

**CITY OF CASCADE LOCKS
PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA**

Thursday, January 8, 2015 at 7:00 PM
City Hall

- I. Call Meeting to Order.
- II. Approval of December 11, 2014 Minutes.
- III. New Business
 - A. Code Assistance Work Session.
- IV. Adjournment.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, or for other accommodations for person with disabilities, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by contacting the City of Cascade Locks office at 541-374-8484.

I. Call Meeting to Order. Planning Commission Chair Larry Cramblett called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM. Planning Commission Members present were Gyda Haight, Virginia Fitzpatrick (7:01), Todd Mohr, Gary Munkhoff, and Larry Cramblett. Also present were City Administrator Gordon Zimmerman, Planning Consultant Stan Foster, City Recorder Kathy Woosley, Port Interim General Manager Paul Koch, Holly Howell, Don Mann, Jim Bussard, and Erik Carlson.

II. Approval of October 9, 2014 Minutes. Motion: PCM Fitzpatrick moved, seconded by PCM Haight, to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. New Business:

A. Public Hearing – LU 14-003 Port of Cascade Locks Industrial Property Subdivision.

Chair Cramblett opened the hearing at 7:02 PM. He said he was on the City Council for 10 years and was told to keep his mouth shut about land use cases. He said he was just told by PC Foster that the same applies to the Planning Commission. He informed everyone that he had visited some of the Planning Commissioners trying to put together information. He said he wasn't trying to push any one view on the matter. CA Zimmerman asked if he had talked to all the Commissioners. Chair Cramblett said he had talked to PCM's Haight and Munkhoff. CA Zimmerman asked what was learned that the other Commissioners needed to know. Chair Cramblett said he learned exactly what lots were being talked about as he was confused.

PCM Mohr declared a conflict as he is employed by the Port. PC Foster disclosed that his company had been employed by the Port in the past but is not currently.

PC Foster advised Commissioners to contact the City Staff if there are any questions. He said that would not constitute an ex-parte contact. He said with this application he didn't see this as an issue but could be in the future. He said he wouldn't want to see the Planning Commission disqualified. PCM Haight wanted clarification regarding participation as she was a Port Commissioner. CA Zimmerman read the opinion from the City Attorney stating she could participate and vote as she wasn't paid for her position as a Port Commissioner.

PC Foster gave a brief overview of the staff report. He said he would go over the conditions of approval at the end of testimony along with a recommendation for approval.

Chair Cramblett read the Planning Commission procedures and Stan Foster explained the public hearing rules.

Applicant Testimony: Jim Bussard said he is the Port's Engineer on this project and has met with the City's Engineers and Consulting Public Works Director for the infrastructure of this project. He said the project meets all City standards.

Chair Cramblett asked if the existing roadway between Lot 1 and 2 would remain. Jim said there would be access entrances into the lots. CA Zimmerman explained that the existing roadways are not required to stay and what is proposed with the plat is a change in the location of the roads to meet the current proposed development of lots.

Chair Cramblett asked about the road on the west end of Lot 3. Jim Bussard said the road will be at a uniform grade all around down to the cul-de-sac and trying not to approach 7%. He explained that there is a slope easement. Jim explained the prospective buyers need the space to get their buildings on the property. He said the old paved road wouldn't be used anyway as water and sewer will be going in and the streets have to be built to City standards.

PCM Munkhoff asked if it is an easement or a road running through Lot 6. Jim Bussard said it is an access utility easement. He explained the 20' wide re-locatable easement is to plan for adjustment if needed when digging for the water line. Chair Cramblett asked why the water line was going in the direction shown on the

plat. Jim Bussard said the original water line underneath the railroad is 8" water line, which gives you about 980 gallons a minute. He said a 12" water line will give 2000 gallons a minute. He said the conduit underneath the railroad isn't big enough and it is hard working with the railroad.

PCM Munkhoff asked where the access is into Lot 6. Jim Bussard said Lot 6 is a flag lot and the entry into Lot 6 is off of the proposed street. PCM Munkhoff said he didn't see a water line mark on Lot 4. He asked where the actual water is. Jim Bussard said the dotted line is the flood easement line. He said the Port will own the easement area toward the water and it is approximately 30' to the water. PCM Munkhoff asked about the bio swale located on the north side of the cul-de-sac on Lot 5. Jim Bussard said this is for the run off from the road. He said each lot will have its own bio swale and will be required with development of each lot.

PCM Munkhoff asked if the owner of Lot 5 would own all the way to Herman Creek or would there be a riparian area or boundary. Jim Bussard said the Port owns a portion and Oregon Fish and Wildlife owns the other side beyond the Port owned property. PCM Munkhoff clarified that Lot 5 crosses Herman Creek. Don Mann said the Port owns the land under Herman Creek and the State owns the water. PCM Munkhoff asked why the Port wouldn't retain ownership of Herman Creek for public use. Jim Bussard explained the 200' offset from the ordinary high water mark and PCM Munkhoff said the owner of Lot 5 would still have control of the land. He said Herman Creek is unique and thought it would be an advantage to the Port to retain ownership. Jim Bussard said ODFW regulates the water and the vegetation below the high water line. He said the public can't just walk through there anytime they want. PCM Munkhoff said the land there can't be developed anyway so it should stay in public ownership for recreational use. Holly Howell agreed saying there weren't any plans at this time to sell this property and explained that it wasn't really a sellable piece of property because of piles of aggregate and the long term lease of the cell tower. PCM Munkhoff asked if there could be some provision for the Port to move the property line of Lot 5 back so that Herman Creek can stay in public ownership. He said it is a goal in the Comprehensive Plan to provide opportunities to access the river. He said Herman Creek is a unique spot in the Gorge and considered this to be an economic development engine. He said it is going to become more and more valuable. Don Mann said he thought this to be an acceptable recommendation and would take to the Port Commission for their consideration.

