

# VENETA PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT & PROPOSED FINDINGS

## Adoption of Additional Standards for Hillside Development (A-1-07)

### Amendments to the Land Development Ordinance No. 461 And Land Division Ordinance No. 462

Application Date: June 21, 2007 (DLCD Notice)  
Referrals Sent: Carrie Connelly, City Attorney  
Jerry Elliott, City Engineer  
Kyle Schauer, Public Works Superintendent  
Heather Hill, Lane County Fire District #1

Notice Posted: August 15, 2007  
Notice Published: August 15, 2007 (Register Guard)  
Joint Worksession: June 4, 2007  
Planning Commission Date: September 4, 2007  
Staff Report Date: August 22, 2007

#### **REQUEST**

The request before the Planning Commission is to review proposed amendments to the Veneta Land Development Ordinance No. 461 and Land Division Ordinance No. 462. These amendments are proposed to remove and replace Sections 5.25 and 1.06 of the Veneta Land Development and Land Division Ordinances respectively. These sections govern the development of lands with average slopes over 15%.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Based on direction from the Planning Commission and City Council, staff has been working on revision of the City's regulations for hillside development. These special regulations found in Section 5.25 of the Land Development Ordinance, and Section 1.06 of the Land Division Ordinance, currently require that the applicant submit a limited geotechnical report, and allows the Planning Commission to require larger lot sizes in hillside areas, though no criteria or guidance is provided on how or where this should occur.

The City's experience with development of hillside areas such as Sherwood Forest and Aspen Heights, as well as hillside development problems that have occurred in other cities in the area have highlighted the need for revision of our hillside code to address the need for

- More rigorous geotechnical information requirements
- Development standards governing removal of vegetation
- Grading standards
- Design standards for construction in hillside areas
- More rigorous oversight
- More explicit drainage and erosion control standards

In crafting the proposed amendments, staff looked to other cities, many of which have code governing hillside development. These codes vary widely in scope and content. Some simply require geotechnical investigations while others go as far as regulating the color of homes on the

hillsides and incorporating ridgeline preservation and solar access requirements. As Robert Olshansky states in Planning For Hillside Development (APA 1996),

*Because of the variety of geologic settings for hillside development and because of the different purposes that may lead a local government to develop hillside regulations, there is no “best” or “model” set of regulations that can be recommended. Indeed, many tradeoffs and choices must be made when making decisions about hillside development policies.*

Some of the trade-offs inherent in hillside regulation are

- Narrow streets which limit grading vs. the need for fire access
- Natural area preservation vs. provision of density within the UGB
- Requiring custom construction vs. providing homes which are affordable
- Slope engineering for stability vs. tree preservation
- Vegetation retention vs. fire safety

In crafting the proposed code, staff has attempted to strike a balance. For instance, although the proposed code limits development on steep slopes, it provides for transfer of density to flat areas of the site. On the whole, the proposed code leans heavily in favor of regulating development on steep slopes both in terms of scope and form in order to prevent erosion, retain natural vegetation, and ensure safe and stable development.

## **ANALYSIS**

### **Limiting the impacts of development**

One of the biggest impacts of the proposed code is the regulation of hillside development in terms of the total area of ground disturbance allowed on each lot. Ground disturbance as defined in the proposed amendments would regulate the actual area of soil that is allowed to be disturbed for all construction activities including buildings, driveways, and tree clearing (as opposed to “lot coverage” which used elsewhere in the code to regulate only the footprint of all buildings). The proposed code would decrease the allowable areas of disturbance as slope increases, effectively increasing lot sizes as slopes increase. Staff chose this approach rather than simply stating the minimum lot sizes as some cities do, because it allows a developer to determine their lot size based on the type of home they wish to build. A small two story custom home may not have as large an impact as a large single story home and therefore, would not need as large a lot. Table 1 below shows the proposed maximum disturbed area allowed as slopes increase.

As some cities specify minimum lot sizes rather than allowable disturbed area, an assumed disturbed area of 4000 sqft was used to standardize figures. For instance, if the maximum allowable disturbed area on a slope of 15-20% is 50%, then the minimum lot size needed to create a 4000 sqft area of disturbance would be 8000 sqft. The 4000 sqft area takes into account a relatively large building footprint, driveways, porches, outbuildings, and the practical needs of construction on a sloped site.

