

## Memorandum

Date: March 1, 2013

To: Planning Commission

From: John Sonnen, Planning Director  
Sara Javoronok, Associate Planner

Subject: Unrelated Substantive CDC Amendments

---

### **Background**

At the Planning Commission meeting on December 19, 2012 the Commission completed its preliminary review of the proposed unrelated substantive CDC amendments. Since then, staff revised the draft per the Commission's direction and submitted it for review and comment to neighborhood associations, the Chamber of Commerce, Willamette Main Street, West Linn-Wilsonville School District, major developers, the Transportation Advisory Board, the Historic Review Board, the Sustainability Advisory Board, and individuals that had previously expressed interest in the proposed changes. The comments we received are attached and they are summarized below under the proposed code section to which they pertain.

### **Comments Received**

#### *Public Notice Requirements (see page 1 of the draft amendments)*

- Recommend notifying property owners within 500 feet for commercial projects and 300 feet for small-scale residential (Comment #2)
- Recommend keeping notice area at 100 feet and adding a requirement to post a sign (Comments #1 )

#### *Sidewalk Use*

None

#### *Number of dwellings along cul-de-sacs (see page 3 of the draft amendments)*

- Recommends no acreage or cul-de -sac length threshold under 85.200(A)(11)(b). (Oral comment at Neighborhood Association President meeting )

#### *In-lieu fee for required improvements*

None

#### *Projecting and sport field signs (see page 5 of draft amendments)*

- Recommends not allowing Fields Bridge Park banner signs since they represent their sponsors and is not appropriate for a City park where off-premises signage is prohibited. Commercial advertising banners in a public park is inappropriate. (Comment #3)

*Docketing (see page 10 of draft amendments)*

- Support a docketing system provided that citizen voices are heard. (Comment #3)
- Would a change to a neighborhood plan need to go through the docketing process? We thought maybe the NH Plans could be a special case where NAs might like to make changes without waiting. (Comment 4)

*Residences in commercial districts (see page 13 of draft amendments)*

- Support one and two unit dwellings in commercial buildings in the GC district and single family residences above permitted uses in the NC district. (Comment #2)

*Temporary structures and uses (see page 14 of draft amendments)*

- Are erosion control items such as screens considered temporary structures? (Comment 4).

*Design Review submittal requirements (see page 27 of the draft amendments , Section 99.038)*

- Support neighborhood meetings for subdivisions with 4 or more lots as suggested and multifamily projects with 3 or more units, not just multifamily projects with more than 10 units. (Comment #2)
- Multi-family unit has a lot of impact in a neighborhood like ours and we think changing the definition to 10 family from 3 is a poor choice. If a developer is putting in a multi-family unit in our NA, we think they should be willing to have a meeting with us as traffic and other aspects could be impacted. 10 family seems very high. (Comment 4)
- Are PUDs considered developments? I.e., would we have a meeting with a developer putting in a six-lot PUD? (are PUDs a sub class of development?)(Comment 4).

*Stormwater control on single family and duplex lots (see page 28 of draft amendments)*

Support an amendment requiring stormwater treatment for all projects that involve more than 500 square feet of new impervious surface. (Comment #2)

**Attachment:** Comments regarding the preliminary draft