Chair Cramblett mentioned the street name used on the plat and said that the City has a policy for street naming. Don Mann stated that a potential property owner requested the street name but understands the City has a policy for street naming.

PC Foster suggested an additional condition of approval to address the Herman Creek concern with Lot 5. He suggested, "The applicant shall designate a public easement of not less than 100' from the high water mark of Herman Creek from the southern boundary of the UPRR right of way to the high water mark of the Columbia River." PCM Munkhoff said he would want Port ownership and not an easement.

Erik Carlson explained that it could be a dedicated public easement. He said public ownership would make a messy property line. PCM Munkhoff said the line is already a messy line and didn't understand why the Port would not retain ownership and questioned the benefit of the easement. Erik Carlson said if it is an easement it would be on the tax roll and remain public use forever. CA Zimmerman said it would be better to create a 100' easement from Herman Creek than to move the property line. He said moving the line would be creating a parcel that there is no access to and the 100' easement from the creek and not the property line would protect more territory.

Erik Carlson said another advantage to a dedicated easement is opportunity to write specifics to it. PCM Munkhoff argued that if the Port owned it there wouldn't have to be anything written.

Opponent: None.

Chair Cramblett said there is the same issue with Lot 4. He questioned the connection to the trails. PCM Munkhoff asked if the public has access around the cove to the jetty. Don Mann said the proposed property owner plans to develop in the water for his business. He said there are no intentions to sell any property below the 82.2' flowage easement line but the Port intends to work with the property owners to allow them use of the waterfront area for the purpose of his business. PCM Munkhoff asked what right the proposed property owner would have to restrict the waterfront area. Don Mann said the Port is considering leasing that portion of land to them for their business so that property owner would have control of that land. PCM Munkhoff said he would like to see something put in place as this business will effectively seal off access to the water. He said it would be a big mistake to close off access to the waterfront. PCM Haight said there could be something written in the deal that the property would revert back to Port ownership. There was discussion regarding no access beyond Lot 4 as that lot is privately owned. PCM Munkhoff said that was a mistake made years ago and wouldn't want to make the same mistake.

Don Mann asked if the Planning Commission would consider waiving Condition 7. There was consensus of the Planning Commission to waive Condition 7 and stated that they trusted the Port to comply.

PC Foster read through the Conditions of Approval with Condition 7 removed, stated the intent for Condition 9 is 24 months for "proposed infrastructure", not "building", and if that isn't enough time the Port could request additional time. PC Foster said the added condition would be, "A dedicated public easement on Lot 5 of not less than 100' from the ordinary high water mark of Herman Creek."

Close Hearing: Chair Cramblett closed the hearing at 8:13 PM.

PCM Munkhoff asked about the 90' easement on a previous partition plat. Jim Bussard said the Corp is reviewing this and thought it could be an error. Erik Carlson said this is a 1935 easement and Don Mann said it would be difficult to change.

Motion: PCM Fitzpatrick moved to accept the proposal with conditions as stated. PCM Munkhoff seconded the motion. The motion was approved with PCM's Cramblett, Fitzpatrick, Haight, and Munkhoff voting in favor. PCM Mohr did not participate in the discussion or vote.

PCM Munkhoff asked when construction would start on the street. Jim Bussard said the street is being designed now and would be built this next summer.

PCM Haight reminded everyone about the Bonneville School reverting back to the original owner.

B. Public Hearing – LU 14-004 City of Cascade Locks Conditional Use. Chair Cramblett opened the hearing at 8:29 PM.

PCM Mohr said Keith Terry, from the City's Electric Department, came to talk to him about the setback problems for the building. He said he hadn't read his packet yet so was unaware that this would be before the Planning Commission. He said that's all he knows about it.

CA Zimmerman explained the City Hall building is sitting on Commercial/Residential (CR) zoned property and the yard where the equipment and vehicles are stored is zoned Medium Density Residential (MDR). He said the bucket truck and larger equipment used to be stored on City property near the waste water treatment plant but had security issues at that location. He said it was decided to bring the equipment to the storage yard near the City Hall building but there is no protection from the elements for the vehicles. CA Zimmerman explained the first phase of the project would be to set poles and put on the roof. He said the walls would come later. He said the City is asking for a conditional use permit as the property is zoned MDR. CA Zimmerman asked if there would be a requirement for sprinklers and if a sidewalk would be required.

Chair Cramblett asked if the building would be a problem of view for neighboring houses. PCM Mohr said if you want to assure you have a view you should purchase the lot in front of you. PC Foster said this land use case was noticed and no one is here to object. He said there is no change in the use of the property but due to the property being zoned MDR the City has to go through the conditional use process. He said the entire City property should be zoned Public and since there is a review of the CDC in process he suggested an amendment to the CDC for additional language to allow a utility facility necessary for public service.

Chair Cramblett said he didn't think sidewalks would be required because there isn't development of a new street, it's not required in the CDC, and there isn't a sidewalk in the area. PCM Haight asked what size equipment would be inside the building and the value of it. She said the building should have a sprinkling system installed to protect the expensive equipment. CA Zimmerman said a sprinkling system isn't required for an accessory building and right now it is just going to have a roof. PCM Munkhoff asked if the side abutting the residential zone could be landscaped with arborvitae or something for screening. CA Zimmerman explained that the property has cement block right along the fence with no dirt. PCM Mohr said you could put up some sort of mesh and CA Zimmerman said something could be done to screen that side.

