Javoronok, Sara

From:

Rolf Olson <rolfolson@outlook.com>

Sent:

Monday, June 16, 2014 4:59 PM

To:

Javoronok, Sara

Subject:

OBC / RESIDENTIAL

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

Hello Sara ---

I talked to Chris this afternoon about more residential use flexibility in the OBC zone considering the apparent need for an avenue of mixed use in the CDC.

As you know, the OBC provides for residential use only above the first floor. I pointed out in my previous correspondence that this limitation required looking at using the PUD section of the code for the parcel at the NE corner of Hood and Burns.

Altering this limitation on residential use in a OBC zone could avoid use of the Waiver procedure for those having properties similarly situated to the subject property. Certainly it is important to use commercially zoned properties for commercial purposes where suitable, but when not suitable what is the best alternative?

The east portion of the Hood and Burns NE corner property is a good example of unsuitability for commercial use. Other commercially zoned properties have similar problems. For example, there may be little value in requiring commercial use for the rear portions and some side portions of commercial properties, especially when facing residential areas.

I submit this idea for consideration of the staff. Possibly there is more flexible language that could be crafted and reviewed by the Planning Commission when considering the current proposed changes in the CDC.

Thanks, Rolf

June 13, 2014

West Linn Planning Commission Staff, Sara Javoronok 22500 Salamo Road West Linn, OR 97068

Subject: CDC Amendments, Undated Letter from Planning Commission post stamped June 10, 2014.

Hello Planning Commission,

I'm the owner of an OBC undeveloped parcel at the northeast corner of Hood and Burns, diagonally across from West Linn Central Village. Our concept for the property as presented to the planning staff is for a mixed use project.

The west portion of the parcel is compatible with the OBC requirement of residential use only above the first floor of commercial use, however, the east portion is best suited for residential use only. Therefore, the OBC code was at odds with a mixed use project on this parcel. Also, the CDC has no straightforward mixed use provisions.

However, through use of a PUD overlay a mixed use plan was put together and presented to the planning staff at a pre-hearing conference. The staff report from that meeting states, ". . . applicant's proposal can potentially meet the provisions of the CDC and be approved but only if it is applied for as a PUD".

In the event the current proposed changes to the CDC are approved the concept for this parcel could only proceed by use of the newly enacted Waiver procedure. A Waiver is certainly a reasonable option; however, we wish to highlight for the Commission the benefit of flexibility in use of the PUD provisions for commercial properties.

Sincerely,

Rolf Olson 3453 Augusta National Dr S Salem, OR 97302