

CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
July 23, 2015

Present

City Councilors:

Frank Hann, Vice Chair

Barbara Bull

Planning Commissioners:

Ron Sessions

Paul Woods

Staff

Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager

Terry Nix, Recorder

Visitors

David Dodson

Excused Absence

Jennifer Gervais, Chair

Roan Hogg

Jasmine Woodside

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force (TF) was called to order by Vice Chair Frank Hann at 6:00 p.m., in the Madison Avenue meeting room. Introductions were made.

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

There was no public input at this time.

III. DISCUSSION OF TASK FORCE PROCESS MEMORANDUM

Vice Chair Hann referred to *Process Used by the OSU-Related Task Force, Spring-Summer 2015*, prepared by Chair Gervais. It was agreed to hold review of this item until Chair Gervais can be present for the discussion.

IV. CONTINUED REVIEW OF WRITTEN TESTIMONY

Planning Manager Young noted that the TF previously discussed the desire to conduct a comprehensive review, and individual members agreed to take on "homework" to facilitate the group discussion. Since the last meeting, Commissioner Woodside forwarded *Task Force Issues of Concern* which was brainstormed by the TF early in the process; Commissioner Woods prepared *OSU-related Task Force Comprehensive Plan Review and LDC 3.36*; and Manager Young provided *Draft Proposed Revisions to Findings and Policies, Organized Under Issues of Concern*.

Vice Chair Hann added that he looked back through recommendations of the three collaboration workgroups and found no outstanding issues that had not already been identified through this process. There was a recommendation from the Neighborhood Planning Workgroup related to zoning, but he doesn't know how that would be addressed here. He also looked through past minutes and found little that has not been addressed, other than Councilor Brauner did say that he would like to see Chapter 3.36 addressed as part of this process. Planning Manager Young said new policy 5.4.18 states the City shall evaluate zoning patterns in the neighborhoods near OSU with the intent of balancing

density goals with preservation of neighborhood character, which he feels somewhat addressed the workgroup's recommendation related to zoning.

Vice Chair Hann said he would like to make good progress reviewing the materials, and he suggested the TF refrain from line-by-line clerical editing since it is early in the process, there will still be a lot of input from all parties, and the recommendations will likely change.

Vice Chair Hann said the *Task Force Issues of Concern* seem to be primarily aspirational. Manager Young said he doesn't see anything on the list that hasn't been touched on. Councilor Bull said that monoculture of housing types is one of the bigger issues. In discussion, it was noted that this is addressed to some degree in Findings 9.7.l and 9.7.m, as well as new policy 9.7.8 which states that housing types that can serve multiple segments of the population with minimal remodeling shall be strongly encouraged to reduce the need for future redevelopment as demographics shift. Councilor Bull noted that there have been proposals which included a variety of housing types, all of which were for students. This is an issue she will want to see addressed, but she is content to bring it up at Council.

Commissioner Woods led a review of the information he prepared regarding items in LDC 3.36 that do not adequately address issues identified in the TF review of the Comprehensive Plan, and discussion included the following:

Plans vs. Districts: Commissioner Woods said the current planning document from OSU is called the Campus Master Plan and the new document is being called a District Plan. He expressed concern about the possibility that OSU could become a Special District that is more independent of the City. Following discussion, there was general agreement with the following concept: There is a need for clarity of meaning and expectations when master plans, district plans, etc., are considered for land use approval or adoption.

Commissioner Sessions commented that there are many unforeseen circumstances and it's difficult to preplan for every eventuality. He said the University will prepare a draft based on their planning and the plan will be primarily for their use. He thinks we can go too far with regulations and, therefore, reduce flexibility in the Code to effectively manage a process that is organic and constantly changing. Councilor Bull said the question is where it is appropriate to place limits and where that is not necessary and gets in the way; she agreed that there is a need to clarify where that line is.

Transportation Demand Management: There was consensus that this term should be defined in Article 50.

Livability: Commissioner Woods said he found the Article 50 definition of "livability" to be unsatisfactory. He noted a table in LDC Chapter 2.6, Annexations includes a table with community-wide livability indicators and benchmarks for annexation applications which could be used as a starting point for identifying livability indicators elsewhere. He added that CP 1.1.7 says there will be monitoring and assessment of livability indicators at least every three years. Manager Young said staff uses livability indicators when considering annexation proposals and there is a desire to develop those metrics in other areas. He believes this will be addressed in the Vision and Action Plan process, as the desire with that process is not just to articulate a future vision for the community, but also to identify

metrics for measuring progress toward those goals, which have been described as “livability indicators”.

Plan vs. Code Alignment: Commissioner Woods said the 2004 CMP and LDC 3.36 contain discrepancies, and he suggested that there be some sort of public process by which the policies of the CMP are reconciled with the Code text, as well as perhaps some annual check as part of the monitoring. Manager Young said conflicts between the CMP and LDC are recognized by City and OSU staff and he understands that OSU intends to present a document that will eliminate those conflicts. Commissioner Sessions said he thinks it’s appropriate that the CMP be an aspirational document and that the LDC layout the process and regulations. Discussion followed. There was general agreement with the following concept: There is a need to resolve discrepancies between the OSU Campus Master Plan and the requirements of Land Development Code Chapter 3.36.

