



**City of Sutherlin  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Tuesday, March 19, 2019  
7:00 p.m. – Sutherlin Civic Auditorium  
Agenda**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**Introduction of Media**

**Approval of Minutes**

February 19, 2019 – Regular Meeting

**DLCD Code Audit Project Discussion**

**Monthly Activity Report(s)**

**Public Comment**

**Commission Comments**

**Adjournment**

**CITY OF SUTHERLIN  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
CIVIC AUDITORIUM – 7PM  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2019**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:** William Lee, Richard Price, Sam Robinson, Collin Frazier, Elainna Swanson and Norman Davidson

**COMMISSION MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT:** Adam Sarnoski

**CITY STAFF:** Jamie Chartier, City Planner and Kristi Gilbert, Community Development Specialist

**AUDIENCE:** Gladys Robinson

Meeting called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Lee.

**FLAG SALUTE**

**INTRODUCTION OF MEDIA:** None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion made by Commissioner Price to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2019 Planning Commission meeting; second made by Commissioner Davidson.

In favor: Commissioners Price, Frazier, Robinson, Davidson and Chair Lee

Opposed: None

Motion carried unanimously, with Commissioner Swanson abstaining

**DLCD CODE AUDIT**

**Kristi Gilbert, Community Development Specialist,** gave the Commissioners a brief update and background on the DLCD Code Audit Project. The consulting firm's (3J Consulting and JET Planning) that were hired on behalf of DLCD is currently working on reviewing all of the cities codes, comprehensive plan, buildable lands inventory and any other documents that they see pertinent to the Sutherlin Development Code. The main objective for this code audit is to address the need for housing, more specifically multi-family housing need. The consulting firm will be at the next Planning Commission Meeting in March. At the next meeting they will go over a draft that will have suggested changes to the development code. Currently from you, the Planning Commission, they want to know any specific barriers you see with our current development code, any suggestions you may have or specific areas that need to be updated to help facilitate the need for housing. Mrs. Gilbert gave some ideas, for example changing the densities in some of our current zones, what is causing problems that limit housing developments, and other barriers we feel can be changed to help with the housing need.

The Planning Commissioner members had a list of code audit discussion questions in their packets. Discussion continued with Commission members and staff with ideas. Commissioner Robinson brought up looking at the Commercial zone on blocks off of Central Avenue, allowing them to change from commercial zone when a residence is already established. Mrs. Gilbert added to this that the city has commercial zoned properties in areas with pre-existing single family dwellings, these properties are hard to sell because are code does not allow for any changes, additions, or accessory buildings to be built unless the property owner/developer conforms to the current zoning regulations. **Jamie Chartier, City Planner**, the possibility of adding an application process for such properties and call it an Alternation of a Nonconforming Use, which would allow property owners/developers to apply for specific alterations if meeting the standards in place. A few ideas where discussed from Planning Commission Members regarding a possible overlay for a combination of commercial and/or residentially zoned property and also the thought of allowing Air, Bed and Breakfast vacation housing.

The Code Audit in the end will have reviewed the existing Sutherlin Development Code and regulations pertaining primarily to residential development. Mrs. Gilbert told the Planning Commission at the next scheduled meeting the consulting firms will have a draft code audit report for them to review. If before the March meeting if any members have any thoughts or ideas to let City Staff know.

## **MONTHLY ACTIVITY REPORT**

**Jamie Chartier, City Planner**, asked the Commissioners if they had any questions with the Activity Report that was given to them in their packets. Commissioner Robinson inquired about the Transportation System Plan (TSP) code audit, and asked if they are looking at turning south onto Exit 136 onramp and onto Parkhill Lane. There were no further comments from the Commissioners regarding the activity report.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None

**COMMISSION COMMENTS** - None

**ADJOURNMENT** - With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jamie Chartier, City Planner

***APPROVED BY COMMISSION ON THE \_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 2019.***

---

William Lee, Commission Chair

# SUTHERLIN HOUSING CODE AUDIT

**To:** Kristi Gilbert, City of Sutherlin  
**From:** Heather Austin, 3J Consulting  
Elizabeth Decker, JET Planning  
**CC:** Josh LeBombard, DLCD