Another important concept is the point at which slopes become unbuildable. As any engineer will tell you, no slope is truly unbuildable, but many communities have determined that the need to ensure public safety, coupled with the difficulties of construction and providing adequate access precludes development of slopes over a certain grade. The greyed out areas in the table represent slopes which other cities have declared unbuildable. This is generally defined as the average slope across the parcel in any direction. This point ranges from 25-35% with 1/3 of the cities prohibiting development on slopes over 30%, and 5/9 prohibiting development on slopes over 35%. This variability may be due to the geographic distribution of the sample and inherent

geologic conditions of particular communities. Two of the three Oregon communities surveyed which limit development in this way place the cutoff at 35%. Table 2 below examines the impacts of these limitation on Veneta’s Low Density Residential (L) plan designation which includes both the SFR6000 and SFR8000 zones, and approximately 30 acres of Rural Residential land in the southwest corner of the city below Bolton Hill Road.

**Table 1**

| <b>Maximum Allowable Area of Disturbance</b> |                      |               |               |               |             |
|----------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
|                                              | <b>Average Slope</b> |               |               |               |             |
|                                              | <b>15-20%</b>        | <b>20-25%</b> | <b>25-30%</b> | <b>30-35%</b> | <b>35%+</b> |
| <b>Ashland OR</b>                            | 65%                  | 55%           | 50%           | 45%           | 0%          |
| <b>Springfield OR</b>                        | 40%                  | 40%           | 20%           | 20%           | 10%         |
| <b>Myrtle Creek OR</b>                       | 30%                  | 30%           | 15%           | 15%           | 0%          |
| <b>Ogden UT</b>                              | 27%                  | 20%           | 20%           | 0%            | 0%          |
| <b>Scottsdale AZ</b>                         | 35%                  | 35%           | 20%           | 20%           | 20%         |
| <b>Rancho Cucamonga CA</b>                   | 50%                  | 25%           | 3%            | 0%            | 0%          |
| <b>Park City UT</b>                          | 25%                  | 25%           | 25%           | 25%           | 25%         |
| <b>Georgia DCA Model Ordinance</b>           |                      | 50%           | 50%           | 40%           | 40%         |
| <b>Ten Towns Model Ordinance</b>             | 40%                  | 20%           | 0%            | 0%            | 0%          |
| <b>Average Allowable Disturbed Area</b>      | <b>39%</b>           | <b>33%</b>    | <b>23%</b>    | <b>18%</b>    | <b>11%</b>  |
| <b>Proposed Code</b>                         | <b>40%</b>           | <b>30%</b>    | <b>20%</b>    | <b>10%</b>    | <b>0%</b>   |

**Table 2**

| <b>Average Slope</b> | <b>Acres</b> | <b>% of Vacant (L)</b> | <b>% of Total (L)</b> | <b>% Disturbance allowed</b> | <b>Min Lot Size assuming 4000sqft of impact</b> | <b>Development potential in number of residential lots with proposed restrictions</b> | <b>Development Impact in # of lots</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| 15-20                | 66           | 23.0%                  | 12.5%                 | 40                           | 10000                                           | 86                                                                                    | -22                                    |
| 20-25                | 47           | 16.4%                  | 8.9%                  | 30                           | 13333                                           | 46                                                                                    | -31                                    |
| 25-30                | 13           | 4.5%                   | 2.5%                  | 20                           | 20000                                           | 8                                                                                     | -13                                    |
| 30-35                | 3            | 1.0%                   | 0.6%                  | 10                           | 40000                                           | 1                                                                                     | -4                                     |
| 35+                  | 1.6          | 0.6%                   | 0.3%                  | 0                            | Unbuildable                                     | 0                                                                                     | -3                                     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>         | <b>130.6</b> | <b>45.5%</b>           | <b>24.7%</b>          |                              |                                                 | <b>142</b>                                                                            | <b>-71</b>                             |

**Application of new standards to existing lots**

There are several lots which have been approved as part of a previous subdivision including all of Aspen Heights (23 lots) and a single vacant lot in Sherwood Forest. Although construction of the subdivision is governed by the code that was in place at the time the subdivision was submitted, the construction of the homes on the lots is governed by the code in place at the time of building permit application. As the proposed code imposes standards for lot disturbance that effect the overall size of the lot, it is impractical to apply the proposed amendments to lots that have already been approved. For instance, where lots may have been approved with a slope of over 30%, it would be imprudent of the City to now declare that lot unbuildable. Similarly, for approved 8000sqft lots of 26% slopes, the maximum area of disturbance would be 1600 sqft which may be an unreasonable constraint. For these reasons, staff recommends not applying the proposed amendments to lots of less than 16,000 sqft (twice the minimum lot size) which received tentative approval prior to the adoption of the new standards. Section 3(i) gives the City Land Development Ordinance Amendments, Land Division Ordinance Amendments A-4-06 3