3.36.20 Definitions Specific to this Chapter: Commissioner Woods reviewed his concerns that the term Development Area allows for situations such as placing parking farther away from traffic generators than would otherwise be allowed. Manager Young reviewed the history of how the term Development Area has been applied to development on campus, and stated that the provisions related to parking were unchanged as a result of that term. Commissioner Woods said that, although it may not apply to this section, there is an issue with parking. Following additional discussion, there was general agreement with the following concept: There is an issue of parking location on campus in relation to where development occurs and a need for associated parking or appropriate TDM measures to effectively serve new development.

3.36.30 Permitted Uses: Commissioner Woods reviewed his concern related to private development on OSU campus that potentially avoids development requirements because it is deemed allowable under this section. He noted that new policy 13.2.7 addresses this concern.

Commissioner Bull said it may be worth looking at the list of permitted uses and the idea of conditional uses on campus. There was general agreement with the following concept: Review of permitted uses in the OSU District is warranted to identify uses that may need Conditional Development review, based on livability impacts.

3.36.40 Procedures and Determination of Compliance: Commissioner Woods reviewed his concern regarding triggers for major and minor adjustments. Manager Young explained that the triggers are standard, and affirmed that if OSU had a major adjustment, a full public hearing process would be required. Commissioner Woods said this section allows open space mitigation which is not allowed elsewhere in the City. Commissioner Sessions said the idea is to create density patterns and open space areas which, in the University’s case, is more of a functional requirement, and this provides flexibility. Manager Young said that exceeding open space requirements is a major adjustment, requiring a public hearing process. The TF identified the following concern: How the City manages open space overall has allowed some of the development patterns associated with the growth of the University that have affected the neighborhoods.

3.36.60 Development Standards: Commissioner Woods reviewed his concern that the standard refers to an operational shuttle without describing attributes that would ensure it solves a parking problem. In discussion, it was noted that new policy 11.2.16 states that

transportation requirements associated with development must be clear, measurable, and carefully monitored for effectiveness.

3.36.90 Monitoring: The TF discussed concerns related to monitoring and reports. There was consensus to amend new policy 13.2.6 by stipulating that monitoring reports shall go annually to the Planning Commission and City Council, changing the reference from District Plan to Campus Master Plan, and perhaps marking the item for further editing.

Commissioner Woods reviewed his suggestion to add a policy requiring monitoring of the OSU population because that drives the need for buildings, traffic capacity, and parking. Following brief discussion, the TF agreed to add OSU population to the list of items that need to be monitored.

Commissioner Woods said the existing policy doesn't appear to cover recent parking complaints, based on public testimony. He suggested the area defined by the University Neighborhood Overlay could be included in the monitoring of university-related impacts, and that a policy could be added defining existing residential areas in terms of 3.34. There was general agreement with that concept.

Commissioner Woods reviewed his concerns related to parking utilization and permitting as detailed in the handout. He suggested a policy that establishes minimum utilization and/or an independent means of permitting. Discussion followed related to parking impacts on surrounding neighborhoods, potential solutions that could be undertaken by the University, possible requirements that could be placed by the City, and what it is appropriate for consideration by the TF in this process. The TF generally agreed with the concept of eliminating the moral hazard of the current parking management structure.

Commissioner Woods stated that traffic and parking studies should be performed at the same peak time annually for ease of comparison and to understand the worst case. With that, review of the handout related to LDC 3.36 was complete.

It was agreed that Manager Young will send out the concepts identified during the meeting, which TF members and staff can then use to craft additional recommended findings and policies. It was noted that there are still several items of testimony to be reviewed. Vice Chair Hann suggested that two meetings be scheduled in August, during which he hopes to complete the work. Staff will schedule the next meetings by email.

V. REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

June 22, 2015 and July 9, 2015

Review of meeting minutes was held to the next meeting.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

David Dodson, OSU Campus Planning Manager, said he appreciates the TF's work and thoughtful discussion. He said OSU has some clear guidance as to the issues, and it is the University's desire that the burden be on them to present to the City what they would like to do to address the concerns. It has occurred to him through this exercise that many of the issues are City responsibilities (densities in neighborhoods, parking issues, and rezoning

considerations). He asked that consideration be given to having the City take on items that are City-related, letting OSU take on issues that are University-related, and then bringing those back together.

Mr. Dodson referred to discussion about the terms Campus Master Plan and District Plan, and he agreed that the terminology can cause confusion. He said the leadership at OSU has provided direction on the terminology but the process is not yet complete. He suggested that, at the Comprehensive Plan level, it might be most helpful to just use the term OSU Plan. He agreed with Commissioner Sessions comments about overregulating, and he provided examples of situations where the regulations have not made sense with particular developments on campus.

Mr. Dodson referred to comments about conflicts between the CMP and the LDC, and he acknowledged that there is confusion because sections of the CMP were never codified. He said OSU intends to develop a lean plan (about 35 pages) that will be presented to the City as a background document, but not for adoption or approval. The land use piece will then be submitted as several land use applications that will track concurrently through the process, and would be implemented through the Land Development Code.

Mr. Dodson referred to new policy 13.2.6, and he cautioned on how it is drafted. He said the policy should speak to what is trying to be achieved, and the specifics should be codified. He referred to concerns about uses that might not be specific to OSU but to the broader community, and he suggested that consideration be given to the fact that it is not just the use type but who the use serves that is important. The unwritten rule with City staff with these situations more recently is that if 70% of the use serves students or faculty, it is considered to be a primarily OSU-based use.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.