**Date:** March 12, 2019

**RE: DRAFT CODE AUDIT REPORT FOR PLANNING COMMISSION**

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The City of Sutherlin is pursuing an audit of the development code and related regulations pertaining to residential development. State law requires a “clear and objective” review path for all housing, which may not cause “unreasonable cost or delay.” This requirement applies to all housing types within residential and mixed-use zones in Sutherlin, referred to in state law very broadly as “needed housing.” A “clear and objective” review path means that there is only one way to interpret a standard, so that there is no discretion when applying it. However, cities may also develop an optional review path with discretionary standards as an alternative to the clear and objective review path and there are limited exemptions to the clear and objective requirement, notably for historic districts.

The Sutherlin code audit will review all applicable development code standards to identify concerns about whether a clear and objective review option exists for all residential development, to identify significant regulatory barriers to residential development, and to identify additional regulatory opportunities to support the development of desired types identified in the City’s Housing Needs Analysis. The overarching goal for the code audit is to identify regulatory barriers to the development of a wide variety of housing types in compliance with both the letter and the spirit of Oregon’s clear and objective requirements, to better meet the City’s identified needs for housing.

The project will include an audit of the City’s regulations to determine whether the code:

- Complies with the statutory requirements for a clear and objective path for approval of residential development, per ORS §197.307(4);
- Includes criteria or procedures that may hinder development of needed housing; and
- Contains permitted use lists and development standards that ensure the mix and density of allowed housing can accommodate needed housing.

The City is working to understand the existing barriers and future solutions to promote housing development for current and future residents through the code audit project. The project includes a thorough review of housing-related development standards. Though not part of the scope of this project, a brief analysis is provided of the City's policies, fees, and procedures, in an attempt to identify other pertinent issues related to housing development in the city. This project is funded by a Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) Oregon Housing Planning Project technical assistance grant.

## **2. PROJECT APPROACH**

The Sutherlin Housing Code Audit will identify current standards, conditions, procedures or zoning designations that have the effect either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay or by not providing enough flexibility for development. The project will identify changes to the code(s) that are needed to address issues identified in the audit and develop a draft schedule for completing a code update.

The audit process began with review of adopted plans, regulations, policies and internal procedures. Information sources included:

- Development code, land division standards, and engineering standards;
- Background documents including long-range planning documents;
- Development review procedures including available informational materials for developers;
- Development review fees including permit fees and System Development Charges (SDCs); and
- Best practices from policy experts and case studies from around the state.

This audit incorporates input from the City's Staff and Planning Commission to better understand how the development regulations and policies impact the review process and production of housing units. These discussions and input were important to understanding the development context, and helped to identify both specific opportunity areas, such as Planned Unit Developments, Mixed-Use Zoning and a stand-alone Zoning Map, and general themes, such as needed changes to the way non-conforming uses are addressed in various zoning districts.

## **3. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS**

This audit reviewed the wide universe of plans, policies, and regulations at federal, state and local levels that impact the availability and affordability of housing choices, with a particular focus on local development regulations that can be analyzed and revised as

part of the Housing Code Audit Project. Those development regulations are designed to implement adopted long-range and housing plans.

The majority of audit findings are recommended changes to the development regulations and development review process. Long-range plan revisions are generally not recommended at this time based on audit findings; the long-range vision as articulated in adopted plans is in line with providing the needed variety of housing units, and the focus for this project is facilitating development of that vision through development regulations.

