

5/23/13

(1)

Leuee
Ed
Cade
Josh
Gregg
Mike Koibela
Rick
Shawn V. Gordon
JD
Matt S.
PF
Fericff.

- Appn prior minutes
- no public comment
- good order

- Ed: asks staff - can you review comments from Phil, Rick & see if they are possible
- can we meet as sub-comm? not up notice, minutes but small group/indiv. less than a quorum okay to meet in bring back to group - not as preordaining thing.
- talk about things already on the record in report back

- Josh = don't refer to it as a subcommittee

Gregg - remind - we are all public officials in this group

absent: Shawn Gordon

- JD: - survey results - sent to group in pdt of Summary Statements
- connections: Eugene does have 2-track process, via email in #5 results in 50% that do have this
 - ministerial - most jurisdictions stop this process if discretion arises
 - variable where MDS is stand alone vs. included as part of BP
 - 17% said all needs to go thru (and use process - (Salem, Tigard), though in Spald only small jobs not requiring MDS or a single-form dwelling are all allowed to go straight to BP.
 - MDS in Spald is at upper end of ministerial review @ 25k \$ threshold.
 - usually ministerial review has no appeal process, but when it does happen it's a challenge - that discretion has been exercised.

Rick asked - has anyone filed an appeal of a BP? Certain indivs (in Greg) watch all permit activity, and he thinks BP appeal has been filed there.

Eric has appealed a bldg officials decision to the state, but that's different.
but some appellants have expected it to drop appeals

JD - there have been discussions about appeals on ministerial reviews, questions re: this wasn't what was applied on site plan, or solar sfd's weren't met ~~but complexity~~ and violated land use decision by calculating solar the wrong way.
Rich's example - June enlargements

Ed: Spfld doesn't have organized neigh groups in opposition.

JD - ministerial/clear-obj vs. discretionary

also about ministerial - one city trigger was @ 2500 sq ft
" was 2500 sq ft or 10% ADT of 10 ADT additional more than prior use
- 2 code citations forwarded - Medford, Tigard
Medford (2) and (3)

Carole - what is vintage of codes?

JD - he's contacting Ed Moore to ask who besides Eugene has 2-track

PF @: Do cities have SP separate from arch review? eg Medford

Eric: Sisters in Jacksonville have design rev. sfd's. to match city "theme"

JD: MDS - ministerial review in Spfld, don't dismiss it as too far clear & obj. sfd's.

Neve - Q to JD: what should we aim for / avoid?

JD - need more research of these juris. stds, triggers, etc.
- look @ exceptions / adjustment sections of these codes to look for clear & objective stds
- are we going to create from whole cloth new / scaled down C⁴⁰?

or look @ existing MDS to pick certain ubiquitous comm. users & say we can apply MDS to these?

- if we look @ MDS, there are things we could make - consider it as poss. to create list of exceptions / adjustments.

Carole: Emily suggested looking @ past land use decisions to see common conditions of appeal that may be applied as C⁴⁰ stds?

JD - conditions indicate some discretion exercised

Matt - eg, neg has to be installed prior to occupancy; eg for water quality pos

JD eg, meet BES stds; or boneway placement stds.

~~Ando~~ Ed: all code needs updating but we don't have resources, so what are our alt? are there a few options of MDS to tweak before looking @ RFP codes?

JD: Carole's idea per Emily could filter what is C⁴⁰ std.

Rich: like another look @ MDS, in terms of process, we look @ existing permits users / categories & see if some SIP reqs are removed for certain users - filter would be: another SIP stamp as is, but if something removed would pass go to MDS and revisit MDS to see if it could be C⁴⁰ / minor special as concurrent w/ BES process

JD - when you take use of ^{categories} out, matrix of uses
MDS is purely ministerial review of notice
in lieu of SPR
- he's used MDS as both

(4)

- Steer to what uses could you apply MDS to

- look @ level stds in MDS, eg, must be on an improved street
look @ context, if these stds are met, can you do
certain type / scale of devel (eg, shopping center)
w/o SPR?

- ~~needs to Council~~
- ENC: 1) MDS std w/ BP takes us a long way
city process for land use compliance is only done thru SPR; Eugene is
only one that really has two tracks
someone still needs to ensure code is followed
- 2) he concurs w/ Emily's comment about making slowly - lots to look @
in matrix of use lists
but change is to look @ high level - so maybe look @ industrial
or Commercial uses as priority
- 3) Teri Handberg / Eric's clients met - looked @ opportunity, sitting ^{across}
what could be streamlined from code w/ in these areas to
streamline / reduce complexity of code to spur development
Ed: form-based code as part of this

(8)

Eric 1) w: app siting, Terri felt it presented only real politically
saleable product in discrete targeted areas. Wholesale
change of code is overwhelming. It could spur app siting in
other areas, that's ok

2) he's doing w/ leaning summary now, comment more next time

JD - be realistic on size of endeavor

Renee - given CC direction, we need keep app siting as consid for
future add to work plan / list / matrix of deliverables

Josh - added Eric w/ Terri / Enverus, certain areas focused for app
siting as areas that could use devel. & is saleable

~~Greg~~ Greg - 1) NDS minist - type 1 - look @ this for pet. trades

2) from May 2, there may be certain specific code areas
for rec. change

3) app siting or overlays, should be considered in reporting
back to PC/CC even if out of scope of this committee -
poss future work.