Engineer the authority to apply all of the hillside provisions to any project where “*specific site characteristics or proposed activities may pose a significant risk which may not be sufficiently addressed using the other provisions of this ordinance.*”

### **Density Transfer**

The proposed amendments will clarify existing provisions which allow for smaller lots when land is set aside as permanent parks or open space. The proposed amendments would allow a net density of up to 10 units/acre when lands over 15% slope are permanently preserved. The following example uses the steps proposed in section 5.25(11)(a) to illustrate how density transfer could be utilized on a hypothetical 13 acre site.

*STEP 1: Determine the area of the parcel(s) with average slope in each of the following categories:*

- <15% =5 acres
- 15-20% =5 acres
- 20-25% =2 acre
- 25-30% =1 acre
- >30% =0 acres

*STEP 2: Determine the number of potential lots that could be permitted for the areas with average slopes over 15%. A figure of 40% ground disturbance shall be used for determining lot sizes.*

Assuming a loss of 25% of the total land area to streets, and other non-housing uses, the total potential number of units is as follows min lot sizes are as follows assuming 40% disturbance:

- <15% =5 acres (3.75 net ac) min lot size = 8000 sqft = 20 lots
- 15-20% =5 acres (3.75 net ac) min lot size = 10,000 sqft = 16 lots
- 20-25% =2 acre (1.5 net ac) min lot size = 13,333 = 4 lots
- 25-30% =1 acre (.75 net ac) min lot size = 20,000 = 1 lot
- >30% =0 acres

*STEP 4: Add the number of potential lots on slopes at or over 15% to determine the density that may be transferred to areas with an average slope of less than 15%.*

There are 21 potential lots on the steep slope areas of the site. Transferring all of these lots to the 3.75 acres with a slope less than 15% would result in a net density of 10.9 units per net acre. Therefore the 10unit/acre cap stated in 11(b) kicks in and the result would be a transfer of 17 units for a total of 37 units on 3.75 acres (a net density of 10units/acre) with a minimum lot size of 4200 sqft.

### **Buildable land supply impacts**

The overall impacts of the new regulations is relatively small given the minimal amount of land in the steeper slope categories and the ability of developers to recoup lots through the use of density transfer. A map of the areas subject to steep slope provisions is found in **EXHIBIT A)** When the Comprehensive Land Use Evaluation (CLUE) was conducted in 1999, net densities for build-out were assumed to be the same as existing urban densities within the City. Given the rural nature of the area and past trends towards larger lot sizes, a net density of 2.9units/acre was used for computing the number of net acres needed to serve a population of 5760 by 2020.

Since 1999, more than 869 single family detached units have been approved in new subdivisions (not counting single lot developments and partitions). The City has also approved over 50 units of multifamily housing and the Southwest Area Specific Development Plan (SWAP) that could potentially result in approximately 500 single family detached units as well as additional multifamily and town home style dwellings. The current population projection from Portland State University is 5600 by the year 2030.

Overall, housing densities within the City have increased over time. As housing prices have gone up and the supply of buildable land in surrounding areas has dwindled, developers have moved toward lots that more closely reflect the minimum lot sizes and densities outlined in the Comprehensive plan and Land Development Ordinance. Using recent housing development from 2000-2007, net densities in the SFR6000 and SFR 8000 zones have been approximately 6 and 4 units/acre respectively. Taking into account recently approved applications for multifamily developments, the net density for SFR6000 moves closer to 7 units/acre.

Tables 3 and 4 below compare the approximate number of new housing units the City will need to build by 2030 with the number of units the City could potentially accommodate on vacant unconstrained lands within the current UGB. A total of 477 units will be needed to accommodate an additional 1360 residents by 2030. The City can accommodate at least 1371 new units given the current supply of vacant unconstrained residential lands. This number accounts only for a limited amount of infill, and no development of the Rural Residential (RR) areas of the City. If the RR areas were to develop at a net density of 6 units/acre, an additional 747 units could be accommodated for a total of over 2000 units. These figures also do not count the number of residential units which have received tentative approval since the population figure of 4240 was released. The City has approved more than 100units in the Southwest Area alone. The proposed regulations will not reduce the City's supply of buildable lands to the level of noncompliance.

