.

Commission Alternate Beymer asked Planner Cogburn to read the Lincoln City definition again.

Deliberations

The Commission was ready to move into deliberations, Chair Holderby closed the public hearing for AMD-17-02.

Planner Cogburn reread the Lincoln City definition of a boarding/rooming/lodging house. *“Boarding, Lodging, and Rooming Houses meant a building or portion thereof, other than a hotel, where meals and/or lodging were provided for compensation, for five or more persons that were not temporary occupants.”*

Commissioners Haag and Scalf noted that it offered some type of measurable standard for review of a conditional use permit, and it still needed to meet Oregon Building Codes.

Chair Holderby asked the Commission if they saw any drawbacks to what they were proposing.

They saw none.

Chair Holderby asked the Commission for clarification on what language they wanted changed from the applicant’s proposal.

Commissioner Haag replied, Lincoln City.

Planner Cogburn offered to read it for the record, if that was what the Commission wanted.

Commissioners responded in the affirmative.

Planner Cogburn reread the Lincoln City definition of a boarding/rooming/lodging houses. *“Boarding, Lodging, and Rooming House meant a building or portion*

thereof, other than a hotel, where meals and/or lodging were provided for compensation, for five or more persons that were not temporary occupants.”

It would amend Junction City Municipal Code Chapter 17.05.020, the current definition of rooming/boarding/lodging houses. The Commission proposed it be replaced with “Boarding, lodging, rooming houses meant a building or portion thereof, other than a hotel, where meals and/or lodging were provided for compensation, for five or more persons that were not temporary occupants.”

Planner Cogburn asked the Commission for confirmation of his understanding of their direction in regard to the portion of Exhibit A that dealt with JCMC 17.30.030, Conditional Uses. The second sentence proposed by the applicant, *“In the C2 Zone the definition is further limited to any stick built home that has had a residential use in its lifetime with an existing shower and kitchen.”* That would be removed.

Commissioners gave verbal indications that was correct.

Motion: Commission Haag make a motion to recommend to the City Council the proposed Zoning Text Amendment initiated by the applicant; file # AMD-17-02 based on the amended findings as stated in the Final Order. Commissioner Hukill seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 6:1:0. Chair Holderby, Commissioners, Haag, Dunn, Scalf, Wells, and Hukill voted in favor. Commissioner Phelan voted against.

6. PLANNING ACTIVITY REPORT

Planner Cogburn reviewed the Planning Activity Report with the Commission.

7. COMMISSION AGENDA FORECASTER

The Commission reviewed the agenda forecaster.

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Scalf made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Beymer seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 7:0:0. Chair Holderby, Commissioners, Haag, Dunn, Scalf, Wells, Hukill, and Phelan voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

The next scheduled Planning Commission meeting would be Wednesday February 20, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tere Andrews, Planning Secretary

Stuart Holderby, Chair