



PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Notes of November 16, 2022

Commissioners present: Charles Mathews, Scott Erwin, John Carr, Joel Metlen, Gary Walvatne, and Carrie Pellett (arrived late)
Commissioners absent: Bayley Boggess
Public Present: None
Staff present: Planning Manager Darren Wyss, Assistant Planner Ben Gardner, and Administrative Assistant Lynn Schroder

The meeting video is available on the [City website](#).

1. Call To Order and Roll Call

Chair Walvatne called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2. Public Comment Related to Land Use Items Not on The Agenda

None.

3. Approval of Meeting Notes: 09.21.2022, 10.05.2022, 10.19.2022, and 11.02.2022

Commissioner Erwin moved to approve the meeting notes for 09.21.2022, 10.05.2022, 10.19.2022, and 11.02.2022. Commissioner Carr seconded. **Ayes: Erwin, Carr, Mathews, Metlen, and Walvatne. Nays: None. Abstentions: None. The motion passed 5-0-0.**

4. Work Session: [Accessory Dwelling Unit Code Amendments Project](#)

Assistant Planner Ben Gardner presented the ADU Code Amendment Review Project. As directed by the City Council, staff is seeking recommendations on changes to the City's current ADU Code (*CDC Chapter 34: Accessory Structures, Accessory Dwelling Units, and Accessory Uses* ([CDC Chapter 34](#))). The PC is asked to make recommended changes based on whether the City wishes to facilitate or complicate the construction of ADUs.

Gardner provided four policy questions with Code and illustrative examples for discussion. Commissioners discussed the questions and provided a policy direction. Based on the direction, staff will draft Code to present to the Commission for further discussion. The policy questions included:

1. Should the visual design of ADUs be regulated in relation to the existing dwelling?

Commissioner Mathews supported the existing Code, which requires that ADU design standards match the primary dwelling.

Commissioner Carr supported a happy medium approach which would require some design requirements for ADUs. He was concerned about the aesthetics of ADUs. Gardner noted that the current Development Code does not regulate aesthetics for other structures on a residential lot.

Commissioner Metlen asked how other jurisdictions regulate this question. He noted that he wanted to keep the barriers to constructing ADUs low. He wanted to allow prefabricated ADUs.

Commissioner Erwin noted that the current Development Code would require ADUs to match a derelict primary structure. He suggested disallowing ADUs when the primary structure was in disrepair. He wanted to compare the cost of a prefabricated versus a custom build ADU. Gardner responded that the costs vary widely based on the property owner's goal.

Chair Walvatne asked for clarification on the Building Code requirements for prefabricated ADUs. Planning Manager Darren Wyss responded that the State is developing Building Code for prefabricated ADUs. He also noted that it is illegal to live in an RV. Any prefabricated ADUs on wheels must be permanently affixed to a foundation. He preferred some commonality with the primary structure.

Wyss noted that the City does not require design standards for any other residential structure, so the ADU design requirement singles out ADUs from other housing types. He wanted to clarify if that was a policy intent. Commissioner Mathews responded that design standards should be required for all housing types. He stated that property owners expect that neighborhood properties should not change after they purchase a property.

Commissioner Pellett agreed with Commissioner Mathews.

Commissioner Erwin said that the cost of an ADU would encourage property owners to consider aesthetics when building an ADU. Pellett disagreed.

Commissioner Metlen strongly opposed design requirements.

Commissioner Carr wanted to thread the needle between anything goes and strict adherence to the design of the primary structure.

Commissioner Erwin expressed that the design standards in the current Code were intended to restrict ADUs from being built. He wanted to support aging-in-place. He suggested that ADUs be painted the same color as the primary structure to thread the needle.

2. *Should the placement of stairs on ADUs be limited?*

Commissioner Metlen asked about the purpose of this requirement. Gardner was unsure of the original intent, but it was intended to reduce the visibility of the ADU from the street. Metlen did not support limiting the placement of stairs.

Commissioner Erwin and Carr agreed with Metlen. Chair Walvatne also agreed that the stair orientation should not be regulated.

Commissioner Pellett agreed that the stairs could face the street, but she liked that they were setbacks from the front of the house.

3. *Should the location of the entrances on ADUs be limited?*

Currently, doors for ADUs are required to be located on the rear or side of the ADU and cannot compete with the front door of the primary structure. Commissioners did not support the current door orientation requirement. Gardner noted that the standard that ADU doors cannot compete with the primary structure front door must be clear and objective.

4. *Should the placement of ADUs be limited in relation to the primary dwelling?*
Detached ADUs must be set back 10 feet from the primary structure.

Commissioner Pellett supported the existing requirement for 10-foot setbacks from the primary structure. She wanted ADUs to be secondary structures on a lot located behind the primary structure.

Commissioner Erwin thought that the requirement unnecessarily limited properties from constructing ADUs.

Commissioner Metlen did not support the diminutive status of the ADUs inherent in the requirement. He thought it was an outdated view of single-family housing. He did not support the requirement.

Chair Walvatne supported the Code requirement because he did not want ADUs in the front yards.

Commissioner Mathews supported the Code requirement because he did not want ADUs in the front yards.

Wyss noted that the Code only restricts ADU placement, not other residential structures or plexes. Essentially, the Code places more restrictions on the ADU structures and does not similarly restrict other housing types or residential structures.

5. **Discussion:** [Planning Commission Annual Report to City Council](#)

Planning Manager Wyss presented a draft annual report for the PC to consider.

6. **Planning Commission Announcements**

Commissioner Pellett requested City Attorney Monahan attend the next Planning Commission meeting to provide feedback on her interpretation of CDC Chapter 80. She wanted the Planning Commission to conduct a Chapter 80 hearing on food carts. Commissioner Mathews agreed. Commissioner Erwin wanted a memo on Chapter 80 before the meeting.

7. **Staff Announcements**

Planning Manager Wyss reviewed the upcoming Planning Commission schedule.

8. **Adjourn**

Chair Walvatne adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:48 pm.