Opponent: None.

PC Foster said staff is recommending approval of the conditional use and reviewed the conditions of approval. He read Condition 3, "Building shall have electricity for lights but will not have a sewer connection as City employees will continue to utilize City Hall for this purpose. PCM Cramblett asked if the screening should be added as a condition. PC Foster said the Planning Commission could do that. Consensus of the Planning Commission was to allow CA Zimmerman to figure out the screening.

Motion: PCM Mohr moved to accept the conditional use permit to build the shop. The motion was seconded by PCM Haight. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Cramblett closed the hearing at 8:47 PM.

IV. Adjournment. Chair Cramblett adjourned the Planning Commission and entered into the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting.

Prepared by
Kathy Woosley, City Recorder

APPROVED

Larry Cramblett, Chair



Memorandum

To: Gordon Zimmerman, Cascade Locks City Administrator
Laura Buhl, TGM Grant Manager

From: Scot Siegel

Date: November 30, 2014

Subject: *City of Cascade Locks TGM Code Assistance – Task 2.4 Code Evaluation*

The Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) program has contracted with Siegel Planning to prepare an assessment of the City of Cascade Locks' Community Development Code (CDC). The TGM program provides direct assistance to communities in updating and improving their comprehensive plans and land use regulations consistent with TGM objectives.

Background

The following background is mostly quoted from the contract Statement of Work:

The City of Cascade Locks is a small city of approximately 1,150 residents located in the Mid-Columbia Gorge. It is bound by the Columbia River to the north and the steep slopes of the Cascade Mountain Range to the south. Interstate 84 and Union Pacific Railroad run through the town. Most of the community's existing development is located between the river and I-84. In addition to being bound by the Columbia River and challenging topography, Cascade Locks is in the heart of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. As a result, Cascade Locks must work even harder than many other cities to accommodate growth within its existing boundaries.

The City of Cascade Locks ("City") is interested in updating its development code in a manner consistent with Transportation and Growth Management Program ("TGM") principles and its community vision. The City determined that it would be beneficial to conduct a code assessment (Phase I) in order to create an action plan to guide code amendments in a subsequent Phase II project. The community would like to find ways to accommodate growth and all modes of transportation while enhancing livability.

Cascade Locks is an important waypoint and destination for cyclists, hikers, and walkers. It is the eastern terminus of a newly-opened non-motorized stretch of the growing Historic Columbia River Highway State Trail, is located on the Pacific Crest Trail and near several other important Columbia Gorge trails, and is the location of an important river crossing, the Bridge of the Gods. Currently, the lack of bike lanes and sidewalks, and the presence of cul-

de-sacs without bike or pedestrian connections are barriers to Cascade Locks becoming a bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly community. The community is also interested in creating complete neighborhoods with a mix of housing options and access to daily needs, and finding ways to require high-quality development.

Project Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the Phase I code assessment is to create an action plan for future code changes that meet the community's needs and support TGM objectives. Consistent with TGM objectives, the code assessment is to pay particular attention to the following topics as identified in the statement of work; the following is quoted from the contract statement of work:

- Appropriate places for higher density and mixed-use development
- Complete neighborhoods
- Design guidelines for high quality development
- Accommodating growth within the existing UGB while maintaining a high quality of life
- Enhancing walkability and bikeability
- Improving connections to the Historic Columbia River Highway and Trail
- Improving the pedestrian-friendly nature of the downtown area along WaNaPa Street (U.S. Hwy 30) while accommodating tourist automobile traffic and maintaining the historic character of the highway

In order to achieve these objectives, Siegel Planning Services has reviewed the City's Comprehensive Plan and Development Code, and relevant information and methods from the *TGM Smart Development Code Handbook*, *Model Development Code and User's Guide for Small Cities – 3rd Edition*, *Commercial and Mixed-Use Development Code Handbook*, *Infill and Redevelopment Code Handbook*, and current smart development best practices.

This memorandum provides an assessment of the City's Community Development Code, Comprehensive Plan, and Transportation System Plan, per Task 2 of the TGM Statement of Work. The evaluation is based on the above project objectives, observations from the community tour, input from City staff, and initial comments from three planning commission members. In reviewing the assessment, please consider whether it addresses the community's and TGM's most important priorities for land use and development, and if there other code-related issues that should be addressed.

Policy and Code Assessment

The following summarizes Cascade Locks' land use policies and regulations, and recommends changes for the City to consider, based on the above objectives.

Higher Density and Mixed-Use Development

The Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area and Columbia River are barriers to Cascade Locks expanding. The City also has limited opportunity develop due to the presence of steep slopes, the

Columbia River, I-84, and the Union Pacific Railroad. Therefore, the City must look for opportunities to use land efficiently.

One of the key challenges the City faces in accommodating high-density housing or mixed-use development is topography. Steep slopes contribute to higher construction costs, which may discourage development. If land values are not high enough to support the cost of building on steep slopes, certain types of housing may not be economically feasible. It may also be difficult to finance and market high-density housing and mixed-use development where properties do not have good connections to downtown or other amenities.

Cascade Locks' Community Development Code contains the following zoning districts that provide for residential uses [CDC 8-6.52 – 8-6.68, and 8-6.76]:

- **Rural Residential (RR).** The RR zone limits density to one dwelling per acre, or less. This zone is limited to single-family detached housing and is generally directed to the hillsides above I-84. The RR zone does not allow high-density housing or mixed-use development. It would not be appropriate to permit these types of uses in the RR district given potential geologic hazards and the district's isolation on the south side of I-84.

Recommendation: The RR zone is not appropriate for higher density or mixed-use development. No change to allowed uses in the RR zone is recommended.

