CALL TO ORDER
Chair Valley called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Council Chambers, City Hall.

ROLL CALL
Recording Secretary called the roll. The following were:

Present: Darby Valley, Blake Hoskin, Tao Orion and Tim Burns

Absent: Chloe Beckes, Ashley Rigel, and Beau Solesbee

Staff Present: City Planner - Assistant City Planner - Eric Mongan, Public Works & Development Director - Faye Stewart and Administrative Aide – Angela Keppeler

Applicant: City of Cottage Grove.

News Media Present: None

Staff advised that this hearing had been advertised and publicized and notices posted as required by law. It was asked that any correspondence received be noted as a part of the item on the agenda.

ITEMS TO BE ADDED
NONE

MINUTES
September 16, 2020

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER TIM BURNS AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BLAKE HOSKIN TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM September 16, 2020 REGULAR PUBLIC HEARING AS PRESENTED.
Vote on the motion as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>Commissioner Valley</th>
<th>Commissioner Beckes</th>
<th>Commissioner Rigel</th>
<th>Commissioner Burns</th>
<th>Commissioner Hoskin</th>
<th>Commissioner Solesbee</th>
<th>Commissioner Orion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 16, 2020 Minutes have been approved.

**EX PARTE CONTACT**

Tim Burns states he is friends with two of the applicants.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BLAKE HOSKINS AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TAO ORION TO ALLOW COMMISSIONER TIM BURNS TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING.

Vote on the motion as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>Commissioner Valley</th>
<th>Commissioner Beckes</th>
<th>Commissioner Rigel</th>
<th>Commissioner Burns</th>
<th>Commissioner Hoskin</th>
<th>Commissioner Solesbee</th>
<th>Commissioner Orion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tim Burns has been approved to participate in meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

A. CITY OF COTTAGE GROVE – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT/LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT (MCPA 5-20) TO REDESIGNATE/REZONE 2.62 ACRES ON GATEWAY BLVD TO RC RESIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL. Applicant is seeking to redesignate and rezone 2.62 acres on the south side of the curve of Gateway Blvd between Harvey and Coop Ct from CT Commercial Tourist to RC Residential Commercial. Relevant Criteria: 14.41.500 Decision-making criteria. Applicant/Owner: Double H Investments, 80321 Sears Road, Cottage Grove OR 97424; Jack & Linda Hartness, PO Box 546, Cottage Grove, OR 97424; City of Cottage Grove, 400 E. Main Street, Cottage Grove, OR 97424.

[EM] Eric Mongan states this is an application for a comprehensive plan amendment with map change. This is for approximately 2 acres of land located on the south side of Gateway Blvd. north of the Row River trail. This plan amendment application would convert presently zoned land that is commercial tourist to residential commercial. This land has sat vacant and undeveloped, with the exception on the far east property at...
319 Roberts Lane, which was built in the 50’s. The current owners of the land, Double H Investments, and Jack and Linda Hartness have put forward this application. They believe this is a great opportunity area for Multi-family development, while also still having a path for some commercial uses as the residential commercial zone does permit.

Looking through State wide planning goals, a significant one would be goal 8 which would provide housing. You may recall that we adopted a housing needs analysis back in 2019, it steered us towards looking at ways to potentially convert undeveloped land with zoning that may have not been compliant with the land type or location. Those of you who are familiar with this part of Gateway, there are a couple of large radius curves there. Speeds are 35 mph. and so for commercial development to be in this location, you can imagine a McDonald’s, Gas station or something like that with 150 plus trips an hour, which would be a lot for this road. That is probably the reason why this hasn’t met a commercial development yet. Whereas residential commercial is essentially the City’s R2 medium density with a minimum of 8 units per acre. Multi-family development is actually only .67 trips per day per dwelling. You can see that this will not be putting a lot of vehicles on the road in this particular part, which many consider to be problematic for development. There was a transportation planning rule analysis done by Branch Engineering, they found what’s logical. As I had said a gas station would have 150 trips an hour, a multi-family development would have .67 times the number of dwellings per day.

Staff recommends that you all recommend approval to City Council for adoption.

[DV] I do have a question on the difference in what would be allowed on commercial tourist vs residential commercial. A gas station would be one, what is another example we could sink our teeth into as far a commercial tourist?

[EM] You could do a hotel, any fast food establishment like Dairy Queen, Starbucks things like that, that would be commercial tourist. Residential can happen, but it would require a master plan. With the City’s current adopted master plan process it would also require that the developer hand over 15% of the total parent development to the city for public use. Where this is only 2._ some change acers, if you had to give 15% of that up for public use it would really decrease it and its ability to reach development potential.