### **Long-Range Plans**

- *Comprehensive Plan (1990-1991)*. The Comprehensive Plan is the cornerstone document for all land use policies and regulations. The Housing Section of the Comprehensive Plan states, "Although everyone needs a place to live, the housing needs of people change over time. Variety in the housing market is essential to meet the changing needs of people". In addition, Goal B. of the Housing Section is "to enable all members of the community to live in housing appropriate to their needs".
- *Sutherlin Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis (2005)*. This inventory and analysis identified a projected population growth exceeding the capacity of residential land within the City limits and the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).
- *Sutherlin Economic Opportunities Analysis (2014)*. The EOA states, "Sutherlin's population increased nearly 20% over 2000-2013, up from 6,669 residents in 2000 to 7,930 in 2013. The Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) suggests that the population growth in Sutherlin has consistently outpaced the growth rate exhibited by Douglas County and the State of Oregon".
- *City of Sutherlin Zoning Map (last updated 4/2018)*. The zoning map mirrors the land use map in the Comprehensive Plan with the zoning designations matching the comprehensive plan map designations.
- *Public Works Master Plans*. Infrastructure plans are designed to support development by providing needed services.
  - Transportation System Plan (2005)
  - Wastewater Facilities Plan Amendment (2013)
  - Storm Drainage Master Plan (2014)
  - Water System Master Plan (2017)

### **Implementing Regulations**

The concepts and policies identified in long-range and housing plans are translated into regulations that are often collectively referred to as "zoning" but include a range of land use, engineering and building standards. These regulations are fully explored in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.

- Sutherlin Development Code (2017)
- Resolution No. 2018.17 Establishing the City's Fee Schedule, which includes land use review fees and System Development Charges (SDCs)

## **Outside Factors**

Additional policy areas beyond the scope of this review affect availability and affordability of housing opportunities, including:

- Accessibility requirements for multifamily buildings and federally funded projects, including the Fair Housing Act, Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.
- Building code requirements for energy efficiency promulgated by the state, included in the Oregon Residential Specialty Code.
- Design and durability requirements for housing projects receiving state funding promulgated by the Oregon Housing and Community Services agency.
- Market forces including costs for land, construction materials and labor.
- Consumer preferences, both preferences of households looking for new housing opportunities and those of existing households concerned about changes within existing neighborhoods.
- Financing and lending institutions, which tend to direct funding towards traditional types of housing development while limiting risk associated with financing nontraditional products such as ADUs or mixed-use projects in unproven markets.

## **4. DETAILED CODE AUDIT FINDINGS**

Within the City's adopted code, this audit identified potential barriers, constraints and incentives to be explored and updated in a future code amendment project. Findings are organized numerically to mirror the organization of the Sutherlin Development Code (SDC). Specific findings include a general description of the existing code features as needed, followed by itemized opportunities for future review and revision.

### **1. Section 1.3: Definitions**

- a. Consider update to definitions for all residential types to ensure existing definitions accurately describe dwellings, add new definitions as needed, consolidate definitions, and use terms consistently throughout this Section. Terms to address are: dwelling unit, duplex, multi-family housing, residence, senior housing, single-family attached housing (townhomes), single-family non-attached house, single-family non-attached zero-lot line house and triplex. Consider listing all above-mentioned dwelling types as subcategories of the definition of the term "dwelling".
- a. Consider update to definition of affordable (consider changing term to "Affordable Housing") to "projects where 50% of the units are priced at 60% MFI or below for a minimum of 60 years".



- b. Review and consider update to definitions of family, residential care center, residential facility and residential home to ensure compliance with fair housing standards protecting those with disabilities.

## **2. Section 2.1.130: Accessory Buildings, Uses and Dwellings**

- a. Establishes accessory buildings, uses and dwelling standards.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

## **3. Section 2.2: Residential Districts**

- a. Table 2.2.110- Permitted Uses: manufactured homes on individual lots are “permitted with special standards or limitations” or “permitted with Planned Unit Development” in all residential zones. Consider changing this to “P” for permitted, with a footnote that manufactured homes on individual lots are subject to the standards of 2.6.160.
- b. Table 2.2.120- Development Standards: Consider adding minimum density standards for the RH, R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. Consider reducing minimum lot sizes in the R-3 zoning district, as this is the City’s high density residential district.