- **Low Density (LDR) Zone.** The LDR zone allows housing at densities of 2-5 dwellings per acre, or a minimum of 7,500 square feet per dwelling. It comprises most of the City's residential land, including areas along Forest Lane that are relatively flat. The LDR zone allows single-family detached housing and residential care homes, but not duplexes or multiple family housing. The definitions section (Chapter 8-608) defines accessory residential unit as an accessory use, but the use is not listed as allowed in any zone.¹ It is also unclear if this type of housing is considered accessory to all primary residential uses (e.g., single-family and multiple family dwellings), or just single-family uses. In addition the definition does not provide standards, such as a size limit, for accessory dwellings.

Recommendation: Consider whether to re-designate some areas from LDR to MDR. Alternatively, consider allowing duplexes and accessory residential units in the LDR district subject to special use standards. The latter option would provide for a broader range of housing without significantly increasing demand on public services.

If added to the LDR zone, special use standards might limit duplexes to properties on corner lots, or those fronting Forest Lane, and require them to have features similar to a single-family house, such as a front porch and a garage that is setback from the main entrance to the residence. Standards for accessory residential units typically limit the size

¹ The Code defines Accessory Residential Use: "An auxiliary and detached living unit with separate kitchen, living, and sleeping facilities, in a single family structure or in a separate accessory building on the same lot as a primary single family residence ... not included in density calculation."

of these dwellings and require the use of exterior materials and finishing that complement the primary residence.

It is also noted that the Planned Development (PD) procedure in CDC Chapter 8-6.140 allows for a greater mix of housing types than is allowed through a standard subdivision in the LDR zone. In a PD, the developer sets aside at least 20% of the site as open space and may transfer density to another portion of the property. This allows for the creation of smaller lots or development of attached housing (e.g., single-family attached, duplex, and multiple family) where it would not otherwise be permitted. The PD procedure may be used in any zoning district, but a minimum of five acres is required, which limits its applicability to few vacant residential parcels.

- **Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone.** The MDR zone allows housing at densities of 6-10 dwellings per acre, or a minimum of 4,000 square feet per dwelling. This zone is concentrated near the downtown and adjacent to I-84. It allows single-family detached housing, residential care homes, group care homes (conditional use), zero lot line housing, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes. (Zero lot line or attached single-family housing is subject to the design standards in CDC 8-6.102.010, which are based on the 2005 TGM Model Development Code for Small Cities.) The MDR zone also allows public, institutional, religious assembly uses, and bed and breakfast inns as conditional uses. The MDR zone does not allow accessory residential units in a separate structure. (Two units in one structure would be classified as a duplex.)

With one exception, opportunities for new development in the MDR zone are limited to small infill sites in the original town plat area, which is to the south and east of downtown. The exception is a large, vacant MDR property located behind Cascade Locks School, east of Tahoma Street, and north of I-84. With appropriate site planning (e.g., buffering against I-84 and completion of the local street grid with sidewalks) this property could provide for a mix of housing within a short walking distance of the school. One option that might be appropriate here, as an alternative to duplexes, is a “cottage cluster” development. Cottage clusters have multiple detached dwellings (cottages) oriented to a common open space referred to as a “green.” Parking is usually grouped in bays, which may include covered parking, garages and/or storage. Another option is to have all parking be on-street, where streets adjacent to the development are designed to accommodate on-street parking, as is common in historic cottage clusters. Some cottage clusters have a small community building or other shared facility.

Recommendation:

1. Consider rezoning properties from MDR to HDR, or from MDR to Commercial/Residential (CR), where appropriate, such as adjacent to the Downtown (D) zone. Rezoning would provide for a wider range of housing choices close to commercial services and recreational amenities. Properties next to downtown with good river views might be more marketable for higher density housing than single dwellings and duplexes.

2. Adopt standards for cottage cluster housing in the MDR zone.

- **High Density Residential (HDR) Zone.** The HDR zone targets housing at densities of 10-20+ dwellings per acre, or a minimum of 2,000 square feet per dwelling. It allows single-family detached housing, residential care homes, group care homes (conditional use), zero lot line housing, duplexes, and multiple family housing (triplexes, fourplexes, and larger). It also allows public, institutional, religious assembly uses, and bed and breakfast inns as conditional uses. The HDR zone is limited to two vacant parcels, one to the east of Edgewood Avenue with frontage onto Wa-Na-Pa Avenue, and one riverfront parcel next to the Port of Cascade Locks Business Park. The parcel east of Edgewood has good visibility from and potential access to Wa-Na-Pa, but it backs up to I-84 and is next to an ODOT materials storage yard. The parcel on the Port property has potential for high density or mixed-use development, including resort/residential uses, with river views.

Recommendation: Same recommendation as for the MDR zone. See above.

- **Manufactured /Mobile Home Park Residential (MHR) Zone.** The MHR zone is similar to the HDR zone but allows manufactured/mobile home parks.

Recommendation: The City should work with owners of mobile home parks to understand the anticipated lifespan of those uses. As applicable, the City should plan for the transitioning of these properties over time, including the provision of services (water meters, sidewalks, etc.), where the owners anticipate redevelopment.

