

City of Hood River  
Planning Commission  
Work Session  
Monday, January 7, 2013

City Council Chambers  
211 Second Street  
Hood River, OR 97031  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair Laurie Stephens; Commissioners Steve Winkle, Nikki Hollatz, Jennifer Gulizia, Bill Irving, Casey Weeks

ABSENT: Nate DeVol

STAFF: Planning Director Cindy Walbridge, Senior Planner Kevin Liburdy, Planning Consultant Scott Keillor

GUEST: Mayor Arthur Babitz

## MINUTES

- I. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Laurie Stephens at 5:34 pm
- II. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S UPDATE: Cindy Walbridge reports that WalMart went before the City Council and it was denied. Notices have gone out and anybody who will choose to appeal it, which more than likely will be the WalMart representatives, have twenty-one days from Christmas Eve. Unclear whether they will take it to LUBA.

The Naito and hotel is still at LUBA. A 60-page petition for review has been submitted.. Brent Foster had to ask for an exception for length. The City Council will decide at the next meeting whether the city has a stake in the process.

All the old minutes are being done. There will be fifteen sets of minutes to be approved. The City Attorney has been asked if the minutes can be approved outside of a public hearing meeting.

There is a public hearing on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013, it's a variance on a garage on Columbia St.

Regarding the current code amendments, commissioner DeVol agreed to present the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council.

The goal setting meeting of the City Council is on February 2<sup>nd</sup> at the Hood River Hotel from nine to three. Cindy encourages commission members to attend. Commissioner Irving suggests a meeting on January 22<sup>nd</sup> to establish Planning Commission goals before the February 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Cindy will send out goals from last year.

- III. WORK SESSION: Cindy Walbridge passes out copies of emails from Bob Francis, Steve Winkle and Nate Devol. Reminds the commission what the goals is today which is that Mayor Babitz requested the Planning Commission provide the City Council with a

thorough description of their recommendation and the commission should take a specific priority action plan and determine how long it will take which the staff will determine.

If the commissioners support the memo drafted by staff and planning consultant Scott Keillor of BergerABAM, Cindy suggests that a paragraph will be added clarifying why they didn't choose to go with the original request and this is their recommendation. Other topics to be decided include fee-in-lieu-of-parking and establishing the boundary east of the Hood River Bridge. Walbridge explains the process once their recommendation goes to the City Council and the timeline which staff will determine.

Kevin Liburdy refers to the memo outlining the floor area ratios (FAR) and the C-2 zoning update concepts for the Waterfront area. Working with Planning Consultant Scott Keillor, staff gathered data to compare existing waterfront buildings and site sizes. Existing FARs are on page one of the memo.

Scott Keillor of Berger ABAM: Refers to memo and explained some of the FARs on the waterfront currently. A FAR above 1.0 may require structured parking. As far as density the Commission could set a maximum FAR or could elect to simply allow parking and height restrictions to cap development potential. Outlined three possible development scenarios with commercial uses required to meet the minimum FAR:

- 100% commercial development at or above minimum FAR
- Phase 1 commercial use meeting the minimum FAR and residential use in Phase 2
- Mixed use development in which the minimum FAR is met with commercial use and residential use is allowed beyond the minimum commercial FAR and up to the maximum FAR.

Keillor explains density, design, orientation, parking, trip traffic reduction and buffers as addressed in the memo. FAR is one tool to use. There is also the idea of percentages.

Liburdy explains this is a broad view of the concepts that were discussed by the commission.

Mayor Babitz encourages the commission to explain what policy objectives the commission is addressing with their suggestion when they make their presentation to City Council. Walbridge says they can include that in the recommendation.

Chair Stephens wonders if setting a maximum FAR is necessary but figuring in the total footprint in is. Wants as much as commercial as possible with residential.

Discussion about Bob Francis' memo about percentages. How would that work with FAR?

Keillor explains it might refer to a small duplex with a shop front. It doesn't move to a maximum use of a limited number of sites which the FAR does. You could have small developments developed over time. Walbridge said that Francis wrote this considering

that residential would only be allowed in an existing building. Part of his memo could be used as a design standard.

Irving suggests that there are solid goals, including preservation of employment lands in the Economic Opportunity Analysis that they could adopt for this recommendation. Walbridge says staff can go through the adopted vision document on how things will look which is about design and location and the interchange access plan.

Discussion of whether 0.4 FAR would work at the waterfront with parking considerations such as parking needs for restaurants. Walbridge suggests that the commission should look at specific parking requirements for C-2 zones if they get the go-ahead to make these changes. Every development, unless it's a really small project, has a traffic engineer. There are three options: it has no impact because it's such a small use; it has an impact but they can take care of the impact by shifting hours; or they do have a great impact and they will do one of the improvements that are listed in the IAMP.

Babitz requested clarification about discussion: is the FAR for all commercial uses or just for commercial uses that are going to incorporate residential? The parking piece can be worked out in the design standards.

Discussion about avoiding a "restaurant row" where there is a restaurant and a large parking lot.

A consensus is reached that a minimum FAR is part of the recommendation. The commission supports residential as long as commercial comes first. Discussion about types of commercial and parking needs continue. Is 0.4 the appropriate FAR for that goal contained in the EOA?

Recommendation of 0.3-.04 FAR for all development as starting point for discussion.

A consensus is reached that residential should be allowed at the waterfront which reflects policy goals of the EOA.

Discussion of the purpose of the vision. There should be design standards and residential should be subordinate to commercial on primary streets and to recreation use. Goal 5 could support this. Design should have visual interest, be inviting and feel livable. Agreement that goals and implementations should be incorporated into the memo to the City Council.

Consensus on elimination of fee-in-lieu-of-parking.

Discussion of boundary of waterfront. Consensus that the boundary of the waterfront should be expanded to the east side of the Hood River bridge. The rationale is to have consistency of treatment of waterfront property. The public hearing process would have to be put in place based on what the City Council decides on.

Commissioner Gulizia agrees to attend the City Council meeting on Monday, January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2013 with Commissioner DeVol.

Linda Maddox – supports elimination of parking in lieu of, doesn't support FARs, concerned about height considerations, setbacks.

Heather Staten – has reservations about FARs.

Chair Stephens adjourns meeting at 7:52pm.

ATTEST:

  
Laurie Stephens, Chair

4/29/13  
Date

  
Cindy Walbridge, Planning Director

4/29/13  
Date (Approved)