

## Scappoose Housing Needs Analysis

Work Session #4: Minutes

July 24, 2017 at 5:30 pm

Scappoose City Council Chambers

33568 E. Columbia Ave

### Introductions

Present ~ Mayor Scott Burge, Councilor Rich Riffle, Councilor Patrick Kessi, Councilor Megan Greisen, Councilor Natalie Sanders, Councilor Joel Haugen, Planning Commissioner Chair Carmen Kulp, Commissioner Bill Blank, Commissioner Bruce Shoemaker, Commissioner Tim Connell, Commissioner Rita Bernhard, City Manager Michael Sykes, City Planner Laurie Oliver, City Recorder Susan Reeves, and Consultant Beth Goodman.

Also present ~ Len Waggoner and Mike Sheehan.

### Housing Needs Analysis document review of results and questions

- Questions for discussion
  - a. Do you have any questions about the analysis in the Housing Needs Analysis document or the revised results of the HNA?

Beth Goodman explained tonight we are starting off by discussing the results of the Housing Needs Analysis. The Committee has received the draft document. She explained what we are planning for here in Scappoose over the next twenty years is 1,195 more dwelling units. She explained we are talking about 65% of them being single family detached, so that is 776. She explained single family attached are townhouses. She explained in looking at multifamily in the two to four units per structure that is about 120, and multifamily with five or more units per structure that is 215. She stated that is the forecast for new housing over the next twenty years. She explained that hasn't changed since the last meeting, but what has changed is they looked at historical development patterns and where you have been getting multifamily housing is in the commercial zones. So they allocated more housing to the commercial zone. In exhibit 54, on page 60 they are showing 191 new dwelling units of multifamily housing with five or more units per structure in commercial. She explained on page 68 they show that the City has sufficient capacity in your existing residential and commercial zones so that new housing that they are assuming would be mixed use development most likely or it could be solely single family development, or perhaps a mixture of both. She explained you have enough capacity under those assumptions that you don't need to rezone land. She asked the Committee if this assumption seems reasonable to them?

There was no response from the Committee.

Beth Goodman asked the Committee if they have any questions about the Housing Needs Analysis. She explained that after this meeting she considers this is a completed final draft.

## **Review and discussion of proposed changes to the zoning code**

- For each of the chapters, the primary questions are:
  - Do you have questions or concerns about the proposed changes?
  - With the changes discussed, should the City bring the proposed changes forward?

Beth Goodman stated, implementing the recommendations out of the Housing Needs Analysis what she and Laurie have done is gone through the zoning ordinance and made some of the key suggested changes, and they are really for discussion here. She explained where the changes are required they will mention that, but a lot of the changes are optional. She explained a few of them, such as changes in A-1, she would strongly recommend, and as they go through she will make that clear.

- Suggested order of review of chapters:
- **Definitions**

Beth Goodman explained the edits they made were all to housing types. She went through the changes and asked for comments.

Bill Blank asked why was the language struck out?

Beth Goodman replied the language stated “by one family” and they feel that is a little bit old fashioned, because housing is often talked about more as a household rather than a family. She explained they have left the definition to be really focused on the building type rather than the specific demographic characteristics of who lives in the house. She explained they added a definition about townhouse and that connects in with the city’s R-4 code, and the A-1 code a little bit. She explained a townhouse is an attached unit on its own lot, rather than multiple attached units on a single lot, that is the big difference between a townhouse and a duplex or a triplex, or a quadplex. She continued to go over the proposed updates to definitions.

Carmen Kulp asked about single lot and common lot.

Beth Goodman replied we can make that consistent and call it common lot.

City Planner Laurie Oliver explained the process for doing the changes would be a legislative amendment to the Development Code. She explained it would go to Planning Commission first, who would make a recommendation to City Council, then if it goes to City Council it would have a first and second reading, and if the ordinance gets passed it would become effective 30 days later.

## **• R-1**

Beth Goodman explained what they have tried to do is reorganize the Permitted and Conditional uses so they are a little bit shorter and a little bit easier to breeze through and the intention was to have them in the same order in each of your zoning districts. She went over the changes. She asked the committee if they would allow duplexes on any legal lot of the appropriate size in R-1.



Joel Haugen asked what is the appropriate size?

Beth Goodman replied the dimensional requirements right now require 7,500 square feet for single family detached, so it would be presumably something larger than that. She explained in the R-4 zone the City currently allows duplexes on a 7,000 square foot lot per duplex. So something larger than 7,500 square feet. She asked if the Committee has any comments on whether to allow cottage housing in R-1. She explained the other housing type they added is accessory dwelling units subject to the existing provisions. She explained as of 2018, cities larger than 2,500 people will be required to allow accessory dwelling units in the single family zone based on Senate Bill 1051, which passed this Legislative Session.

City Planner Laurie Oliver replied that was previously a conditional use in the R-1 zone so it was permitted conditionally, so with this we would be moving it into the list of permitted outright uses in the R-1 zone.

Beth Goodman went over the changes. She explained the proposed minimum lot area is 6,000 square feet. She explained she needs to get a duplex lot size. She asked how about 9,000 or 10,000 square foot lot for a duplex?

City Planner Laurie Oliver replied currently a duplex in the R-4 zone only requires 7,000. She stated maybe 8,000 just to have a slightly larger requirement in the R-1.