Sean V6 - app siting reminds of Springfield's enterprise zones (the
entire city) - all of Springfield is app site - how
can we make all city competitive, all city is open for
biz not just one site.

Suzanne - ~~pet~~ apply specific uses, could be then applied more
broadly

- 2 trade process - maybe NDS is one track w/ SPA the other

Nick: re: survey-question #5 - only Eugene has 2-track process
what is it?

Eric - if you don't have SP overlay, you can go thru BP directly;
there are C40 slots to be met (w/ poss for adj. rev).

- land use process elements checked alongside BPs
Nick - land use analysts look while bldg reviewers look @ plans
Eric - LVA's follow the letter of the code

JD - Springfield has similar setup - planners @ counter, buy/licenses etc, also
do comm/ind/res BP reviews and Type 1 & 2 apps
- July 1 will be down to .7 FTE to do all of above

Renae - MDS is ministerial since its Type 2 - no notice

Mike K. - heartened by app siting; could be way to move toward MDS,
revenue matrix analysis by focusing on area that merits
app siting, rather than so many pass impacts from making
one change in one area to another.

JD: remember, we are here to look @ SM, advocacy, fees -
app siting would be city-wide review; how much analysis
req'd? like overlay w/ another name.

Carole: re: app siting seeks to address Eugene's req;
re: survey - move beyond it, per Emily look @ jurisdictions that have
done the most recent code updates, some of these may not
be relevant.

Carole - MDS as minist. review, are planner's do what LWAs in Eugene do now? What kind of review does MDS go thru - is it LWA checklist, or more time-intensive review?

- Emily also mentioned paying cost of staff to discuss w/ multi-person DPM, just w/ one staff - option (DPM-like) because it takes 3 weeks to set up DPM

become
 Josh - * hope for minimization of extremes

Eric - assume: whatever group recommends are just that - PC/CC will review/accept/discard

- if MDS stripped away all requirements, how would probs be addressed w/ compatibility, etc.?
- better way is to think of place/use to be whatever +/- 50% of what code mandates, but w/ other adjustments as mandated to address outstanding problems
- simplification of code pieces / simpler process in specific some yields greater simplicity
- what has been achieved / what has been done by codes?
- be brave

Rick - next agenda

CC recess after July 22 or 29 - we get to CC recess after ^{summer} break

next mtg - look @ MDS

JD will bring framework what it is - by name
 " locational guidelines
 " ubiq. uses

- also confer w/ Ed Moore

Eric - comments re: checklists - CC can check - Energy checklists for applicant but sp. checks by staff

Sean to JD - how much further can we go w/ MDS?

JD: if we examine qualifs for sites, we may have room to do so w/o getting into discretion
- eg, sites have fully improved streets, all utilities, etc. as threshold

Sean - re: stds - eg require 10 phy spaces; is it still c'ko if we allow w/ x % of a numerical std?

JD - having administrative adjustments could equalifs

Mike - opp siting isn't out of our discussion, targeted devel by area or type of prop is in matrix.

PF - checklists?

JD - land use compatibility checklists - done by staff.

MDS-like, another alternative - verifying that a site meets stds.

scoping sheets used for TIA, storm analyses

apps do
- another one - are you eligible for new food?

Reece - next mtg

checklists?

Thurs, June 13, 5³⁰ - 7³⁰
Next agenda -

- PF, Rich present ideas @ next agenda + others

- follow up on survey

- Tim MDS ideas

outcome: idea / found of where we are going

- pass longer mtg

Rich - start of MDS as part of 2-track process

step 1 - review MDS

- 1) MDS revised - minor
- major
- LUCS

} C & O

- ensure it isn't a land use decision

processed if amendment of BP

next - look @ use tables, pick

tools - checklist; over the counter / hourly / DM - streamline

one as guinea pig (eg, category, rather than list of uses)

2) SPR

- any things that could be moved to

MDS home tables revised

W process

(10)

FD - app siting w/ compromise w/ neigh assoc on
compatibility SAs

- 2 approaches - along transit corridors and by
developers meeting density reqs
- expedited permits, reduced SAs,