

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

SEPTEMBER 5, 1985
7:00 p.m.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CODE - FIRST DRAFT - ARTICLE VI - DEVELOPMENT SITING REQUIREMENTS - LOT SIZE, DENSITY, SETBACKS, COVERAGE AND HEIGHT LIMITATIONS.

Commission Members Present: Chairman Leo Appel II, Vice Chairman Jim Izett, Commissioners Mary Jane Brimm, Lonny Draheim, Jean Hagen, Elgin Gunderson

Commission Members Absent: Commissioner Earl Breuer

Staff Present: City Manager Lynn Stuart, Planning Director Chuck Rhodaback, Engineering Technician Leo Lightle, Building/Fire Safety Officer Marshall Ferg.

Chairman Appel convened the study session at 7:00 p.m., and asked City Manager Lynn Stuart to make appropriate opening comments, with reference to the staff's presentation on Article VI. Mr. Stuart explained to the Commission that staff had developed a difference of opinion over setback requirements proposed in Section 6.040(1). The Planning staff felt that the proposed Development Code could have more restrictive setback requirements than required by provisions of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The building official felt that the City could not be more restrictive than the UBC. The City Manager stated that the City Attorney gave a ruling on the issue and the City can require more restrictive standards. Mr. Stuart also explained to the Commission that another area of staff difference related to Section 6.080(b) and required minimum lot sizes for the Industrial Park (M-P) zone. The staff felt that there was a need to illustrate the differences of opinion to the Commission, from both a technical and philosophical viewpoint. The City Manager stated that the purpose of the staff presentation was to allow the Commission to determine whether or not they want the proposed Development Code to be more restrictive or less restrictive. Mr. Rhodaback gave a brief presentation outlining all of the proposed on-site development standards for a 20,000 square foot lot and a 6,000 square foot building; and a 10,000 square foot lot and a 2,000 square foot building in an M-P Industrial Park zone. Mr. Ferg, Building official, also gave a brief report to the Commission, based on the same criteria, and indicated to the Planning Commission that a 10,000 square foot minimum lot size, for an Industrial zone, was adequate. Following a brief discussion, Commissioner Gunderson stated that maybe the community didn't need three industrial zoning classifications. Mr. Stuart asked the Commission members if they wanted to control the lot sizes and landscaping requirements or if they felt that on-site development standards should be less restrictive in Industrial zones. Chairman Appel stated that he didn't feel satisfied with either a restrictive or non-restrictive approach. Commissioner Gunderson asked staff if the present Zoning Ordinance restricted industrial lot sizes and Mr. Rhodaback said no. Commissioner Gunderson felt that maybe the proposed 20,000 square foot minimum industrial lot size may restrict development. Some discussion followed with reference to industrial

land values in the Brookings-Harbor area. Mr Ferg stated that he disagreed with the 50% coverage factor being applied to industrial development. The discussion on industrial development requirements concluded and Mr. Stuart began the review of residential lot size standards and the need to expand the lot sizes.

Mr. Stuart suggested to the Planning Commission that staff prepare a proposal that deals with varied residential lot sizes. Commissioner Gunderson indicated that if the residential lot sizes were varied, then they would need to correspond with existing residential areas and lot sizes. Mr. Stuart also suggested that the Planning Commission review and consider varied lot sizes in the commercial zones, in addition to the possibility of creating a Design Review Committee for commercial development. Chairman Appel felt that the Design Review Committee approval would create an additional level of control and requirements. Mr. Stuart asked the Chairman if he wanted Commissioner Breuer's written comments read into the record and he said that he did.

Commissioner Breuer's comments related to lot sizes and setback requirements. Chairman Appel asked Vice Chairman Izett to comment on the issues that had been discussed. Vice Chairman Izett stated that he felt, to a degree, that the City of Brookings was on the verge of change, but didn't feel that the change should be as extensive as the proposed Development Code requirements. Vice Chairman Izett also indicated that he wasn't totally convinced on the issues, one way or the other. Mr. Stuart asked Vice Chairman Izett if he felt the existing City Zoning Ordinance was adequate, based on the development of the City. Vice Chairman Izett felt that the residential standards were adequate and that the commercial and industrial areas were questionable. Mr. Stuart asked Commissioner Gunderson if he felt that there was a difference in the level of development between the Harbor area and the City of Brookings and he said no. Commissioner Gunderson stated that the commercial area is strip development, without cohesiveness and shopping ease. Commissioner Gunderson felt that residential development was in fairly good shape. Commissioner Gunderson felt that the 50% coverage requirement for industrial development was too restrictive.

Mr. Stuart asked Commissioner Draheim how he felt about residential and commercial development standards. Commissioner Draheim felt that a Commercial Review Committee could create a problem with more restrictions and that residential lots, at 6,000 square feet, were too small. Commissioner Draheim was in favor of creating a variety of residential lot sizes, with a minimum lot size of 7,500 to 8,000 square feet.

The Planning Commission discussed the idea of eliminating the landscaping requirements for single family residential development and retaining the requirements for multiple family development.

Commissioner Brimm was in favor of requiring landscaping for multiple family, and not single family developments. Mr. Stuart asked Commissioner Brimm if she felt that the commercial and industrial standards were adequate and she said that she was in favor of having a new Industrial Park classification, but with not too many restrictions. Commissioner Brimm was also in favor of larger residential lot sizes.

Commissioner Hagen also agreed with the concept of creating a variety of residential lot sizes.

Mr. Stuart began a discussion about yard setback requirements. Commissioner Gunderson suggested that the yard setback standards be varied also. After a brief discussion, Vice Chairman Izett stated that making decisions about the proposed Development Code was not a simple matter and that maybe the Commission should hold back on the Development Code until "Operation Bootstrap" was further along in the process. Mr. Stuart explained to the Commission members that the Mayor will be appointing individuals to serve on the six committees organized for "Operation Bootstrap" and that each Planning Commission member will serve as Chairman for each separate committee. Chairman Appel stated that his concern was the demand on the Planning Commission members time. Vice Chairman Izett felt that the Commission members would give as much time as necessary to get the job done. Chairman Appel stated that he felt that work on the proposed Development Code should not be delayed.

The general concensus of the Planning Commission was to continue with work on the Development Code. Chairman Appel indicated that the work study session schedule would remain and that different articles would be reviewed by the Commission at a different time.

Mr. Rhodaback explained to the Commission that in addition to the Development Code and "Operation Bootstrap", the Commission also needed to begin work on the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Review and the Public Facilities Plan Element, by the first part of 1987.

Another discussion followed pertaining to the philosophical and technical aspects of the proposed Development Code and how the Commission plans to continue review of the remaining Articles and the role staff would play in providing information for the Commission. The Planning Commission agreed that staff should select the Article to be reviewed by the Commission, with the information being delivered to each member prior to each scheduled meeting. Chairman Appel also stated that the present study session schedule would not change.

There being no further discussion on the Development Code, Chairman Appel indicated that Mr. Stuart would give a brief status report on the revitalization program and committee selection.


Planning Commission Study Session
September 5, 1985
Page 4

Chairman Appel adjourned the study session at 9:00 p.m.



Leo Appel
Chairman

ATTEST:



Judy Pectol
Recorder