- **Other Zones Allowing Residential Uses.** The Downtown (D), Commercial/Residential (CR), Commercial (C), and Resort Commercial (RC) zones all to varying degrees allow high density housing and mixed-use development, as summarized in the table below:

Residential Uses and Density	Zones			
	D	CR	C	RC
Single-Family Detached	N	P	P (3)	N
Single-Family Zero Side Yard	N	P	N	P
Duplex	P (1)	P	N	P
Multifamily, Triplex	P (1)	P	P	P
Multifamily, Fourplex	P (1)	P	P	P
Multifamily	P (2)	P	P	P
Residential Home	N	P	N	P
Residential Facility	N	P	P	N
Maximum Density (Min. Lot Area/Unit)		1,000	1,000	2,000
Minimum Density (% of Min. Density)	80% (4)	None	None	None

Notes

1. Limited to parcels not fronting Wa-Na-Pa Avenue
2. Limited to apartments in mixed-use buildings, which must be located above or below street level floor

3. Permitted only in conjunction with another allowed use on the same lot
4. There is no minimum density for housing in a mixed-use building.

All four commercial zones allow high density housing and mixed-use. The density limit in the RC zone is one dwelling per 2,000 square feet (the same as HDR); in the CR and C zones it is one dwelling per 1,000 square feet; and there is no limit in the D zone.

The limitations on ground floor housing in the D zone are appropriate for Cascade Locks, which has a small downtown and only one main commercial street. The C zone, which is located outside the downtown core, does not limit residential uses to the extent they are limited in the D zone, but it has building design standards for properties fronting Wa-Na-Pa Avenue that are intended to promote storefront character along that main street.

Recommendation: No change to allowed residential uses in the above zones is recommended. As suggested in the preceding section, the City might consider re-designating properties from MDR to HDR, or from MDR to Commercial/Residential (CR) where they are adjacent to downtown and have good river views. This could make the properties more marketable for higher density housing and provide a wider range of housing choices close to commercial services and recreational amenities, which in turn might help promote local economic development.

Complete Neighborhoods

Over the past decade, prior to the failure of the Warm Springs Tribes' casino project, the City had approved three large subdivisions and other projects. These projects stalled during the Recession. Now that the economy is recovering, it is appropriate to review the Community Development Code and prepare for the next wave of development.

The City should encourage the formation of complete neighborhoods, which are neighborhoods with a range of housing types and sizes, multimodal connectivity (for bikes, pedestrians, and cars), and open space. Due to the small size of Cascade Locks, the market may not support commercial services within neighborhoods. However, through its code, the City can require that new developments have good connectivity to the downtown and commercial services.

The following background is relevant to planning for complete neighborhoods in Cascade Locks:

- Windsong, which had previously been in bankruptcy, has a new owner. The new owner wants to re-plot the 64 hillside lots. This presents an opportunity to recalibrate the project to the market and improve its overall design, for example, by creating usable open space and improved pedestrian and bicycle connections.
- Katani, a Planned Development (PD), is full, but the newest residential subdivisions, Windsong, Shahala, and Harmony Heaven, are mostly vacant. Lot consolidations (through "cancellation and combine") are occurring where builders see a market for larger lots. This too presents an opportunity to encourage the formation of complete

neighborhoods as market begins to recover. By amending the Development Code to allow duplexes on corner lots, and to more clearly allow accessory residential units (with standards) in the LDR zone, the City can encourage a wider variety of housing.

- The City recently amended its code to allow zero lot line housing. This is evident in the Katani subdivision where attractive zero lot line homes have been built. Zero lot line or attached single-family housing is subject to the design standards in CDC 8-6.102.010, which are based on the 2005 TGM Model Development Code for Small Cities. The standards require builders to break up facades and provide architectural detailing similar to single-family homes. However, in an interview with three Cascade Locks planning commissioners, it was noted that residents in some neighborhoods are concerned about small lots and minimal setbacks. This concern should be considered as the City contemplates code revisions.
- As described above, PDs provide for flexibility in lot size and housing types within the density limits of the underlying zone. In reviewing requests to approve new PDs or to modify existing PDs, or in considering code changes that would allow for increased densities, the City will have to balance the builders' desire for greater flexibility with residents' interest in maintaining neighborhood stability and protecting property values. This can be accomplished through thoughtful site planning (that orients similar building types facing one another) and requiring high-quality design in buildings and streetscapes (e.g., sidewalks with ornamental lighting).

Recommendations: The City should consider making the following revisions to the Community Development Code to support the appropriate redesign of previously stalled projects, and the development of complete neighborhoods:

1. Establish criteria for and streamline the permit process for minor modifications to approved development plans.
2. Establish protocols with Hood River County for reviewing plat vacations and requests for lot consolidations (cancellation and combine), for consistency with City land use approvals. This should be coordinated with the City-County agreement that provides for County review of Building permits.
3. Adopt standards to allow detached accessory residential units in residential zones. The code amendment should address lot size, floor area, building materials, and the requirements of the zone in which these uses are located. It should also reference applicable building code and utility connection requirements.
4. Adopt standards for cottage cluster housing as an alternative to duplex development in the MDR zone. (See related discussion on page 3.)

5. Review the standards for PDs. The open space standard may be excessive given the abundance of open space surrounding Cascade Locks. In lieu of open space, consider other types of amenities that the PD process could allow which would benefit the community. Clarify the type of open space that is acceptable.
6. Update the requirements for sidewalks and surface water/storm drainage improvements as required for infill development and redevelopment projects. See also, discussion under “Enhancing Walking and Biking.”
7. Add code criteria for development exactions (“rough proportionality”), per case law.

Downtown Design

Chapter 8-6.070 of the Community Development Code contains the downtown design standards, which are based on the Cascade Locks Downtown Plan and Strategy. Recent downtown building construction includes a fish market and coffee shop, both independent businesses, which are designed per the Cascadian standard. There is a desire to incorporate the best of Old Cascade Locks while allowing new development. The market, café, arts and crafts store, and ice cream place were cited as examples of Old Cascade Locks that may not fit the current design standards. Input is needed on whether the code should encourage these building styles.

