



**PLANNING COMMISSION
DRAFT Meeting Notes July 15, 2026**

Commissioners present: Kathryn Schulte-Hillen, David D. Jones, Tom Watton, Gary Walvatne, Kris Kachirisky, and Liz Dietz and Dan Saltee
Staff present: Community Development Director Steve Koper, Principal Planner Darren Wyss, Senior Planner Erica Smith, Management Analyst Lynn Schroder
Council Liaison: Carol Bryck

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

1. Call To Order and Roll Call

Chair Schulte-Hillen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Management Analyst Lynn Schroder called the roll.

2. Public Comment related to Land Use Items not on the Agenda

None.

3. Approval of Meeting Notes: 06.17.2026

Commissioner Watton moved to approve the meeting notes for June 17, 2026. Schulte-Hillen seconded.

Ayes: Jones, Schulte-Hillen, Watton, and Saltee. Nays: None. Abstentions: Kachirisky, Dietz, and Walvatne. The motion passed 4-0-3.

4. Work Session: [Housing Production Strategy Implementation](#)

a. Project Overview and Background

Principal Planner Wyss introduced the project to the Planning Commission (PC) and briefly discussed state requirements and previous work done by the City that led to the Housing Production Strategy (HPS) implementation project, including HB 2003 and the City's Housing Production Strategy (approved by the state in 2025). Matt Hastie discussed the role of the Planning Commission and provided an overview of the project, including a brief summary of the HPS actions, the land use actions that will be implemented through this project, the HPS implementation timeline, and the "near-term" HPS implementation project timeline.

b. Project Overview Discussion and Questions

- Who is on the working group for financial actions and when will PC learn more about them? The PC should be informed about implementation of these actions.
 - The working group includes homebuilders, city staff, other agency staff, including County Assessor, and affordable housing developers. City staff will provide the PC with an update on that project and what we hear from the working group after they meet.

Action 1 – Rezone Land

Brandon Crawford provided a summary of the City's existing multi-unit zones and current regulations for multi-unit housing that the City may consider updating to promote multi-unit housing production. He also summarized the analysis and criteria for selecting areas that the City should consider for rezoning to a multi-unit zone (R-3 or R-2.1). He shared the options (key

decision points) for the City to consider for implementing Action 1, including:

- Rezone higher ranking identified properties to R-3 or R-2.1 – Recommended
- Rezone properties to match Comprehensive Plan designation or existing use – Recommended
- Eliminate minimum lot sizes for multi-unit in R-3 and R-2.1 – Recommended
- Remove maximum lot coverage for multi-unit in R-3 and R-2.1 – Recommended
- Remove detached single-unit as an allowed use in R-3 and R-2.1 – Recommended
- Increase maximum height for multi-unit to 45 feet for all multi-unit in R-3 and R-2.1 – Recommended

Action 1 Discussion and Questions

- Why would the City remove lot coverage and not Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for multi-unit housing?
 - Multi-unit housing is already exempt from FAR requirements.
- There is no definition for “garden apartments” in the Code.
 - City staff will look into this question and clarify what garden apartments refers to.
- R 2.1 and R3 are about 5% of residential land. Is there a specific goal for increasing the share?
 - The project team identified potential sites to rezone for multi-unit housing, but the City is not obligated to reach a specific target of multi-unit zoned land.
 -

Action 2 – Small Dwelling Development

Brandon summarized the City’s existing standards for R-10 and R-7 zones, which comprise the majority of the City’s residentially zoned land. He shared some examples of how other Cities have used zoning to allow and/or encourage small lot dwelling development. He discussed the options for the City to consider for implementing this action, including:

- Reduce max lot coverage and/or FAR for detached plexes – Recommended
- Scale max lot coverage or FAR for detached plexes based on lot size – Recommended
- Set maximum building size for detached plexes
- Exempt lots w/ existing dwellings from max lot coverage/FAR – Recommended
- Use a sliding scale for max building size based on housing type
- Reduce minimum lot size for certain zones
- Create a new “small lot detached single-unit” housing type to allow in R-10 through R-2.1 – Recommended
- Eliminate max FAR and lot coverage for townhouses in R-10 and R-7 - Recommended

Action 2 Discussion and Questions

- What drives pricing in a community?
 - Great schools influence property value. SDCs also drive prices, particularly per unit. This has been a sticking point for City. Streets also take up part of residential areas.
- How is affordable housing defined and how does the City guarantee that it is affordable and available for low-income residents?
 - Affordable housing is typically defined as being affordable to people at or below 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI) to meet low-income household needs, and affordable for households 80%-120% AMI to meet workforce housing needs. If the City is providing incentives in exchange for building affordable housing, the City

would require the housing to be affordable to the targeted income groups for a specified period of time.