[DV] Opened public hearing for DCTA 4-20 at 7:18pm

**IN FAVOR**
None
NEUTRAL

[JL] Joseph Lima 319 Roberts Lane Cottage Grove OR. 97424
My biggest question is, are we here to be told what their plan is? I’ve heard somebody say something about Senior Apartments, that’s hear say though.

[DV] at this stage it’s just for a zoning change.

[JL] My biggest concern is there is a lot of foot traffic back and forth. You literally can’t leave anything in site with the way it is around here. You’re constantly worried about it, and if this is going to increase it. I know, as well as the lot behind me, (between me and the welfare office) has also been sold. There was talk about apartments as well. That’s my biggest concern and I was going to figure out how to address maybe blocking the road off there, to get rid of that foot traffic and unwanted people scoping your property out and going through your stuff.

[EM] as Darby has said, this is not to consider a design or specific use, building placement etc. It is to create a space for it through zoning. If and when an application comes in for an actual design and build out, you will receive a notice and have an opportunity to speak to that. If there is anything within the code that you bring forward that can be discussed or if the developer and you come together or make some agreements, that’s an opportunity area for that. I will tell you that if there is more development there, more eyes out there, more light, more quality traffic. That generally leads to less of the transient foot traffic that you’re referring to, petty theft etc. It does cut both ways. You will receive a notice in the mail and there will be a big green sign staked on the property saying HEARING THIS DATE to look at the development of this lot.

[JL] ok, excellent.

[DV] what is the radius that notices get mailed out to?

[EM] for Coop court property or this property we’re discussing it would be 300 feet from the outer limit of each parcel. 319 Roberts lane you are definitely getting covered, it will also be put out in the newspaper. There are other mechanisms of public posting that we do.

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BLAKE HOSKIN AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TAO ORION TO RECOMMEND APPLICATION DCTA 4-20 AS WRITTEN BASED ON CRITERIA FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS STATED IN THE STAFF REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL.
Vote on the motion as follows:

| Commissioner  
| Valley | Commissioner  
| Beckes | Commissioner  
| Rigel | Commissioner  
| Burns | Commissioner  
| Hoskin | Commissioner  
| Solesbee | Commissioner  
| Orion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AYES | X | X | X | X | |
| NAYES | | | | | |

Motion passed unanimously

B.  
CITY OF COTTAGE GROVE – DEVELOPMENT CODE TEXT AMENDMENT (DCTA 4-20) TO AMEND TITLE 14 DEVELOPMENT CODE RELATED TO HOUSING.
Applicant is seeking to amend the Title 14 Development Code regarding duplex development and residential parking to comply with the latest OARs and LCDC guidance on HB 2001. Relevant Criteria: 14.41.500 Decision-making criteria.
Applicant: City of Cottage Grove, 400 Main Street, Cottage Grove OR 97424.

[EM] DCTA 4-20 is a bit of State mandated changes to code based on House bill 2001, and some housekeeping from staff on some issues that have come to bare through the application process over time, and trying to pull it all together.

The first one we'll talk about is the rules that came through regarding duplex parking. House bill 2001 said that anywhere you allow the single family dwelling, you now in a medium size city like us, 10,000-25,000 people, you have to allow a duplex on that same size lot, and there can't be any extra strings. We brought that change into our code in January. But now they've gone through the rule making process and have added a part that says, because of that duplex being on the same lot as a single family dwelling, you can't require any more parking than what you require for a single family dwelling. In the City of Cottage Grove for a single family dwelling you have 2 parking spaces. They're saying if it is two for a single family dwelling than it is two for a duplex. That is the State mandated part of the rule. The next step that Staff took, which is the subject of these additional documents, is asking what the next step from that. Do we then go to say that a triplex would require six spaces? Under the current code it would, depending on the number of rooms.

Our current codes says that multifamily development, based on the number of rooms, dictates how many parking spaces are required. So Staff, looking at the housing needs analysis, and looking at ways to lower the barriers to development, and making ease, it became an equity thought process in our minds. If a duplex just required one parking space per dwelling, then a tri-plex should only require one parking space per dwelling,
and then therefore multifamily should only require one parking space per dwelling. Currently our multifamily standard is, one bedroom one parking space, two bedrooms one and a half parking spaces, and above three bedrooms its stays flat at two per dwelling. Staff has purposed to amend that to say that we would only require one parking space per dwelling. That is the point of these memos, it’s a little bit of the background on how that process was born out. The document was an analysis done by Ethan Stuckmeyer at the DLCD, he’s the Middle Housing Manager, and He’s kind of spearheading a lot of this kind of work. It’s really just getting to case studies on how many vehicles folks have if they live in multifamily housing. I think this is the time we should pause for a second and discuss.