In interviews, City staff and members of the Planning Commission said there is a need to review the current standards for building design and location of off-street parking, which require all parking to be placed behind buildings. There is also interest in reviewing the extent of the Downtown (D) zone, which does not include Char Burger and the Columbia River Inn, two key buildings at the west entrance to downtown. (These properties are located in the Commercial (C) zone. An assessment of the Downtown zone follows:

Assessment of Downtown Development Design Standards		
Standard	Standard	Comment
Lot Dimensions (8-6.070.050)	No minimum standards.	No change needed.
Residential Density (8-6.070.060)	No minimum or maximum for mixed-use buildings, otherwise same as HDR zone.	No change needed.
Height Limit (8-6.070.070)	35 feet. Section 8-6.070.120 limits height to 125% of average height of buildings on same side of street.	Consider increasing allowable height for upper-story residential uses, provided building design standards are met.
Landscaping (8-6.070.080)	5% of lot area.	No change needed.

Assessment of Downtown Development Design Standards		
Standard	Standard	Comment
Access and Circulation (8-6.070.090)	OAR 734-051 (ODOT Access Management Standards for Special Transportation Area).	No change needed.
Activities External to Building (8-6.070.100)	Prohibits outdoor storage. Permits outdoor seasonable display and sales of not more than 10% of retail sales area. Permits outdoor dining with standards. Requires 60-inch minimum unobstructed walkway.	Consider adopting standards for food carts and farm stands, while maintaining tribal rights to sell historically harvested native products.
Off-Street Parking and Loading (8-6.070.110)	Exempts residential units in mixed-use buildings, and allows in lieu fee option.	No change needed.
Site Plan and Design Review (8-6.070.120A-C)	Design review is required for changes of use, development, and alterations to approved development.	This code section appears to conflict with 8-6.148.020 Applicability of Site Plan and Design Review, which exempts minor modifications of an existing development.
Design Code Modifications (8-6.070.120D)	Allowed.	Planning Commission has discretion to modify the standards where there is a unique site condition and the design substantially complies with the intent and purpose of the design standards.
Standards of Review (8-6.070.120E)	This section has seven criteria, including: Consistency with the goals and objectives of the Downtown Plan and Strategy. Four allowed historic design styles: Classic Revival, Craftsman, Cascadian, and Arts and Crafts. (Which forms of Classic Revival?) Buildings must orient to the street; corner buildings orient to	The standards are very broad and subjective. The lack of clear and objective standards may add costs and delays to the permit process, which may discourage desired development. The requirement that buildings orient to a street may have the unintended consequence of buildings turning their backs to the river. Building and site designs should provide for a pedestrian-oriented streetscape, but also respond to the context,

Assessment of Downtown Development Design Standards		
Standard	Standard	Comment
	<p>corners.</p> <p>Building height is limited to 125% of the average height of adjacent buildings on the same side of the street.</p> <p>There is no exception to the maximum front setback of 10 ft.</p>	<p>including opportunities for river and mountain views.</p> <p>Allow an exception to the maximum front setback of 10 feet for building entrances that orient to a plaza (adjoining the streetscape).</p>
<p>Building Materials & Colors (8-6.070.120F)</p>	<p>Standards for masonry, wood siding, and paint color.</p>	<p>The materials lists appear limited given the four styles specified. Consider allowing metal roofing, which sheds snow and is consistent with mountain architecture. Metal can also be used in decorative elements, e.g., flashing, signs, and sculpture.</p>
<p>Roof Materials, Parapets, and Roof Pitch (8-6.070.120G)</p>	<p>Pitched or stepped parapet roof required. Rooftop equipment screened. Sloped roofs use dark materials.</p>	
<p>Building Orientation and Entrance Standards (8-6.070.120H)</p>	<p>Buildings orient to street.</p>	<p>This is redundant with, but more detailed than, the recommendation in 120E.</p>
<p>Parking Lots (8-6.070.120.I)</p>	<p>Parking lots behind buildings only.</p>	<p>The code should allow parking located under a building. A variance should not be required to place parking in a garage under a building. It may not always be feasible to construct underground parking, but the code should not discourage it. On the north side of WaNaPa, where lot depth is limited and the land slopes toward the river, placing parking below grade, under a building, should be allowed with appropriate design standards.</p>
<p>Building Facades (8-6.070.120J)</p>	<p>Requires detailing, weather protection features, build-to line (common buildings), and traditional storefront elements.</p>	<p>Some required elements may not be appropriate for the prescribed design styles, and it is not clear which elements are required, or how the City determines applicability. For example how large is a “large display window”? (Cascadian buildings typically do not have storefronts, much less “large storefront”, but</p>

Assessment of Downtown Development Design Standards		
Standard	Standard	Comment
		the style can be adapted to provide them.) The standard that buildings must “include changes in relief on 10 percent of their WaNaPa facades” is unclear. It would be clearer to set a limit on uninterrupted facade plane.
Windows (8-6.070.120K)	Windows required on ground floor along WaNaPa, and adjacent to public parking lots. Code provides minimum dimensions/area and materials.	The standards are generally good, except the requirement to provide ground floor windows next to public parking lots “over 16 sq ft per story or 6% of the facade area” does not make sense. Some visibility of the parking lot is desirable, but this standard should be reviewed.
Upper Floor Window Standard (8-6.070.120L)	This subsection limits the size of upper story windowpanes to 5’x7’ and requires at least half of all upper story windows not exceed 2’x3’.	The reason for this standard is unclear, as the prescribed design styles would not necessarily preclude larger windows, or banks of windows exceeding this size.
Streetscape and Street Furniture (8-6.070.120M)	Requires consistency with the Street Furniture standards of the Cascade Locks Downtown Plan and Strategy.	The referenced document provides good guidance for streetscape improvements.
Lighting (8-6.070.120N)	Requires minimum lighting level of four foot-candles at building entrances and requires lighting to not shine into the sky.	The International Building Code (IBC) has lighting requirements for egress. The Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) has standards for the signs required to designate an exit or entry. The IBC prescribes minimum lighting for building egress at 1 foot-candle (fc). The minimum for Emergency exit signs is 5 fc. The Dev. Code should avoid prescribing lighting levels for buildings, except dark sky standards are appropriate.
Trash and Recycling Storage (8-6.070.120O)	Trash collection must be located within the structure, or behind the building in an enclosure.	No change needed.

