

The Junction City Planning Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, December 21, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City Oregon and remotely via internet and phone.

PRESENT WERE Planning Commissioners, Jim Hukill (Vice-Chair), Jim Creech, Doug Easterday, Chris Miles, Jesse Newman, and Jack Sumner (attended via Zoom); Gary Darnielle, Principal Attorney, Lane Council of Governments, contracted Planning services; City Attorney, Rebekah Dohrman; Public Works Director, Gary Kaping; and Planning Secretary/Technician, Tere Andrews.

ABSENT: Chair Jeff Haag

1. Open Meeting

Vice-Chair Hukill opened the meeting at 6:30pm 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

• **August 17, 2022**

MOTION: Commissioner Creech made a motion to approve the August 17, 2022, Planning Commission minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Easterday.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Vice-Chair Hukill, Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

• **September 21, 2022**

MOTION: Commissioner Creech made a motion to approve the September 21, 2022, Planning Commission minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Easterday.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Vice-Chair Hukill, Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

• **October 19, 2022**

MOTION: Commission Easterday made a motion to approve the October 21, 2022, Planning Commission minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Miles.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Vice-Chair Hukill , Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

5. Final Plat: Bess Partition (File# MP-22-33)

Technician Andrews explained the conditions of approval set in the Preliminary Approval of the Bess Major Partition, file # MP-21-19) had all been met. Thus, the partition application met the provisions of Junction City Municipal Code 16.05.040 and 16.05.050.

MOTION: Commissioner Creech made a motion to approve the Bess major partition final plat, file MP-22-33 based on findings that the application met criteria set forth in Junction City Municipal Code 16.05.040 and 16.05.050. Commissioner Miles seconded the motion.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Vice-Chair Hukill , Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

6. Planning Commission Training

Vice-Chair Hukill called for the Planning Commission Training from City Attorney, Rebekah Dohrman.

Attorney Dohrman began with a reminder of the 19 Statewide Planning Goals of which Goal 10, Housing was the topic of the training.

- Goal 10 required cities provide housing for all housing types (single family, duplex, apartments etc.).
- Cities were required to inventory buildable land, available for residential use, within their Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).
- Cities required to provide housing for people in the community at all income levels.
- State adopted Administrative Rules (OAR's) implemented Goal 10.
 - Cities conduct a Housing Needs Analysis as part of their Comprehensive Plan.
 - Analysis included a 20-year housing forecast.
 - If the inventory and analysis resulted in a deficit of land to accommodate the forecasted need, options included:

- Urban Growth Boundary expansion
- Land use regulations modification(s) to increase residential densities.
- Mix of the above.
- Cities with populations of 2,500 or greater must provide a broader mix of housing types, such as:
 - Attached and detached dwelling units
 - Multi-family
 - Government assisted housing
 - Mobile home or manufacture home parks
 - Manufactured homes on individual lots
 - Housing for farm workers
- The State statute (ORS chapter 195) for needed housing was recently modified.
 - Prior to modification some housing types were not included as “needed housing”.
 - Now all housing types were considered “needed housing”. (ORS197.303)
 - Review procedures must be clear and objective.
 - Clear: Easily understood, without ambiguity
 - Objective: Existing independent of mind, observable and verifiable.
 - Objective: answered with a ‘yes’ or ‘no’
 - Appeals were through the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).
 - LUBA was authorized by their statutes to reverse a City’s decision when clear and objective standards were not applied.
 - A reversal from LUBA meant the plaintiff could ask for the city to pay their attorney fees.

Commissioner Easterday asked who would conduct a housing needs analysis.

Attorney Dohrman answered, generally, the city would contract with a Planning consulting firm. The City Council was the decision-maker. The analysis needed to be completed every 20 years.

A form-based code (diagrams/pictures) were preferable over written descriptions. Resources were needed to update/amend existing land use code which could be an issue for local/smaller governments.

Implementation of Goal 10 in Junction City was through Chapter 9 of the city's Comprehensive Plan.