Do you have any questions about what I have just presented regarding this specific change?

[TO] Tao Orion asked if people do have more than one vehicle per dwelling, does that mean the others would be parked in the street.

[EM] Yes, but remember this is a minimum standard. We are not saying the developer, who builds forty apartments couldn’t install sixty spaces, we are just saying that we would only say you have to do at least forty. Granted it’s an unknown, we can only put a box on the bottom, less on the top. We do have some restrictions based on number of spaces over maximum, generally its 50% of the minimum.

[DV] what is the development advantages to doing it the way you’re purposing?

[EM] For example, a few months ago we had that 14 unit townhome development up on the end of Arthur Ave. Because our multifamily code says after four units you have to provide open space. So now it becomes a balancing act between getting the bare minimum of open space, getting all the parking in there, and then trying to get your dollar, which is rent. If you go taller you have cost of construction increases, if you’re paving more for parking you have cost of construction. Not to mention monthly fees on the more hard surfaces you have the more you pay on your water bill on commercial accounts. These are all barriers to development. Infill development, specifically, like the Arthur Ave. one. That lot was already platted and has been R3, it’s not a typical shape, yes it has right angles, but it has a narrower throat that basically says it has to be a drive isle. If they had a one for one parking ratio they probably could have put a whole other building in there, and we’d get that much more density.

[DV] what statistical stuff out there say ones enough?

[EM] even our current SDC calculations, (that’s system, development, charges.) When we do a single family dwelling it’s a unit of one, one vehicle trip per day. Notwithstanding there could be two working parents, adults, or co-habitants, and multiple vehicles. But we charge for one based on the science of trip calculations. For
multifamily we only charge .6, and that’s because we recognize that there is actually less vehicle trips for multifamily style housing. Generally if there are less vehicle trips, there are less cars.

[DV] Is that born out in other cities?

[EM] are you asking about Eugene or Springfield? The ITE manual is not specific to us, and that’s where we get this from. I believe the “I” is international.

[DV] any other questions from commissioners?

[TO] so would you say this decision is mostly based on the developers interests, and potentially having more buildings, or does it have other implications?

[DV] Let me jump in on that one. I was on the multifamily housing looking forward on how we were going to do it. The duplexes are really being driven by the State that we have to do the duplexes, but that leaves out triplexes, quads, and how we deal with cottage clusters, and everything else, so it all gets pretty confused. With our current code with the requirements, I think the biggest jump is from a duplex to a triplex. The duplex is going to have a two parking requirement because of the state mandate, and a triplex is going to require six. I can’t remember the cost per developed parking space on lots, but it’s not cheap. It’s like $10,000 or more, and so it adds up significantly, which means we’ve basically done all this work on changing code, but now we are not going to have any triplex or quadplex development, which in theory we want in order to supply more affordable housing. We keep having all this housing that we keep making very expensive, and we just approved developments on the hill behind us, those are all going to be nice single family homes, we’re doing more and more infill that’s all higher end. There is some area that needs to be higher density of housing, the question is do we need the same density in parking.

I think the statistics for the City of Cottage Grove is one household in five don’t even own a car. There are other factors once you get down to that level of housing, you are far less likely to have vehicles. So the theory is you’re making parking spots that never get filled. We have a higher use for that if we use it for recreational open space, green space, and make it nicer and more pleasant to live in. So it doesn’t look like a crappy apartment buildings that you see that are all parking and right up against a big block of house with no trees. That’s my take on it, that’s how I’ve been reading it when I read the memos, and what I’ve seen going through the housing development processes for the other programs. I welcome other people’s input and questions. If someone disagrees please get it on the record.