## **4. Section 2.3: Commercial Districts**

- a. Table 2.3.110- Permitted Uses: Residential uses are permitted as part of a mixed-use project, not to exceed 50% of the floor area.
- b. Table 2.3.110- Permitted Uses: Consider adding “single family residences built before January 1, 2006” as a permitted use, subject to 2.3.135.
- c. Section 2.5.125- Special Status for Single Family Residences: consider updating to include consistency with proposed changes to Section 5.3- Non-conforming uses and development.
- d. The City of Medford permits dwelling units in all commercial districts except the Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) zone subject to the underlying dwelling type standards established for housing within the MFR-30 district. Sutherlin could consider permitting dwelling units in all commercial districts subject to the underlying dwelling type standards established for housing within the R-3 zoning district.

## **5. Section 2.45: Mixed Use District**

- a. Section 2.45.110- Permitted Uses, Conditional Uses and Structures: consider revising this section to table format such as Table 2.2.110, 2.3.110 and 2.5.110.
- b. Consider specifically exempting the Mixed Use District from any type of density calculations for the residential portions of development, allowing the market to guide the number and size of dwelling units proposed with a project. This has the potential to increase the number of dwelling units provided with mixed use developments.



## 6. Section 2.5: Industrial Districts

- a. Table 2.5.110- Permitted Uses: Consider adding "single family residences built before January 1, 2006" as a permitted use, subject to 2.5.125.
- b. Section 2.5.125- Special Status for Single Family Residences: consider updating to include consistency with proposed changes to Section 5.3- Non-conforming uses and development.

## Section 2.6: Special Use Standards

- a. Section 2.6.100- Accessory Dwellings: one attached or detached ADU is allowed per single-family lot, through building permit (Type I) review. ADUs may have a floor area of up to 600 SF, must provide 1 off-street parking space, must comply with underlying lot development standards and must be designed and constructed of "similar or better quality and type of materials as used in the principal structure on the same lot", with additional design standards.
  - Clarify and consider expanding the zones in which ADUs are permitted; current reference to 'single-family zones' should be expanded to include all zones where single-family detached housing is permitted for compliance with SB 1051, or as accessory to any existing dwelling in any zoning district, even nonconforming uses.
  - Allow one (or more) ADU per dwelling unit, rather than per lot to comply with updated state law (SB 1051).
  - Review architecture standard to ensure it meets the clear and objective requirement.
  - Review dimensional standards for ADUs, currently tied to the underlying lot development standards. Develop clear and reasonable standards for height, setbacks, and relationship to lot size specific to ADUs.
  - Review maximum square footage for ADUs, consider allowing a maximum size of 800 SF.
  - Explore feasibility of allowing one attached and one detached ADU per house.
  - Explore feasibility of allowing a tiny home as an ADU, including revising or eliminating the requirement that accessory dwellings be stick-built.
  - Off-street parking requirement is inconsistent with DLCDC guidance on best practices for ADUs, which recommends no parking requirements for ADUs; consider removing parking requirement for ADUs.
  - Explore feasibility of allowing manufactured home or other prefabricated units as ADUs to reduce costs, and the intersection with design guidelines.
- b. Section 2.6.160- Manufactured Homes on Individual Lots: establishes standards for manufactured homes on individual lots, such as floor plan minimums, roof pitch, building materials, garages and carports, thermal envelope and placement.
  - The code states that manufactured homes shall have an enclosed floor area of not less than 1,000 sq. ft. in R-2 and R-3 zones and 1,200 sq. ft. in

RH zones. ORS 197.307(8)(a) does not permit a city to establish a minimum enclosed floor area greater than 1,000 sq. ft. Recommend changing 1,200 sq. ft. min in RH zone to 1,000 sq. ft.

- c. Review Section 2.6.170- Manufactured Home Parks: establishes standards for manufactured home parks.
  - Standards are generally compliant with ORS 446.100. No significant changes anticipated.

