

Canby City Council and Urban Renewal District

Work Session Agenda

8:00am-12:00pm March 3rd 2018

Time	Item of Discussion	Objectives
7:30am	Breakfast from Gwynn's Coffeehouse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nourishment
8:00am	House Keeping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Information for the day • Review the Agenda • Review Why We Are Here - Purpose
8:10am	Team Builder/Ice Breaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get to know each other a little bit better
8:20am	City Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review our Values as a council and city. • Discuss Changes, if any.
9:00am	City Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the City Goals • Discussion of Amendments to Goals
10:00am	BREAK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take a very quick breather
10:10am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parks Conversation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What was the 2002 Plan ○ Where are we now ○ Where do we want be with parks in the next 20-30yrs ○ Policy Issues To Consider 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What further discussions will be needed • What Additional Advisory board involvement •
11:00am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for Future Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Succession Planning ○ Planning Items from Recent Public Hearings • Policy Items to Elevate further 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Manager Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Succession Planning ○ Bond Payoff • Review Councilor Dales List of Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Council Adjustments ○ Planning Commission Changes ○ New Policies
12:00pm	Adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go Forth and enjoy the wknd

Planning and Code Bubble List

General

In annexation hearings, we want:

- A slide that lists the three criteria that must be satisfied for approval (or conversely, to deny).
- A slide that lists exactly what we are approving (e.g., an Annexation, a Zone Change, and maybe a Concept Plan)
- A slide that shows an “overlay” of the annexation, zoomed out enough to give a clear context of the surrounding area.
- Have ready a reminder of the lot size limitations for L/M/HDR.
- Reminder that lot lines in DCPs are conceptual; actual lot lines will be in subdivision plan.
 - However, the proposed street layout in the DCP is pretty well cast so the city/CUB can properly plan infrastructure (streets, water, power, sewer, storm, etc.)

Property owners who choose not to participate in an annexation, or a subdivision, may find themselves with significant future financial detriment for not “getting on the train now”, by winding up with unfavorable lots, disproportionate street dedications/costs/layouts.

Reality check: developers like to wave off stub streets as “temporary”. Reality is they are long-lived/permanent (e.g., Tofte Farms). Should we establish policy they be improved as fire dept turnarounds?

Planning code and Concept Plans need to be combed through looking for “permissive” vs “prohibited” instances that are silent or ambiguous

- We’ve had multiple hearing where developer’s lawyers are expert at find where our language is silent and construing that as permissive.

Planning Department and Commission

- Does CC need to supply general policy guidelines and expectations so approvals and questions don’t escalate up to CC (especially in appeals) that should have been addressed by staff or PC?
 - Most of these probably addressed by policy clarifications listed further on...

S Ivy (6th - Manuel)

Make explicit in code: cannot incorporate streets into lot sizes.

Sanity check on CP: area of special concern 6 expects transition to commercial, not H/MDR. Is this still the goal? Is this the reality that we can expect?

Lot size averaging: not popular with CC. A lot of hearing time and angst spent on it.

- Developer can game the formula with a few big lots (i.e., existing lots with existing homes and no intent to demo/split and develop) to get many small lots. Even to extent of effectively getting higher density w/o a zone change.

S Ivy (Hope Village)

Give land use notice not just to property owners, but to all residents/tenants.

- City staff is actively working this issue; will code change need to come before CC?

Traffic

Pattern of skepticism by CC and neighbors that traffic studies properly account for nearby schools and student ped traffic.

- Studies often done in off-season and/or off-times. S Ivy developer waved off saying “traffic engineers apply standard adjustments for this”.
- Result: study numbers are simply not believed because they don’t align with personal experience.

Park Land Dedication

Discussion and policy guidance

- Smart land banking:
 - Not all park land is desirable (and may be larger liability and operational cost than it’s worth).
 - Sometimes better not taking dedication and using the SDCs to purchase and bank land elsewhere (e.g., in areas where residential growth is expected; or even for speculation. School districts do it.)
- General policy: wisdom of land dedications if operations is not foreseeable in future (should reject dedications and use SDCs to speculatively buy land instead for appreciating return?)

JoeT concerns: CC asked to approve park dedications without:

- Even a rough estimate of land value (appraisal is in the future).
- Metes and bounds of the actual dedication

Examine the practice/formula where city winds up purchasing park land in proposed developments.

Examine our acres-per-thousand population policy. We currently have a “deficit” of acreage, but no hope of operating it if we get it.

S Ivy:

Dedication ratios feel wonky: 20 acres of development, but with 5 acres of park dedication? That's 25%....

Policy that development must provide fencing to attractive nuisances on private property (e.g., the river slope/bank south of the development is privately owned; those owners should not bear the burden of protecting their party from a new annexation/development.) Rick says this can be made a condition of the SUB plan, and is eligible for SDC offset.

Large park in center of development, but without public parking around it. Makes it feel like a private park for the neighborhood.

N Redwoods:

A single development proposed so much park dedication (to benefit of the developer re: SDC offset and density transfer) that it supplied 2/3 of the CP's total goal, but in a single development. Could actually put at risk getting enough park land in the remainder of the CP area.

Policy: pocket parks vs. larger parks (much of current CC does not like pocket parks, because they tend not to be developed, because can't maintain. E.g., SE Teakwood & 10th lot.)

Park dedication is not truly a benefit to all: no parking in SUB proposal, no trail development. At best, only reasonably usable by the neighborhood. (Insufficient parking in S Ivy, too.)

Our CMC and CP language allows developers to double-dip: they contribute “park” land (which can really be developable land, albeit expensive to do so), enjoy SDC offsets, and use density transfer to get more lots in the flat grid they are developing, so enjoy better profitability (this is how ICON wanted to get 89 lots in the R-1 space for 71).

Policy examination: trading park dedication for density (not popular with most of current CC).

- Allows the spirit and vision of the DCP to be co-opted with respect to density (in the NRW case, most of the planned R-1 gets converted into R1.5-sized lots in R-1 zone).
- At least tighten up the permissiveness of the NRDCP to put limitations on density transfer such that it is an exceptional case (few lots), versus an entire neighborhood.

For purposes of park dedication for density transfer, the definition of “developable” land is too broad.

- Tiny, disjoint patches of land that are by no means developable are counted as so for the density transfer and SDC offset calculations.

Page 16 of NRDCP has semantic conflict: “ave min lot size may be reduced [to] 5,000 ft²” vs next sentence: “overall dev density must not exceed the max density standard [R-1 7,000 ft²] for the zone”