[FS] Faye Stewart states if I might add, I think there also needs to be a discussion about functionality. I think that it’s easier to support multifamily housing in someplace like Portland, Eugene, and Springfield that has a robust transit system. That makes it
easier for folks to get to work and do their basic needs. Does that exist in Cottage Grove? I think that should be a consideration, how people get around. I think that other thing is that are we assuming, are there going to be guests that visit, where are the guests going to park? We have had conversations about other comments that have come before the Council and the Commission regarding projects, one was on Arthur, in relationship to the land trust development. Folks were concerned about parking on the streets because that was were some of the parking was going to take place. So I think it’s important, me as the Public Works Director, because I’m hearing from the City Manager, and from other folks concerns about making sure there’s enough parking to support the housing needs in our community and who’s going to be living in them. I just want to make sure there is a good conversation amongst the Planning Commission as you make a recommendation to the Council that can be justified as to why you’re reasoning was that you supported either this proposal or a different one.

[DV] Great points, I’m curious, on our current lots sizes, and things that are needed, what are the current street parking units that are mandated for each house.

[EM] Say that again.

[DV] I know my house,(I’ve got more than most), I have six parking spots that surround my house, I’ve got a double lot on the corner. I’m also across from a park so I’ve got twenty four more parking spaces. I could have a huge party and I don’t have to get valet parking, but you go in a block it gets tighter, and most of those houses have a 50 foot front, so they probably have space for two maybe three cars parked on the street in front of their house. I know we just reduced our lot size requirements down to 45 in the R1 zone. So that would leave maybe two spots in front of the house.

[EM] if they are blocking the driveway.

[DV] Two if they’re blocking, one if they’re not?

[EM] Yes.

[DV] 45 really? How long is a parking space?

[EM] Parallel parking is 20 foot. That’s the prescribed parking if someone was stripping their parking lots. That accounts for the F350 dually, long bed, crew cab, wrench kit, whatever.

[DV] ok so we have one dedicated spot, we’ve got a bunch of sluff space, and a driveway at minimum at every house. Then the question is how much do we need? I come from bigger cities, I’m use to fighting it out for parking. My bias is defiantly towards let the cars scramble for it, but that’s where the Commissioners need to
entertain this and discuss what you think and why you think it. Because we are going to vote on this in a little bit.

[TB] Tim Burns states it’s sort of a double edged sword. On one hand trying to create affordable housing, you want to keep the building cost as low as possible, so having less parking spaces ($10,000 per parking space) on a fourplex that’s another $40,000 you’re spending on a parking space. Maybe that makes the project not pencil out and the developer won’t build, but it does make it a better place because people tend to have cars, trailers, or a boat or something they’re parking in the space. They don’t necessarily put it in garages and fill the garages up with stuff. I see it both ways. I’m not sure if one way is better than the other. If we are trying to entice more affordable housing, maybe we don’t want to push for more parking spaces and keep it more up to the developer’s choice whether they want to have low end or higher end overall construction.

[DV] I think that’s a great point. I think the question though is, if you’re moving into a triplex or quad, what is the chances you’ll have a boat that you’ll need to store, or an RV. I think the reality of the folks moving in there, they tend to have less gear. How do you stop stuff? I tore my garage down and had no place to put it, boy am I suffering. I’m now building one so I have a place to put that stuff, but part of it is dedicated for a car or two if I want it that way. I don’t think you can win. I think you will have pressure either way. We have to find an equilibrium, what the greater good that matter the most is. I think finding people homes is more important than finding cars, and garages in my final analysis. If you need to you can always add parking later.

[BH] Blake Hoskins states, I would agree, I would think the housing needs are given priority, and so if we can encourage developers to come. Anything we can do to encourage more housing and more development of Cottage Grove is good. I think you’re just simplifying the numbers. It seems like the state is saying one to one is good. I’ve lived in apartment complexes where it was one per unit. I think it’s pretty standard, so I think it just makes it easier for any development, low income or high income. It’s going to increase housing overall. I think that’s a good thing for Cottage Grove.

[TO] Is there any kind of requirement for garages in a development like that?

[DV] so the current code I’m reading on display says, for single family you need two spaces per dwelling. It doesn’t say it has to be a garage, just spaces off street. For two and three family dwellings, duplexes, and triplexes, it’s two spaces per dwelling. That is being forced to be changed by state law, for the duplex part, not the triplex part. And we’ve distinguished multifamily, and I don’t know if this conforms to our current multifamily definition or not, it’s one space per studio or one bedroom unit, one and a half spaces per unit on two bedroom unit, and two spaces for a three bedroom or larger unit. Maybe the answer is to cut the baby in the middle, and just change it to triplex’s and above go with that standard. That gets you as long as you’re doing with the smaller
unit for people on their own do have one. And if you need to come up with one and a half if you have two bedroom units. I can see the analysis there. If you’re a single mom and your kid turns seventeen they may have a car, but they may not. That would be a place for compromise as far as that goes. Did that answer your question, or did I just jumble it more?