### **Section 3.2: Access and Circulation**

- a. Establishes standards for access and circulation for pedestrians and vehicles.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

### **Section 3.3: Parking Area Screening, Landscaping, Street Trees, Fences and Walls**

- a. Establishes standards for parking area screening, landscaping, street trees, fences and walls.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

### **Section 3.4: Vehicle and Bicycle Parking**

- a. Table 3.4.120.A- Vehicle Parking Minimum Standards provides required minimum number of parking spaces per use type. Single family detached housing requires 2 parking spaces per detached unit or manufactured home on an individual lot. Two- and three-family housing requires 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. Multi-family and single-family attached housing requires spaces based on unit configuration:
  - i. Studio, 1-br units > 500 sq. ft., 55+ and ADUs require 1 space/du
  - ii. 1-bedroom units 500 sq. ft. or larger require 1.5 spaces/du
  - iii. 2-bedroom units require 1.75 spaces/du
  - iv. 3-bedroom or greater units require 2 spaces/du
  - v. Visitor parking is required for over 10 units (and 1-9 units with no on-street parking) at a rate of 1 space/10 du
  - vi. On-street parking credits, off-site parking and shared parking permitted.
  - vii. Maximum parking in ground surface parking lots may not exceed minimum required by more than 30%.
- b. ADU: Off-street parking requirement is inconsistent with DLCD guidance on best practices for ADUs, which recommends no parking requirements for ADUs; consider removing parking requirement for ADUs.
- c. No significant changes anticipated for vehicle parking standards for primary dwellings.
- d. Section 3.4.130- Bicycle Parking Requirements: Bicycle parking is required for multi-family uses of 4 or more dwellings at a rate of 1 sheltered bicycle space per dwelling unit. No bicycle parking requirements for single-, two- and three-family developments.

- e. No significant changes anticipated for bicycle parking standards.

### **Section 3.5: Infrastructure Standards**

The City should determine the balance between the infrastructure improvement standards that should be located in this chapter of the development code, and those that should be located in the engineering design criteria. While a complete audit of infrastructure standards is outside the scope of this audit, some general guidelines include:

- a. Design issues that relate to land use approvals, such as tentative subdivision plans and site plan approval, should be included in the development code, while design and construction details should be located in the engineering design criteria. For example, street spacing and widths should be included in the Sutherlin Development Code (SDC), but street cross sections could be located in the engineering design criteria and referenced in the SDC. This would allow the city more flexibility in updating street design standards without a zoning code text amendment but hold developments accountable to meet the minimum right-of-way standards.
- b. Some regulatory requirements are driven by state and federal standards, such as stormwater, and may change more quickly than the development code is updated. Where possible, reference outside standards rather than integrating into the development standards.

### **Section 4.2: Types of Applications and Review Procedures**

- b. Establishes review procedures for various types of applications, including Type I, II, III and IV applications.
- c. Develop fast track permitting process for affordable housing projects, to meet the requirements of SB 1051. "Affordable" is defined as projects where 50% of the units are priced at 60% MFI or below for a minimum of 60 years.

### **Section 4.3: Development Review and Site Plan Review**

- c. Section 4.3.110 identifies two processes, a Type I Development Review and a Type II Site Plan Review.
- d. No significant changes anticipated.

### **Section 4.4: Land Divisions and Property Line Adjustments**

Requires a two-stage review process for subdivisions and partitions: Type II review for preliminary plat and Type I review for final plat. Final plat must be filed within two years of approval of the preliminary plat.

- a. Section 4.4.140.E.4 states, "The applicant may be required to install landscaping, walls, fences, or other screening as a condition of subdivision approval. See also, chapter 2, Zoning Districts, and section 3.3, Landscaping, Street Trees, Fences and Walls." Revise to a clear and objective standard.

- b. Section 4.4.140.N states, “Conditions of Approval. The city may attach such conditions as are necessary to carry out provisions of this code, and other applicable ordinances and regulations, and may require landscape screening between uses, or access reserve strips granted to the city for the purpose of controlling access to adjoining undeveloped properties. See also, section 3.5.100.D (Infrastructure). Revise to clear and objective standard.

#### **Section 4.5: Conditional Use Permits**

- a. Requires a Type III review for conditional use permits. The Conditional Use Permit process allows the City to require discretionary standards and additional conditions when an applicant proposes certain uses which, due to the nature of their impacts on surrounding land uses and public facilities, require a case-by-case review and analysis.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

#### **Section 4.6: Planned Unit Developments**

- a. A three-step review process for a PUD applies upon submittal for review of a PUD- no minimum site size is required. The three steps may be combined for notification and public hearings. PUDs in residential districts are required to contain at least forty percent (40%) open space.
- b. City staff indicated that the PUD process is used with some frequency.
- c. Consider clarifying allowed uses in the underlying commercial and industrial zoning districts (4.6.130.B and .C).
- d. Consider reducing the amount of open space required in a PUD in residential districts.