**Table 3**

| <b>NEEDED UNITS</b>                    |            |
|----------------------------------------|------------|
| Projected 2030 Population*             | 5600       |
| Current Population                     | 4240       |
| Future Growth                          | 1360       |
| Persons/Unit**                         | 2.85       |
| <b>Additional Units Needed by 2030</b> | <b>477</b> |

\*Portland State 2006

\*\*2000 Census

**Table 4**

| <b>POTENTIAL UNITS</b>       |                                              |                               |                                           |                        |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------|
|                              | <b>Gross Vacant<br/>Unconstrained Acres*</b> | <b>Net Vacant<br/>Acres**</b> | <b>Actual<br/>Average<br/>Net Density</b> | <b>Potential Units</b> |
| Vacant GR                    | 100                                          | 75                            | 8                                         | <b>600</b>             |
| Vacant SFR6000               | 40                                           | 30                            | 6                                         | <b>180</b>             |
| Vacant SFR8000               | 197                                          | 147.75                        | 4                                         | <b>591</b>             |
| Vacant RR                    | 166                                          | 124.5                         | (6)                                       | <b>(747)</b>           |
| <b>TOTAL POTENTIAL UNITS</b> |                                              |                               |                                           | <b>1371 (2118)</b>     |

\*Does not include tentatively approved developments

\*\*Assumes 25% loss of gross acreage for roads, open space, etc.

**PROPOSED FINDINGS**

The Veneta Planning Commission finds the following:

1. The Veneta Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 4, 2007 on the proposed amendments after giving the required notice as per Section 2.11 of Veneta’s Land Development Ordinance No. 461.
2. Written notice was mailed to owners of affected properties in accordance with ORS 227.186 on August 15, 2007.
3. Notice of public hearing was published in a newspaper of general circulation, posted on the City’s website and at City Hall on August 15, 2007 in accordance with Section 2.11 of the Veneta Land Development Ordinance.
4. The proposed amendments to the Veneta Land Development Ordinance and Land Division Ordinance are consistent with the goals and policies of the Veneta Comprehensive Plan Ordinance No. 416, and all statewide land use goals as detailed below.

## Criteria #1: Conformance with the Veneta Comprehensive Plan

### B. COMMUNITY, BUILDING, AND SITE DESIGN ELEMENT

#### GOAL:

*Create a city with efficient and ecologically sensitive infrastructure; an environment that aesthetically stimulates us; and buildings, sidewalks, trails, and other public facilities that are accessible to everyone.*

**In order to provide “ecologically sensitive” infrastructure, it is necessary for the City to ensure that development in steep slope areas is adaptive to the natural topography and incorporates existing vegetation into development plans.**

#### POLICIES:

- 7. Incorporate natural features such as creeks, wetlands, and large trees into site plans (including grading, landscaping, and lighting).*

**The proposed amendments increase the likelihood that large trees will be incorporated into site plans by limiting the total area of disturbance allowed on hillside lots and minimizing grading when feasible. Although there are springs, creeks, and wetlands on the hillsides, these features are covered elsewhere in City code. The proposed regulations will work in concert with other City codes to ensure that natural features are incorporated into hillside development plans.**

- 13. Establish and enforce development and performance standards for landscaping, buildings, open space, architecture, and tree canopy.*

**The proposed amendments increase the likelihood that large trees and tree canopy will be preserved during the development process by limiting the overall impact of development in hillside areas through grading and design standards. The proposed regulations establish standards for landscaping, buildings, and architecture in hillside areas to ensure that development fits the natural topography and character of these areas, rather than allowing developers to reshape the hillsides to fit the proposed construction.**

### C. RESIDENTIAL LAND AND HOUSING ELEMENT

#### GOALS:

- 1. Encourage efficient land development patterns that minimize service and infrastructure costs and provide viable, livable*

*neighborhood centers with nodal development, mixed land uses, housing types and alternative or non-conventional building practices.*

**By clarifying the mechanics of the density transfer option, the proposed amendments encourage efficient land development by providing incentives for development of increased density in areas without steep slopes. The proposed amendments encourage a diversity of housing by requiring that homes in steep slope areas utilize custom foundations and other building practices to tailor the development to the natural topography, rather than allowing the same type and scale of development that is allowed in the flatter areas of the City. These design standards will result in a wide range of home sizes and styles. The proposed amendments help minimize infrastructure and maintenance costs by providing incentives for compact development of flat areas while preserving steep slope areas in their natural state where the cost of infrastructure maintenance would be appreciably higher.**