[BH] every development is going to be different, you could build a duplex that has four bedrooms in each unit, and would have enough space on the lot to do that, and when we are looking at that plan won’t we be able to say (“well if you’re having this many people living on this property where are they going to park?”) and then look at the street around it and be able to analysis each development at the time the development plan is submitted. I think now setting the standard easier to get plans submitted and looking at each specific plan, it helps get things rolling at least.

[DV] are you advocating the lower parking per unit measure there Blake?

[BH] I think so, I think that’s what I’m understanding the submittal is. One parking space per unit, and I would support that.

[TO] I just kind of wonder, at looking at the streets as Blake mentioned, I don’t know if that is part of the process when you are looking at a development piece, and just assessing if people did have two cars, could they park here. I have noticed a couple places in town where it seems like there are apartments right on 6th I think, right by the acupuncture office. There are always a lot of cars right there, because I think there are a lot more apartments put in in those buildings, and it’s kind of a squeeze.

[DV] that’s because they’ve closed the gateway there on Washington for the hardware store, but that’s another issue. I get your point, my patients do have an issue. I am the acupuncturist on that street just for the record. There definitely is a difference in parking. I have patients that have to walk further because of the commercial development, and The Brewstation draws lots of cars onto that street. They have advocated to have the parking requirements be changed in the area. The apartments haven’t so much been the issue, the lack of enforcement has been the issue.

In theory you’re not allowed to leave a car on the street here in Cottage Grove for over 72 hours, or you get an orange sticker and you get towed. Even with my abundance of spots I’ve regularly gotten an orange sticker on my vehicles that I’ve left on the street, and then had to move. That is more commercial space, and I don’t think the apartments apply to that. I think the question is does that pressure translate into more residential areas being places you don’t want to live. Does that make it too hard to enjoy what’s going on around you? I think that’s where we have to come down to on either accepting or rejecting, or amending this proposal by staff as a recommendation to Council.
I would add, I think that Blake is correct in saying when application comes in you analyze the area and see what’s available for it. So just take for instance the last item that came forward to the Commission for rezone, there is not going to be any on street parking for that development, that’s completely out. I think the developer will have to recognize that and plan accordingly to whatever he believes they are going to try to achieve with that development. I think each application, and what the applicant desires to build is probably what is going to play out. I guess the question is, does this meet adequately having this minimum, and once again it’s just the minimum, because folks can put in more than what’s required. Tao you asked about garages, I don’t believe garages are required or carports, but let’s say somebody built a garage, if they built a single garage for each apartment or each unit, that would qualify as the single parking space required if this is approved. There could be some additional onsite parking built into it that went over and above the parking minimum.

and just to be clear, when we are doing a single family dwelling, even if they provide a garage as most do, we still require those non covered parking spaces. Because of this assumption that garages become full of things and less about parking. That’s what’s going to be in the duplex code, again the State is telling us we have to do this for duplexes. It’s over and above that’s this discussion piece, even for the duplexes if they have a garage they will still have to have a paved parking space 20 feet deep, 9 feet wide.

I think it’s worth reading that Middle Housing Memo, even after the fact. It’s was kind of revealing too the actual density. I know there was another article I read recently discussing where they have lightened it up, they’ve taken away, or established no minimum, or really minimal minimums and they are coming out to around .7 is the number the developers get to on their own. That’s what keeps the properties marketable, that’s what keeps the neighborhoods lively. I didn’t find the one space at all to be outlandish.

its economy’s too right, the developers have to have a clientele. In Cottage Grove I think the clientele does have cars, and I think the developers recognizes that. It’s kind of what Faye was saying. We are not saying zero, and we are not mandating one. We are saying one minimum.

there are no other comments from staff, I would entertain a motion.

Let’s go over some other items on here first. For an amendment to section 14.22.200H1 manufacture homes; the current code requires that manufactured homes be multi-sectional, which is (come in two pieces.) This amendment if approved for recommendation to Council, would actually allow things to come in on one load as long as they meet our architectural design standards. Which to me makes since, because our code doesn’t have anything that says a stick built home has to be a certain size. You can stick build a home that is 390 sq. feet and be just fine, you can build it at 401 sq.
feet, but once you do the 401 sq. feet you have to add the architectural features like you would with a house. (Six features that give the house character). So this is an amendment to clean up something that probably came in a long time ago to prevent park model homes. But with changes to State law, and the adoption of housing needs analysis, this is a logical amendment that will bring in a new economy.