#### **Section 4.7: Modifications to Approved Plans and Conditions of Approval**

- a. Establishes a minor (Type I) and major (same type as original review) review procedure for modifications to approved plans and conditions of approval. Review threshold between minor and major modifications.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

#### **Section 4.8: Zoning District Map Amendments**

- a. Establishes Type III review procedure for quasi-judicial zoning map amendments. The review procedure for a zoning map amendment is appropriate. However, City staff has identified the issue that the Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation are the same, and therefore a Type III quasi-judicial zoning map amendment *always* requires a Type IV comprehensive plan map amendment.
- b. The City could consider an update to the Comprehensive Plan Map to generalize land use designations. For example, the Comprehensive Plan Map can be updated to identify land uses generally, such as “residential”, as opposed to zone-specifically, such as “RH, R-1, R-2 and R-3”.

#### **Section 4.10: Miscellaneous Permits**

- a. Identifies process for obtaining temporary use permits and temporary manufactured dwelling medical hardship permit.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

#### **Section 4.11: Amendments to the Sutherlin Development Code and Land Use Plans**

- a. Requires a Type IV review for amendments to the city's development code or a land use plan, including amendments to the comprehensive plan text or map, annexations and amendments to the urban growth boundary.
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

#### **Section 5.2: Variances**

- a. Establishes three classes of variance: Class A (Type I review), Class B (Type II review) and Class C (Type III review).
- b. No significant changes anticipated.

#### **Section 5.3: Non-Conforming Uses and Development**

- a. Prohibits expansion of non-conforming uses and developments. Limits ability to rebuild non-conforming uses in situations where more than 75% of structure is destroyed. Requires full compliance with code and underlying zone if use is discontinued or abandoned for any reason for a period of more than 12 months.
- b. City staff has identified this as an area of the Code needing review and potential revision. The City has many pre-existing non-conforming residential uses in commercial and industrial zones. The City would like to allow the owners of these uses some latitude in the use and development of their property.
- c. Consider allowing residential structures that are non-conforming to be reconstructed if destroyed.
- d. Consider allowing residential structures that are non-conforming to expand in floor area by not more than twenty percent (20%) and in lot coverage by not more than ten percent (10%), subject to underlying zoning district standards for setbacks, height, lot coverage, etc. This is similar to the standard utilized by the City of Medford, identified as a potential model for Sutherlin by DLCD staff.

### **5. ADDITIONAL AUDIT FINDINGS**

The City can ensure effective application of the development code during the residential development review process by implementing supportive policies, such as:

**Coordination between City departments.** The departments tasked with development review (Community Development/Planning and Public Works) coordinate closely in the City of Sutherlin. Like many cities in Oregon, Sutherlin does not have a City Engineer on

staff and utilizes a contracted professional engineer (PE) to review and approve public improvements. Currently, the consulting PE is generally not engaged to review a project until after land use approval. The City may consider bringing the consulting PE into the project earlier in the process, at time of land use review or even pre-application. This would allow the PE to identify any major engineering issues with the development proposal that may be costly, timely or ultimately fatal to the development proposal at a later stage in the process.

**Informational materials.** Develop new or amend existing informational materials available for residential projects, including typical development projects and annexation procedures. Materials should be specific to the type of residential construction (e.g., ADUs or multifamily development) and written for the typical developers of such projects (e.g. homeowners constructing an ADU may require greater detail, but a developer building a 200-unit mixed-use project may require limited but precise information). Consider including review requirements, timelines, fees, SDCs, and applicable code sections. Recognize limitations of one-size-fits-all guides, and also focus resources on providing site-specific information through over-the-counter advice and pre-application conferences. Consider providing developers and property owners written summary notes after pre-application conferences.

