

ORDINANCE NO. 422

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (CDC) AS ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 350, BY AMENDING ARTICLE II, CHAPTER 8-6.20 – ARTICLE V - DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

WHEREAS, the City has prepared language to add provisions requiring an applicant to meet with the Architectural Review Committee when requesting development in the Downtown Zone; and

WHEREAS, the City’s Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on the issue of adopting the amendments to the Development Standards Chapter of the Community Development Code; and

WHEREAS, the City’s Planning Commission approved the draft language to amend the Community Development Code, and recommended adoption to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a Public Hearing on the issue of adopting the Code amendment ordinance on March 11, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the City Council makes the following findings in accordance with the criteria of CDC 8-6.176.060:

- A. The proposal complies with the Statewide Planning Goals and administrative rules as they relate to the proposal:

FINDING: The proposed change complies with the relevant Goals and rules in the following ways:

Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement – the proposal was subject to a public hearing as required by the Community Development Code. The proposal helps frame how citizen involvement takes place as part of planning applications.

Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – the proposal was considered in accordance with the applicable procedures of the Community Development Code.

Goal 3 – Agriculture – the goal is not applicable because the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 4 – Forestry – the goal is not applicable because the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 5 - Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces – the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Resources Quality – the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 7 - Areas Subject to Natural Hazards - the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 8 – Recreational Needs - the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 9 – Economic Development – the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 10 – Housing – the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 11 - Public Facilities and Services – the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impacts, not with specific land uses.

Goal 12 – Transportation - the proposed traffic impact analysis process is consistent with the Transportation Goal as it is intended to mitigate any potential traffic impacts of development, and to be the primary traffic management tool for the Forest Lane Interchange Area Management Plan.

Goal 13 – Energy Conservation - the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impact, not with specific land uses.

Goal 14 – Urbanization – the goal is not applicable as the change deals with traffic impact, not with specific land uses.

Goals 15-19 – these goals are not applicable as they deal exclusively with other regions of the State

B. The proposal complies with the Comprehensive Plan goals, policies, and implementation strategies:

1 – Policies on Natural Resources and Hazards

The policy supports the placement of new structures in a manner which supports the overall goals, policies and strategies of the comprehensive plan

2 – Infrastructure and Public Services

The policy ensures that all development is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the development code as to the provision of public services from the city.

3 – Economy –

The policy support the sustainability of the local economy by allowing citizens to access the planning process with the least up-front expense to achieving their desired development. The policy supports the goals, policies and the implementation strategy of the comprehensive plan.

C. Be internally consistent with related Comprehensive Plan or Development Code provisions

FINDING – The proposed amendment fits directly into the structure of the Development Code by adding language specific to the site design review process. The policy incorporates the design review process into the citizen involvement objectives of the plan and places control over decisions on design in the hands of a local special formed committee.

D. Promote provision of adequate public facilities and services for the community

The policy implements key design objectives of the comprehensive plan and the downtown zone in a citizen control review process. The policy is consistent with the goals, policy and implementation strategy of the comprehensive plan.

NOW THEREFORE:

THE CITY OF CASCADE LOCKS, HOOD RIVER COUNTY, OREGON, ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Chapter 8-6.20. Chapter 8-6.20 of the Community Development Code is amended by adding a new Section 8-6.20.070 – Architectural Review Procedures that reads as follows:

8.6.20.070 Architectural Review Procedures

The City Council shall approve and appoint a three-person voluntary citizen committee to act as the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) when the code requires a site plan development review as preliminary to issuing a development permit. This committee will serve at the pleasure of the City Council and shall serve staggered two year terms subject to reappointment of the City Council after the completion of a twenty-four month period from the date of appointment. The ARC shall consist of three persons; one of whom is a sitting member of the City Planning Commission, one of whom is a representative of the Downtown Zone and one who is a design or building professional with knowledge of the construction trades. An ex-officio representative of the City staff shall be appointed by the City Administrator to assist in the processing of the application for design review on behalf of the ARC.

- a. Upon receiving notice of a request for a development permit in the affected zone the City shall advise the applicant of the requirements of the zone for a Design Review with the City's ARC. The applicant will be asked to identify a date of when they will be ready to submit preliminary design per Sections 8-6.148.040 to 8-6.148.100 as appropriate for the particular application.
- b. The applicant upon submitting design documents will be advised of a date not less than 7 days nor more than 14 days in which the applicant will meet with the ARC to review the proposed development.
- c. The ARC shall meet with the applicant to review the application and discuss the design features of the proposed development. Applying the specific criteria of the CDC, the ARC shall complete their review and submit a summary of their findings to the City staff to be included in the staff report provided to the City's Planning Commission. Specifically, the ARC shall determine whether the proposed development meets the standards of the CDC and if it does not, specify why the proposal fails to meet this criteria.
- d. The ARC may suggest or recommend modifications to the proposed development site plan to ensure compliance with the standards of the CDC. These proposed changes should be made prior to submission to the City Planning Commission or the ARC shall note that the applicant failed to modify the application to comply with the design standards of the zone.

SECTION 2. Section 8-6.148.030. Chapter 8-6.148 of the Community Development Code is amended with:

- A. A Site Plan Review requiring an Architectural analysis for the Downtown Zone shall be completed by the ARC as set forth in 8-6.20.70 (a) through (d).

SECTION 3. Section 8-6.148.110. Section 8-6.148.110 of the Community Development Code is amended by adding language to read:

“The Planning Commission shall receive an Architectural Review Committee recommendation on a specific site design for all proposed developments in the Downtown Zone.”

SECTION 4. Severability. Should any section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance be declared invalid, such declaration shall not affect the validity of any other section, subsection, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase; and if this ordinance, or any portion thereof, should be held to be invalid on one ground but valid on another, it shall be construed that the valid ground is the one upon which said ordinance, or such portion thereof, was enacted.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective thirty (30) days after adoption by the City Council and approval by the Mayor.

First Reading Approved: March 11, 2013; Ayes 6 ; Nays 0

Second Reading Approved: March 25, 2013 ; Ayes 6 ; Nays 0

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Recorder