Assessment of Downtown Development Design Standards		
Standard	Standard	Comment
Signage (8-6.070.120P)	Prohibits freestanding pole signs and internally illuminated signs. City Administrator may grant “pedestrian-oriented sign bonus” of 6 square feet.	Consider revising sign standards, as needed, for consistency with any other code changes, as discussed above. Define pedestrian-oriented signs.

Recommendation: Based on the above assessment of the Downtown zone, the City should consider amending its code to support downtown revitalization, as follows:

1. Remove the standard that limits building height to 125% of the average height of buildings on the same side of the street. The standard is not well defined and may discourage downtown development. Consider increasing the 35-foot height limit of the D zone for consistency with the prescribed architectural styles with peaked roofs.
2. Consider providing an option for buildings to exceed 35 feet where a mixed-use (residential above commercial) development is proposed, provided it meets fire protection requirements. If the height were increased to 40 feet that would allow for a building with ground floor retail (16-foot ceiling height), two stories of residential above, and a gabled roof in the Cascadian design style.
3. Consider adopting standards for food carts and farm stands, while maintaining tribal rights to sell historically harvested native products.
4. Review the Downtown zone threshold for modifying an approved site plan against Section 8-6.148.020, and update the code to make the two sections internally consistent.
5. Provide an exception to the 10-foot maximum front setback along Wa-Na-Pa Avenue for buildings that orient to a plaza or an expanded sidewalk with furnishings.
6. Broaden the palette of allowed building materials. Allow metal for roofing and architectural accents. Consider allowing concrete fiberboard as a less expensive alternative for siding materials. Concrete fiberboard should be wood-like in appearance and have appropriate finishing (e.g., rough hewn).
7. Allow parking to be located under, instead of only behind, buildings that front Wa-Na-Pa Avenue, subject to applicable storefront design standards.
8. Where new highway approaches are proposed, require shared access drives between adjoining properties, consistent with ODOT’s Special Transportation Area designation. This will minimize interruptions to the building wall along the street frontage.

9. Clarify and simplify the standards for building facades, windows, and lighting. Update the lighting standards, or remove them and reference Building Code standards instead.

Accommodating Growth within the UGB

The Cascade Locks Comprehensive Plan recognizes the community's growth is limited by its location next to the Columbia River and within Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The Plan recommends transferring density away from isolated and steeply sloping areas south of I-84 and into areas that are more suitable for development. It also identifies a need for downtown revitalization, recreation amenities, and infrastructure improvements, including improved water service and sidewalks. Congestion is also perceived as an issue, even though traffic levels are not failing at any intersection, due to the constraints of the railroad, river, and freeway.

An electrical capacity upgrade is planned to serve new/expanded industry. A new reservoir and water transmission line (in Wa-Na-Pa Avenue) are also planned. The improvement will help facilitate development at the Port of Cascade Locks Business Park, which in turn will provide local employment and create the need for housing and commercial services. The 150-acre master planned Port property is zoned primarily for industrial and public uses. Other developable properties along the riverfront are zoned industrial, resort-commercial, and high-density residential. Examples of potential new industry include a water bottling plant, call center, resort, and expansion of Bear Mountain's operations at Port property.

Upgrades to Forest Lane may or may not be needed to serve industry; truck traffic likely will be less than the car traffic that was expected with the casino. Emergency, secondary access/egress will be needed to/from the Business Park. Another key issue is how to facilitate orderly development that is attractive, creates complete neighborhoods, and integrates well with existing residences and recreational uses.

Recommendation: The Development Code does not directly address the above issues, but the recommendations in this report should help the City manage its growth, ensuring land is used efficiently, and development is served by adequate public facilities. Another important consideration is that people should be able to easily get around on foot and bicycle.

Enhancing Walking and Biking

The City would like to build upon the pedestrian-friendly nature of the downtown area along Wa-Na-Pa Avenue (U.S. Hwy 30) while accommodating tourist automobile traffic and maintaining the historic character of the highway. Sidewalk connections are lacking in many parts of the City. There is a need for sidewalks along Wa-Na-Pa Avenue east of downtown, and the City would like to work with Hood River County on installing sidewalks along Forest Lane.

Connections to trails and recreational amenities are also important. The Pacific Crest Trail runs through Cascade Locks and crosses the Columbia River on the Bridge of the Gods. Connections to Marine Park are currently lacking. Sailing, ultimate Frisbee, and mountain biking are popular pastimes and Marine Park annually attracts hundreds of visitors. The City would like to take

advantage of the community's reputation as a recreation hub by improving the local sidewalk and pathway network.

Chapter 8-6.112 of Community Development Code contains walkway standards for residential and non-residential development. These standards are in conflict with the street frontage improvement standards, which are found in the City's Transportation System Plan (TSP) adopted in 2001. The minimum walkway width in the Code is five feet, which may be adequate for a local residential street but is inadequate for a commercial main street, such as Wa-Na-Pa Avenue. It is also inadequate for a thoroughfare such as Forest Lane. The TSP recommends six-foot wide sidewalks for both residential and non-residential streets. Code Section 8-6.112 appears to exempt residential projects with fewer than four dwelling units or lots from installing walkways.