**System Development Charges (SDCs).** SDCs are currently under \$4,000 per dwelling unit in Sutherlin. There is no differentiation between types of dwelling units- a single-family detached home is charged the same SDCs as a unit within a multifamily housing development, a manufactured home or an accessory dwelling unit. The city is currently undertaking a feasibility study for a potential SDC rate increase. The city may consider charging different SDC rates for single-family residential than for other housing types, consistent with other jurisdictions in the state.

**Land Use Fee Structure.** The land use review fees in Sutherlin are typically lower than comparably sized and located jurisdictions. While land use review fees can have a negative impact on a project's feasibility, the city may consider recovering costs of land use review of private development. For example, the above recommendation to include the consulting professional engineer (PE) at an earlier stage in the land use review process may result in the need to increase the pre-application conference fee. However, the above recommendation to provide a written summary of the pertinent points addressed at the pre-application conference will add value and knowledge to the project, allowing the property owner or developer to fully weigh the development cost against the projected revenue of the project at the feasibility stage.



126 E. Central Avenue  
Sutherlin, OR 97479  
541-459-2856  
Fax: 541-459-9363  
[www.ci.sutherlin.or.us](http://www.ci.sutherlin.or.us)

## City of Sutherlin

Date: March 12, 2019  
To: Sutherlin Planning Commission  
From: Community Development  
Re: Monthly Activity Report

This report is provided in an effort to keep you apprised of recent land use and other relevant activities.

### **TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Central Avenue Paving Improvement**

Guido Construction final punch list on-going.

#### **Valentine Ave Paving Improvement**

Town Hall meeting was rescheduled and held on March 7, 2019, due to the snow storm. The tentative project schedule will be as follows: Project advertises on March 21, 2019, Bid Opening – April 11, 2019, City Council Contract Award – April 22, 2019, Finalize contract with Contractor – May, 2019 and Construction to begin in June, 2019 and completed by the end of August, 2019.

#### **Transportation System Plan (TSP)**

Second Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting was held on February 19, 2019, to review Current Transportation System Operations (Tech Memo 3). Comments were then submitted to the consultant on March 13, 2019. Consultants are now beginning work on Task Memo #4 addressing Future Transportation Operations. The first Open House is tentatively scheduled for the end of April, 2019.

#### **Code Audit Update**

A draft Code Audit has been provided to the Planning Commission for discussion at their March 19, 2019 meeting. Bi-Weekly conference calls continue between Staff, DLCD and Consultants.

### **UTILITIES**

**Tapani Construction, Inc.** is in full swing of construction on the Wastewater Treatment Facility. Construction of the new Everett Pump Station started on March 11, 2019. We are still on schedule.

#### **Schoon Mountain Storage Tank and Sixth Avenue & Oak Street Pump station improvements.**

RFP Deadline was February 21, 2019. Three RFP's were submitted. Interviews of the three firms were held on March 6, 2019, with The Dyer Partnership Engineers and Planners Inc. was award the contract at the March 11, 2019 Council Meeting. Schedule continues as follows:

Start Design	Mar. 12, 2019
Complete Design	Sept. 27, 2019



Start Construction (Tentative)	Mar. 2020
Complete Construction (Tentative)	Nov. 2020

## **LAND USE ACTIVITY**

### **Building Worksheets**

- 2019-001 - 2019-015 on previous Activity Report(s)
- 2019-016 – 814 Airway Ave – addition to existing warehouse
- 2019-017 – 1802 W Duke Rd – Single Family Dwelling
- 2019-018 – 1427 Gleason – Repair to floor in SFD
- 2019-019
- 2019-020 – Umpqua and Fifth Ave – Fiber Optics Facilities
- 2019-021 – 126 E Central Ave – Interior Remodel
- 2019-022 – 1740 Scardi Blvd – Single Family Dwelling

### **Active Land Use Applications**

- 19-S001 – 19-S003 on previous Activity Report(s)

### **Right of Way Applications**

- 19-01 – Paramount Cable Corp – 213 Casa De Loma
- 19-02 – Paramount Cable Corp – 819 S Comstock Rd, Sp 29