2. *Generate new housing starts to adequately insure that all people in Veneta will have the opportunity and choice to acquire safe, sanitary, and affordable housing.*

**The proposed amendments are intended to help ensure that developments in hillside areas are safe, and to not subject current or future residents to undue safety hazards due to erosion, slope movement, or other geologic conditions. Because the hillside area represents less than one quarter of the total Low Density Residential land within the City, and because density transfer will help offset the costs of developing hillside areas, the proposed changes will not appreciably effect the overall affordability of housing in Veneta.**

3. *Maintain an attractive residential community in an appealing rural setting.*

**To many residents of Veneta, mature trees and larger lots are integral parts of the “rural feel” of the area. The proposed amendments will lead to increased preservation of mature tree canopy and larger lots on the hillside which maintains an attractive rural community and an appealing rural setting which is rapidly being lost elsewhere in the community.**

**POLICIES:**

1. *Designate adequate land to support the residential needs for a population of 5,760.*

**The population number of 5760 was used during periodic review to estimate the number of residents in 2020. The current population projection from Portland State University is 5600 by the year 2030.**

**Overall, housing densities within the City have increased over time. As housing prices have gone up and the supply of buildable land in surrounding areas has dwindled, developers have moved toward lots that more closely reflect the minimum lot sizes and densities outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Ordinance. Using recent housing development from 2000-2007, net densities in the SFR6000 and SFR8000 zones have been approximately 6 and 4 units/acre respectively. Taking into account recently approved applications for multifamily developments, the net density for SFR6000 moves closer to 7 units/acre.**

**Tables 3 and 4 in the staff report compare the approximate number of new housing units the City will need to build by 2030 with the number of units the City could potentially accommodate on vacant unconstrained lands within the current UGB. A total of 477 units will be needed to accommodate an additional 1360 residents by 2030. The City can accommodate at least 1371 new units given the current supply of vacant unconstrained residential lands. This number accounts only for a limited amount of infill, and no development of the Rural Residential (RR) areas of the City. If the RR areas were to develop at a net density of 6 units/acre, an additional 747 units could be accommodated for a total of over 2000 units. These figures also do not count the number of residential units which have received tentative approval since the population figure of 4240 was released. The City has approved more than 100 units in the Southwest Area alone. The proposed regulations will not reduce the City's supply of buildable lands to the level of noncompliance.**

5. *Encourage a range of housing prices including high-end, mid-range, and affordable housing that is available for purchase or rent.*

**By clarifying the mechanics of the density transfer option, the proposed amendments encourage efficient land development by providing incentives for development of increased density in areas without steep slopes. The proposed amendments encourage a diversity of housing by requiring that homes in steep slope areas utilize custom foundations and other building practices to tailor the development to the natural**

**topography, rather than allowing the same type and scale of development that is allowed in the flatter areas of the City. These design standards will result in a wide range of home styles and prices which will provide a largely high-end alternative to the majority of mid-range and affordable housing which has been developed in Veneta in the past.**

14. *If public open space is provided, allow smaller lot sizes than zoning districts otherwise allow. In this way, the overall gross density of development does not increase, but the open spaces may be used to protect natural resources or provide more viable recreation areas.*

**The proposed changes will more clearly detail the way in which density may be transferred to protect natural resources. In exchange for creating open spaces in hillside areas, developers have the option of shifting that density to flatter areas of the site.**

#### *J. AIR, WATER, AND LAND RESOURCE QUALITY*

##### *POLICIES:*

- (1) *Overall Policy: The City of Veneta shall comply with all federal, state and local environmental quality and environmental protection regulations.*
- (3) *Water Quality:*
- (a) *The City shall comply with all federal EPA Waste Discharge requirements, the State Water Quality Management Plan, Lane County "208" Comprehensive Study and all other applicable local, state, and federal water quality regulations.*

**Erosion of hillside areas is a point of concern for the City. Removal of hillside vegetation and soil disturbance, especially mass grading on a sitewide basis poses a significant erosion control problem that cannot easily be managed. Two approaches exist to manage erosion in hillside areas, the use of best management practices (BMP's), essentially engineering solutions for stabilizing disturbed areas, and retention of native slopes and vegetation. Of these two methods, preserving existing vegetation is more effective, and requires minimal oversight by the City and is therefore, the preferred method of erosion control in these areas. The proposed hillside standards will limit the total area of disturbance in hillside areas and put in place standards intended to control erosion to the greatest degree practicable.**

