



COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Summary Minutes

Classroom 1, Emergency Services Training Center, 1705 W 2nd Ave

January 21, 2020, 5:30 PM

CAC Members Present: Cameron Ewing, Jon Belcher, Rick Duncan, Mary Leontovich, Hans Wittig, Ann Vaughn, Louisa de Heer, Kate Perle, Louie Vidmar

Community Members Present: Dwight Owens, Jerry Mohr

Staff Present: Terri Harding, Chelsea Hartman, Audrey Stuart, Julie Fischer

Agenda items

1. Introductions and Agenda Review
2. Public comments
 - No public comment received
3. Project Charter Update
 - a. The revisions to the project charter were presented, including:
 - i. The list of project staff and Technical Advisory Committee was updated
 - ii. New language about project deliverables that the Expanded Project Management Team drafted was added
 - iii. The timeline was extended from two years to three years
 - iv. Language from the CAC Working Agreement was incorporated
 - v. The FTA grant timeline was updated
 - vi. Clearer language about annexation was added
 - b. The CAC and staff discussed the proposed revisions. Questions and discussion included:
 - i. Language was struck about concurrent zone changes and included in plan adoption package. Does new language feel rigorous enough? CAC discussed this generally seemed in agreement with the new language.
 - ii. Should CAC members be listed in the charter?
 - iii. Make the language about ongoing implementation and code changes that will occur after adoption.
 - iv. Make sure that areas flagged for future study and rezoning (i.e. along major arterials) and which are not part of the corridor study, builds off CAC input when zoning changes occur in the future.
4. Final Review of Draft Action Plan
5. Review Adoption Package Outline

6. Corridor Study Concept 3 and Code Framework

- a. Chelsea provided an introduction and announced the February 28th subcommittee meeting.
- b. Neighborhood Conversations can be used to collect feedback on rezoning occurring north of the Corridor Study boundary.
- c. Clarification needed on Residential Middle Plus (RM+) zone. Question raised if new units on Owosso would be categorized as RM+.
- d. There are many large church properties with redevelopment potential north of the Corridor Study. How can new proposed zoning lead to better outcomes when these properties redevelop?
- e. Chelsea presented the updated Concept 3 map and discussed changes including, rezoning to match underlying Metro Plan designation. Changing existing R-2 to Corridor Residential (CRES). Establishing more logical endpoints for blocks that are getting rezoned (like Mayfair). Consultants need these zoning decisions made so they can run the final financial analysis.
- f. Question raised if large lots farther north of the Corridor Study should be changed to Corridor Mixed Use (CMU) versus CRES. Comment that it might help bring more services and restaurants to Santa Clara.
- g. There was a question regarding that the proposed zoning appears to be generally supported by the public, but increased traffic seems to be a concern and how to deal with this concern.
- h. Suggestion that the Alberta boundary be moved in so that the street is the boundary and then move it out on Crocker to do the same.
- i. Concern was raised regarding the Residential Middle (R-M) density (pg. 12) of 28 dwelling units per acre is too high.
- j. Staff clarified that these would be new base zones so they would come with their own development standards. Consultants are scoped to write that code that includes those standards. They write the first draft and then staff take it from there and make edits.
- k. Suggestion that setbacks between sides of property should be more than 5 feet and that more details about transition standards are needed.
- l. Staff clarified that the Code Framework is not intended for public comment and that will come later when more detail is available. At upcoming Neighborhood Conversations, we will share the proposed zoning map and description of the zones. There was a suggestion to create a map showing city limits and potentially annexable areas. Suggestion to also include information on existing City streets and how they may be extended.
- m. Suggestion to see street sections comparing existing and proposed zoning.
- n. Question arose about making the Corridor Study buffer more neighborhood specific as ¼ mile buffer seemed arbitrary.
- o. Question about how the Corridor Study interacts with the Willamette Greenway as it seems arbitrary to upzone all the way to the Greenway. There are ongoing conversations about redefining the Greenway standards.

- p. It was pointed out that design principles about greenway transitions are missing from the Code Framework. Staff clarified that this will be developed and reviewed by the CAC this summer.
 - q. Overview of surface runoff
7. Upcoming Neighborhood Conversations
- a. Julie presented an update on the upcoming Neighborhood Conversations and gave an overview of how each session will go. They will focus on land use and CAC person who is present can give introduction to the plan and process so far.
 - b. Clarification that materials being presented at the Neighborhood Conversations are drafts.
8. Action Plan Matrix Update
- a. Staff provided an update on efforts to provide details for feasibility, timeframe, cost, and type of actions for all draft actions so that we can discuss short and longer term priorities to implement the plan.
9. The CAC reviewed the draft actions for Transportation Goals 4-6.
- a. Language added about context-sensitive design, Northwest (NW) Expressway and paved bus stops
 - a. Suggestion to clarify how to make the on/off of NW Expressway safer, however, current wording balances River Road and Santa Clara's unique uses for NW Expressway.
 - b. Language added to draft policy 5.4 about efficiency
 - c. Wording changed to draft action 6.4.2 for clarification.
 - d. Kate moved to approve the current set of action items, except for the suggested edits that goalkeepers will bring back to the January CAC meeting, as a framework for next steps in the Action Planning phase and shifting into the adoption phase. Louisa seconded, and the motion passed (9 thumbs up votes).
10. The CAC reviewed the draft actions for Community Goals 15-18
- a. Suggestion to change wording of 15.4 so that it is not vague
 - b. CAC agreed to make wording in 18.4.2 more specific. It was suggested to incorporate ways to access water without electricity.
 - c. CAC agreed to remove 18.1.5 and instead loop it into 18.1.4
 - d. Kate moved to approve the current set of action items, except for the suggested edits that goalkeepers will bring back to the January CAC meeting, as a framework for next steps in the Action Planning phase and shifting into the adoption phase. Ann seconded, and the motion passed (9 thumbs up votes).
11. The CAC reviewed the draft actions for Parks and Natural Resources Goals 7-10.
- a. Suggested edit to 8.1 - add action to "within 2 years, identify and inventory good park sites in Santa Clara and contact owners about possible sale"
 - b. Edits to Goals 7 and 9 were okayed by goalkeepers
 - c. For Goal 10, 'investigate' was changed to 'initiate'

- d. Suggestion that Goal 8 should include an urban plaza in River Road which could be located at the end of Maxwell, near the appliance store.
 - e. 8.1.1 - Added "sized relative to population density"
 - f. 10.1.2 - Missing the last words (lands)
 - g. Staff clarified that the CAC can make a recommendation, but then it has to go through the adoption process and review.
 - h. Suggestion to switch the order of 10.2 and 10.3
 - i. Mary moved to approve the current set of action items, except for the suggested edits that goalkeepers will bring back to the January CAC meeting, as a framework for next steps in the Action Planning phase and shifting into the adoption phase. Louisa seconded, and the motion passed (9 thumbs up votes).
12. The CAC reviewed the draft actions for Land Use Goals 11-14
- a. CAC discussed middle housing and how the action items regarding it were consolidated.
 - b. Staff recommended to add in that design standards would apply for all housing types.
 - c. Suggestion to clarify that action items are not proposing to raise density in R-1 and to explore avg. maximum unit size.
 - d. Suggestion to add in % coverage of lot, setbacks, etc.
 - e. Will vegetative screening block solar to neighboring properties?
13. February CAC Co-chair Elections for Adoption Phase
14. Adjourn