The Committee was okay with the 8,000 square foot proposal.

- **ADU**

Beth Goodman explained she accidentally struck out one ADU per parcel. She explained that should still be in there. She went over the proposed updates.

Scott Burge talked about Air B & B's. He stated if you have a hotel and they are having to pay a transient room tax, he feels they would be amiss if the City wasn't regulating and collecting the same tax on other rental style units.

Beth Goodman explained requiring four off-street parking spaces for a single house, with an ADU, is a lot of parking. It is a barrier to ADU development because it requires more area for off-street parking and increases development costs. She recommends reducing this standard to three (or fewer) on-site spaces.

The general consensus of the Committee would be to reduce it to three on-site spaces.

- **Manufactured homes**

Beth Goodman went over this chapter.

Scott Burge talked about Section 7 ~ C. Historic Districts. Manufactured homes shall be prohibited within, or adjacent to, or across a public right-of way from a historic site, landmark or structure. He asked why are we regulating it to that detail?

City Planner Laurie Oliver replied if we want to remove that, we could propose that.

Scott Burge stated should there be a prohibition or should it be a standard?

Beth Goodman stated why don't we perhaps leave it the way it is, these will be available to be edited again before they go to hearings.

- **R-4**

Beth Goodman went over this chapter. She asked one of the questions for the Committee is do they want to set a limit on the number of townhouses in a row?

City Planner Laurie Oliver replied she had recommended internally to Beth keeping it at four to maintain consistency with the R-4 and the quad-plex, four attached units per lot.

Patrick Kessi replied he thinks that is fine.

- **A-1**

Beth Goodman went over this chapter. She explained the biggest change is multifamily dwelling units as a housing type, but it is not limited to a maximum of eight attached units per building. She explained they did suggest a change to height from thirty five feet, to forty feet and that would allow a three story building.

City Manager Sykes asked why a three story building and not a four story building?

Beth Goodman replied because in discussions before the Committee talked about 35 feet, or maybe 40 feet and the committee seemed okay with that but when we talked about above 40 feet there seemed to be less interest in that. She stated certainly the City could allow for a four or five story building, height around 60 feet. She stated if you did that she would suggest allowing a little bit smaller lot sizes so a little more density.

Beth Goodman asked the Committee is removing the 8 dwelling units per structure something we should go ahead with.

The general consensus of the Committee was yes.

Beth Goodman asked the Committee if they want to stick with the 40 foot height, or if they want to look at a taller building?

Rita Bernhard replied she thinks we should stay with the 40 foot. She explained she mentioned last time in the past people had concerns with the Creekside apartments going in.

Patrick Kessi asked what was the result of the height question being asked at the Annual Town Meeting?



Beth Goodman explained the question was should the City allow buildings up to 60 feet, five stories, in the commercial zone. The answers were: 41% yes, 37% yes, but only for mixed use buildings, and 22% no.

Beth Goodman explained we haven't talked about commercial. She explained the EC uses the same development standards as the A-1 zone for residential, and we could talk about developing different development standards in EC for residential than what is in A-1.

City Manager Sykes asked if anyone is opposed to higher density in the existing commercial zone?

Rita Bernhard replied she thinks the commercial zone would be more acceptable than the residential zone.

Beth Goodman asked if they should bring back some code showing that update?

Natalie Sanders stated she is not opposed with going 60 feet within the A-1.

Beth Goodman explained what she has heard from the Committee is to bring back some language on EC, with the buffer, height, etc.

Beth Goodman went back over A-1. She explained in the special buffer requirements we need to clarify where the buffer is, if it is from the setback or the lot line. Then we included some architectural character requirements.

City Planner Laurie Oliver explained the architectural character requirements were mostly pulled out of the language in the Downtown Overlay.

- **Cottage Housing**

Beth Goodman went over this section. She explained right now what they have done is allowed these in the R-1 and the R-4, and the MH is going to be made to be consistent with the R-4, so the MH also. She went over the density.

Scott Burge stated he prefers the owners of the cottages own the underlying property.

- **Floodplain**

Beth Goodman went over this section. She explained the purpose of this language is to look at parcels that are partially in the floodplain and are partially not in the floodplain and allow opportunity for development of the piece that is not in the floodplain at a little higher density than you could in your base code but it comes with the price of removing or relocating any existing structures outside of the special flood hazard area.

City Planner Laurie Oliver explained it also requires that the portion of the parcel within the SFHA shall be dedicated to the City as open space unless the City determines the SFHA should be placed in a conservation easement instead.

Natalie Sanders asked if this is to help existing land owners get more use out of their land?

City Planner Laurie Oliver replied yes, that is right.

Beth Goodman replied she also thinks it is a conservation effort for the areas in the 100 year floodplain.

Joel Haugen stated we should keep in mind the concept that we have the capacity for huge storms. He doesn't think it is a question of when we are going to have a significant flood event, he thinks we should keep that in mind.

Beth Goodman asked for comments from the Committee by August 7, in regards to Cottage Housing and Floodplain.

- Next steps ~ next Housing Needs Analysis Work Session will be August 28th.

Work Session adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor Scott Burge

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan M. Reeves, MMC  
City Recorder