**The City of Veneta is a Designated Management Agency (DMA) under the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)**

**program administered by Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. As a DMA, the City has the responsibility to reduce pollutant loads into nearby water bodies. Erosion control and stormwater management are listed as high priorities in the draft Veneta TMDL implementation plan. The proposed hillside standards will codify erosion control requirements for development of these areas and work in conjunction with DEQ requirements to help ensure that erosion is minimized to the greatest degree practicable.**

*K. AREAS SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS*

*GOAL:*

*Protect life and property from natural hazards and disasters.*

*POLICIES:*

(1) *All Hazard Areas: The City shall cooperate with all local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that all physiographic constraints to development are evaluated and hazards are minimized.*

(b) *An in-depth review may be required if affected property possesses any of the following characteristics:*

3. *Site is located in the steep slopes area above the 450 foot elevation level.*

**Nearly all of the hillsides over 15% slope are located above the 450ft elevation level. In order to ensure that developments are safe and that danger to life and property from slope instabilities are minimized, the proposed amendments will continue to apply to all developments on lands over 15%, as opposed to just those over 450ft elevation. In depth geotechnical reporting is currently required for development of slopes over 15%. The proposed amendments clarify what specific issues and recommendations should be addressed in the report, and required qualifications of those drafting such reports.**

(4) *Steep Slope Areas: The City shall cooperate with all private developers and affected persons to ensure that steep slope hazard areas are identified and non-buildable slopes are protected.*

**In order to ensure that developments are safe and that danger to life and property from slope instabilities are minimized, the proposed amendments clarify the information required to accompany hillside development applications. The proposed amendments also set a limit on the slopes that can be developed at 30%. Any slope over 30% is considered unbuildable. This number was arrived at through analysis of**

**what other cities had done and represents the average of the limits imposed by other cities.**

- (a) *All developments over two acres in size and land division proposals located on slopes exceeding 15% shall provide a geotechnical report identifying buildable and non-buildable areas, proposed improvements to alleviate the hazards and a statement on the environmental impact of the development.*

**In depth geotechnical reporting is currently required for development of slopes over 15%. The proposed amendments clarify what specific issues and recommendations should be addressed in the report.**

- (b) *Subzone zone shall be used to identify this steep slope zone on the Veneta Zoning Map.*

**A subzone does not currently exist. The SRF8000 zone essentially acts as a subzone requiring larger lots in the western portion of the City. This is based primarily on the need for larger lots in steep slope areas as shown below in the purpose of the (L) plan designation. A more refined subzone that overlays only the hillside areas, and a rezone of nonslope areas to 6000sqft minimums may be proposed at a later date.**

#### IV. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AND LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

##### PLAN DESIGNATIONS:

##### LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (L)

##### *Purpose of Plan Designation:*

- *Provide areas suitable and desirable for primarily single-family uses with provisions for associated public service uses, planned developments, and limited multiple-family use under controlled conditions on lots incapable of division to city standards.*
- *Ensure that residents are provided with a low density single-family residential area.*
- *Allow up to seven (7) units per net acre. Planned Developments may qualify for a density bonus of up to fifteen (15) living units per net acre in the Single Family Residential (SFR) zone.*
- *Require minimum lot sizes shall of 6,000 square feet and 8,000 square feet on steep slopes. Larger lots may be established by the Planning Commission if it determines that development hazards or constraints exist or if the Planning Commission finds larger lot sizes will be more compatible with surrounding residential areas.*

**The SRF8000 zone essentially acts as a subzone requiring larger lots in the western portion of the City. This is based primarily on the need for larger lots in steep slope areas as stated in the purpose of the (L) plan designation. A more refined subzone that overlays only the**

**hillside areas, and a rezone of nonslope areas to 6000sqft minimums may be proposed at a later date. The proposed amendments include provisions for density transfer which would allow densities up to the 7 units/net acre stated above in exchange for setting aside hillside areas as open space. The proposed amendments codify the ability of the City to require larger lots to avoid hazards or development constraints. The City finds that the potential hazards and practical constraints of developing in hillside areas justifies the proposed limitations on development and the proposed amendments will provide greater certainty to the development community rather than imposing constraints on a case by case basis.**

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed amendments will clarify existing code and improve consistency. The proposed new text will provide more information for decision makers and clarity for applicants. Staff is asking the Veneta Planning Commission to approve the findings of fact and recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the City Council.

### **EXHIBITS**

- A. Map of Hillside areas
- B. Proposed changes to the Land Development and Land Division Ordinance