- Chapter 9 was updated in 2012.
- ORS 197.296(10) and 197.296(11) provided the requirements for cities with populations less than 10,000.
- Junction City had a population of about 7,200.
- ORS 197.296(10) and 197.296(11):
 - Determination of housing needs for a 20-year period
 - Inventory of land available for residential uses
 - Adoption of measures that accommodated the housing need.
- The Housing Needs Analysis study methodology was outlined in the Oregon Administrative Rules.
 - Data gathered was heavily based on census data.
 - Cities generally contracted with a Planning firm to gather the data.
 - Firm would share data and gather input from the Planning Commission.
 - Public comment also gathered through an open house, or similar process.

Commissioner Easterday asked if there were percentages for each housing type.

Attorney Dohrman was not sure how the numbers were determined but it would be included in the housing report. The current Comprehensive Plan contained much of the housing analysis data.

Secretary Andrews offered an example, the 2012 (current) housing needs analysis identified a deficit (need) for R2 (Duplex Residential) land.

Attorney Dohrman stated in Chapter 9, the Housing Element of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, the city needed to provide 80 dwelling units per year for the 20-year period (2012-2032).

The state statutes and rules related to Goal 10; Housing were changing.

- 2017- Senate Bill 1051

- required cities with populations of 2,500 or more to allow accessory dwelling units in areas zoned for single family homes.
- 2018- House Bill 4006
 - applied to cities with populations of 10,000 or more Cities. Those cities were required to
 - report to DLCD (Department of Land Conservation and Development) housing production on an annual basis
 - whether that production met the goal set in their Comprehensive Plan.
- 2019-House Bill 2001
 - applied to cities with populations of 10,000 or more.
 - essentially eliminated R1 (Single Family Residential) zoning districts.
 - required duplexes be permitted where single-family homes allowed.
 - Cities with populations of 25,000 or greater were required to permit even higher densities for housing in R1.
- 2019-House Bill 2003
 - directed DLCD and Oregon Housing Community Services to work together to come up with a new methodology for housing needs analysis, and to focus on the state level methodology.
 - Cities with populations greater than 10,000 had to develop and adopt a strategy to stay on track with their housing production needs.
- 2023 legislative session
 - Oregon Housing Communities Services and DLCD made their report on what could be done at a state level to track housing needs,
 - determine housing needs *not* met and
 - how they could be met.
 - recommendation was to change goal 10,
 - along with the statutes and rules that implemented Goal 10
 - housing needs analysis methodology needed to change

- unclear, as yet, whether the changes considered would apply across the board or to populations of 10,000 and greater.

Commissioner Creech asked had there been any opposition.

Attorney Dohrman responded that one of the pushes with the proposed changes was to provide more resources to local governments to plan for housing, such as infrastructure. A financial package was being contemplated.

Commissioner Miles asked if there was a target date when Junction City would reach a population of 10,000.

Attorney Dohrman answered, it may be five or more years before Junction City reached a population of 10,000, however, that could change.

The Commission thanked Attorney Dohrman for her presentation.

7. Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair Elections

MOTION: Commissioner Creech made a motion to nominate Commissioner Haag as Planning Commission Chair. Commissioner Easterday seconded the motion.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Vice-Chair Hukill, Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Creech made a motion to nominate Commissioner Hukill as Planning Commission Vice-Chair. Commissioner Miles seconded the motion.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 4:0:0. Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

8. Request to Modify Standing Meeting Date

CONSENSUS: By a consensus of the Commission, the discussion to possibly change the standing meeting date was tabled to the January 18, 2023, meeting.

9. Planning Commission Agenda Forecaster

Pending items:

- Replat city-owned block containing 175 W 7th Avenue (Community Center)
- Preliminary subdivision application anticipated in February
- In response to Commissioner Sumner's question, the single-family home at 5th and Holly (287 W 5th Ave), had a structural permit to convert to a tri-plex. Concern was raised that people lived there while the building was under construction. The building official checked with the property owner and was

told there was someone living there but it was for security purposes. Thus, any safety issues that arose was the responsibility of the property owner.

10. Commissioner Comments

None.

8. Adjournment

MOTION: Commissioner Easterday made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Creech seconded the motion.

VOTE: Passed by a vote of 5:0:0. Vice-Chair Hukill , Commissioners, Creech, Easterday, Newman, and Miles voted in favor. Due to technical difficulties Commissioner Sumner did not submit a vote.

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

The next Standing Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for Wednesday January 18, 2023, at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tere Andrews, Planning Commission Secretary

James Hukill, Planning Commission Vice-Chair