Based on our reading of the Code, the City may require sidewalk improvements through the subdivision review process, and for multifamily and non-residential developments. However, we did not find a Code provision addressing sidewalk improvements for minor partitions, or housing developments with fewer than four dwellings. It is possible the City may exact public improvements for these smaller developments when the improvements meet the rough proportionality test under *Dolan v. City of Tigard*, but it would be clearer to place that requirement in the Code.

Recommendation: Chapter 8-6.112 Circulation and Access should be revised to provide clearer standards for sidewalk improvements for all types of development. Code provisions should be based on the standards in the TSP, or the TSP and Code should be amended to allow more options. For example, the City may want to adopt a policy of not requiring sidewalks on low-volume, dead-end roads, or allow deferral of improvements until it is possible to fund a capital project, e.g., with local improvement district or other funding strategy. The City should also consider requiring, or encouraging through code incentives, wider sidewalks (e.g., 9-12 feet) along Wa-Na-Pa Avenue and Forest Lane, where pedestrian usage is expected to be greatest and where it would be desirable to have space for benches, lighting, and flower baskets or planters.

Other Code Improvement Ideas from Planning Commissioners and City staff

The following additional topics (not otherwise addressed, above) were discussed during our community tour and initial meetings with City staff and planning commissioners.

1. *Sheltered walks in commercial area* – Pedestrian weather protection features are required in the Downtown zone. Should they also be required in the Commercial zone where buildings are spaced further apart?
2. *Addition of storage units as allowable or conditional in appropriate zones* – The code should provide criteria for accessory structures that are larger than 120 square feet, including temporary storage units. Storage units that are accessory to a residential use, meet the size and height limitations of the Code, and do not require a building permit should be permitted outright, or with approval of the City Administrator. A conditional use permit should be required for accessory structures that do not meet the criteria.

3. *Allow nursing homes in appropriate zones* – Nursing homes are currently allowed only in the Downtown zones. This type of use may not be appropriate in the downtown, where the community is trying to promote economic development through tourism. Where else would nursing homes be appropriate?
4. *How to address RVs in mobile home parks (ORS 197.493)?* – The City may adopt standards requiring that Recreational Vehicles, when used as a dwelling (not a temporary use), be connected to water, electrical supply, and sewage disposal systems; and be located in an approved manufactured dwelling park, mobile home park, or RV park. The City currently has Code standards for manufactured/mobile home parks.
5. *Review existing garage requirement for manufactured homes, versus other single-family homes (ORS 446)* – State statute limits the standards local governments can place on manufactured housing. Generally, standards for manufactured homes must not be any more restrictive than a local jurisdiction’s standards for stick-built homes. Currently, the City’s code requires a garage be provided with each new manufactured home. If this requirement remains it should be applied evenly, to both stick-built and manufactured single-family homes.
6. *Review geologic hazards overlay* – It is unclear what concerns the City has with the Geological Hazards Overlay. It is outside the TGM Program’s scope of services to assess natural hazards and it may be outside our scope to update the GH Overlay.
7. *Process for review of vacant buildings or changes of use* – Changes of use are important for the City to review when a change is to a more intensive use. For example, a use that impacts parking, paving (surface water runoff), noise, light, glare, public services, etc. could adversely impact adjacent properties. Changes of use can be tracked through the business license registry, which should include housing rentals and rental agencies. The Code currently has procedures for reviewing changes of use through the Site and Design Review procedure, but it would benefit from adding criteria.
8. *City Hall and the Public Works Shop Site* – These City facilities sit on two lots. City Hall is zoned CR (Commercial/Residential) and the City Shop and Storage Yard is zoned MDR (Medium Density Residential). Both lots should be zoned Public Use.

Next Steps

Please distribute this evaluation report, along with the stakeholder interview questionnaire, to the interviewees during the week of December 1. (The interviews are scheduled for December 11.) Siegel Planning will prepare a summary of the interviews prior to the January 8, 2015, Planning Commission work session. The January 8 presentation will have images to help convey the design concepts in the report.



Meeting Summary

Date & Time: Tuesday, November 25, 2014
Location: Conference Call
Subject: TGM Code Assessment - PMT Meeting #2

Participants: Scot Siegel, Consultant; Gordon Zimmerman, City Administrator; and Laura Buhl, TGM Project Manager.

The team reviewed the itinerary for the stakeholder interviews, which are scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 2014. Three group interviews are confirmed, beginning at 10AM and extending into the afternoon.

The team reviewed Laura's comments and provided direction to Scot for preparing the Final Evaluation Memo, which Gordon will distribute to the interview participants during the week of December 1. Gordon said City staff had found the draft report acceptable for public discussion purposes.

The following tasks remain:

Task 2.4	Final Evaluation Memo	December 1
Task 2.3	Stakeholder Interviews	December 11
Task 2.5	Planning Commission WS	January 8
Task 3	Action Plan	January-February
	PMT #3	TBD
	Joint PC-CC meeting	February 12*
Task 4	Final Action Plan and Report	March
	City Council meeting	March/April TBD

*Previously the joint PC-CC meeting was targeted for February 23, however, that date conflicts with Scot's schedule. On discussing it with Gordon (after the PMT call) both agreed that an earlier meeting date would be beneficial. The earlier date would allow the project to stay on schedule, as it began one month late due to contracting delays. Gordon said he would request February 12 for the joint meeting, as that is a regular PC meeting date.

#