- Why aren't we seeing people building smaller homes on 7K and 10K lots?
 - Dwelling size is driven by financial feasibility and market driving building larger homes to maximize value of home.
- Did the project team look at examples of co-op housing or cottage clusters?
 - The City already allows cottage cluster housing per state middle housing requirements. The City has seen the middle housing land division process used to develop medium sized single-unit homes on larger lots. One of the goals of this project and this HPS action is to find ways to ensure that middle housing land divisions and detached plexes deliver smaller, more affordable homeownership opportunities. These housing products may also be more appropriate for the co-op housing model than traditional single-unit homes.

Action 9 – Zoning for Affordable Housing

Brandon discussed how the City's code currently does not address affordable housing. He described how this action is consistent with some state requirements for allowing development bonuses for affordable housing, and he shared some other bonus options that aren't required by the state that the City may consider. He summarized each of the Action 9 implementation options for the City to consider, including:

- Scale bonus level to the number of affordable and accessible units – Recommended
- Adopt bonus standards from OHNA State model code – Recommended
- Apply bonuses equally for accessible and affordable housing – Recommended
- Use density standards for multi-unit development to leverage affordable housing development – Recommended
- Apply bonuses to specific areas of the City

Action 9 Question and Discussion

- Why shouldn't the City target specific areas for affordable housing incentives?
 - We recommend allowing affordable more broadly throughout the City and not requiring or only applying it in specific areas. This provides greater affordable housing development options, improves access and opportunity for low-income households, and reduces the risk of concentrating low-income residents in specific areas.
- What about encouraging affordable housing in the Hwy 43 area?
 - There are some opportunities for developing affordable housing in that area, and we assume there will be some focus on implementing this strategy in the new mixed-use corridor zones that the City is considering as a part of the Vision43 project, but we still don't want to limit affordable housing only to that area or other specific areas.
- Is the City considering anything similar to Portland's approach to requiring affordable housing?
 - Portland has an inclusionary housing program that requires developments to include a minimum percentage of their units as affordable housing if the development is over a certain number of total units. The proposed approach is to provide incentives to encourage affordable housing rather than mandating it. Portland is currently the only city in the state that has an inclusionary housing program, in large part because implementing inclusionary zoning has a number of other specific state requirements that tend to be very staff intensive to administer and because limitations on how inclusionary zoning can be applied make it less

effective.

- I would be worried that developers will build housing at whatever price they want to or that affordable units would be rented by people with higher incomes.
 - That is not the intent of the incentives. Any housing developed using these incentives would have to be rented or sold to people in specific income levels and that housing would have to remain affordable to those groups for a specified period of time (typically at least 20 years and sometimes closer to 50 years or more).
- CC&Rs can limit what can be developed, including affordable housing and other housing types.
 - State legislation has invalidated many of those types of CC&Rs, and they are often unenforceable due to the state's requirements.

Housing Statutes and Legislative Compliance

Brandon summarized some of the recent housing legislation and updates to statute that the City should prioritize code updates for consistency as a part of this project. These state requirements would override any local zoning standards, but it is generally recommended that cities update their code for consistency to improve implementation, avoid confusion, and limit exposure to legal risk. The priority compliance items are also generally consistent with the goals of some of the HPS implementation actions, particularly for affordable housing.

Statute/Legislation Question and Discussion

- Will the PC see future MF housing applications, given recent legislation that limits the ability to have public hearings on those types of projects?
 - The City is still evaluating the implications with their legal counsel and will keep the PC up to date.
- Is the Code staying current with innovative housing construction trends, such as 3-D printed homes or modular housing?
 - The Code is generally silent on construction practices or materials, but some of the legislative compliance items (HB 4064) will ensure that barriers to some of these practices and housing types are removed or limited.
- The PC requests that City staff provides more information on how affordable housing is defined.

Next Steps

Brandon noted that there are several next steps in the project, but for the purposes of the Planning Commission's role, the project team will draft amendments based on the recommended implementation options in the audit over the fall. The team will plan to meet with the Planning Commission to discuss the recommended Code updates to implement those options in January 2027.

5. Planning Commission Announcements

None.

6. Staff Announcements

Wyss discussed the upcoming Planning Commission schedule.

7. Adjourn

Chair Schulte-Hillen adjourned the meeting at 7:34pm.