We are all familiar with the tiny house on wheels concept, this wouldn’t allow the tiny house to stay on wheels, and you would still have to have a permanent foundation, but it at least could be the smaller type dwellings. This is an amendment for that.

The next amendment is to section 14.43.115C; flexible lot size, flag lots and lots accessed by midblock lanes. Under the current code there are two checks on flag lots for fire department turn arounds. Staff ran into this issue where lots where partitioned in a way that created a flag that was just under the requirement for the fire code for folks and then that was the impression of development. Then in another section of the code, this particular section says that if that farthest wall is more than 150 feet away from the right of way you still need a turn around. So instead of the code just dictating that part, it really is just kind of deferring to the Fire Marshal, they will have an opportunity to review your plans and make recommendations, or conditions. We do get that this creates a little bit of an unknown, but it also allows for a discussion to be had between the applicant and the Fire Marshal of the time.

[TO] Would that add a layer of permitting to the process? That the Fire Marshal would then have a time frame, what would that look like?

[EM] there are several types of applications that the Fire Marshal and staff do engage in a comment exchange if you will, type II and type III applications always get comments from the Fire Marshal. Our current Fire Marshal Danny Solesbee is very accessible, and he generally turns comments in within a day or two. Slipping that into a single family dwelling permit process would be seamless and unnoticed by the applicant.

[DV] I need you to go over the flag lot part again. (The remove restriction in), give me a before and after so I can visualize that.

[BH] have we got any large apartment complexes, any developers that have been interested in building any large developments?

[EM] we’ve had some discussions with a couple different developers, kind of just prospecting on the old Harrison Elementary school site, nothing of course nailed down yet. It’s R2 density so it could be an 80 plus development. The folks that were in the item earlier about the zone change, I think they are looking at about 40.

[BH] that’s a pretty large property, I can’t think of any large residential areas that would be developed like that. There might be a couple more in the south side of town.
[EM] the south side, so there is property down on about 30 acres out south 6th street, Cleveland area that are zoned R2 presently. That will probably change with a development application for a master plan where they do some density shifting, so maybe one area has more of the appearance of R1, whereas another area might be R3, but across the whole development it meets the R2 density.

[BH] I feel like our population is growing so fast that they can’t even keep up with the housing needs. I’m just wondering when it’s going to happen that larger development comes in.

[EM] we’ve defiantly done things as the City to encourage that. We have that tax exemption program for multifamily development. Our first one of those was just approved for the Rogers development across from Coiner Park. They build three new dwellings, and I believe the fourplex you guys approved late last year on 22nd and Whiteaker, I think they are going to apply for the MUPTE as well. With those incentives being the reason why they could do it. You can imagine that something like the 80 plus development you know if they could only keep their taxes at the value of the dirt for that 10 years, that’s a significant tax break. 10 years is a long time to do your debt service. Those things will help for sure.

[DV] Eric I withdraw my question, I’m reading the actual amendment that’s far more intelligible then the summery of what it did.

[EM] Roger that. Any other questions?

[DV] Hearing none, I would entertain a motion.

**IN FAVOR**
None

**NEUTRAL**

**AGAINST**
None

**COMMISSION COMMENTS**
NONE
IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER BLAKE HOSKIN AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TAO ORION TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL APPLICATION DCTA 4-20 AS WRITTEN BASED ON CRITERIA FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS STATED IN THE STAFF REPORT.
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<th>Commissioner Beckes</th>
<th>Commissioner Rigel</th>
<th>Commissioner Burns</th>
<th>Commissioner Hoskin</th>
<th>Commissioner Solesbee</th>
<th>Commissioner Orion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion passed unanimously.

[EM] We are getting into the season of expiring seats, I do believe there are a couple of seats will be expiring. It might be Chloe and Beau, they are both not on the call right now, but we will be reaching out to them. And anybody whose seats are expiring, of course incumbancers are given some preference. If you’re one of them expect an Email soon. We have it on the agenda for council to appoint the subcommittee to appoint Commissioners late November with the idea that we will be interviewing just after Thanksgiving. And then approval at the next Council meeting which is the 9th of December. So we will be already to go for the new year.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Commissioner Darby Valley adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 7:57 p.m.

ATTEST: ____________________________  APPROVED: ____________________________

Angela Keppler, Administrative Aide  Darby Valley, Chair