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| **To:**  | Project Advisory Committee |
| **Cc:** | Project Management Team |
| **From:**  | Joe Dills and Kyra Schneider, Angelo Planning Group |
| **Re:** | **DRAFT** Summary of November 2nd, 2016 PAC Meeting |

# Introduction

This memorandum provides a summary of the November 2, 2016 meeting of the Hood River Westside Area Concept Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), including meeting discussion, decisions made and next steps.

# Summary of Discussion

**Date:** November 2, 2016

**Time:** 6pm

**Location:** Hood River City Hall,

301 Oak St, Hood River, OR 97031

Members:

* Ross Brown, property owner in study area
* Denise McCravey, property owner in study area, real estate broker (**ABSENT**)
* Mike Caldwell, property and business owners in study area (**ABSENT**)
* Mark Fuentes, Modern Pacific Properties, property owner in study area
* Bob Schuppe, property owner in study area, County Planning Commissioner (**ABSENT**)
* Belinda Ballah, property owner in study area, Hood River County Prevention Dept. (**ABSENT**)
* Heather Staten, Executive Director, Hood River Valley Residents Committee
* Susan Garrett Crowley, interested citizen on behalf of Livable Hood River
* Elizabeth Whalen, interested citizen on behalf on the Lovable Hood River; business owner (**ABSENT**)
* Jessica Metta on behalf of Dan Hoyt, Executive Director, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District
* Teresa Ocampo, interested citizen, business owner
* Maria Castro, interested citizen (**ABSENT**)
* Claudia von Flotow, interested citizen
* Pat Baird, Nez Perce Tribe (**ABSENT**)
* Michael Broncheau, Manager of Fishing Site Maintenance Dept. for Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
* Les Perkins, Manager, Farmers Irrigation District; County Board of Commissioners; and Mid-Columbia Housing Authority board member (**ABSENT**)
* Tim Counihan, City Council representative
* Will Smith, City Planning Commission representative

Visitors: Jacquie Brown-Barone, Corrie Podolak, Alex Podolak

## Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

Joe Dills briefly reviewed the project schedule and invited members to attend the upcoming Open House event on November 17th. He noted that the project’s next steps are to prepare alternatives to bring back to the committee at their meeting in February.

## Agenda Item 2: Vision Statement, Guiding Principles and Evaluation Criteria

Joe Dills provided an overview of the Vision Statement, Guiding Principles, and Evaluation Criteria. He briefly reviewed comments from the TAC meeting, including the inclusion of specific language about the success of commercial and industrial lands in the west end of the project area.

### Discussion of the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles

* The team will prepare alternatives which include different land uses and ways to run roads. The guiding principles are designed to help choose the preferred alternative or elements that will comprise a hybrid preferred alternative.
* There are trade-offs involved in choosing the preferred alternative.

### Discussion of the Evaluation Criteria and Performance Indicators

* The evaluation criteria are intended to inform decisions and guide the process of choosing the preferred alternative.
* Need to align evaluation criteria to goals in the Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) to ensure high-value development on commercial and industrial lands.
* Importance of considering the rental prices as well as purchase prices for housing units in the evaluation process.
* Trails and trail connectivity is important to getting people to and from parks, schools, and between terraces.
* TAC comments indicated a deficiency in the amount of land assumed for parks, so the team will take a second look at those assumptions.

## Agenda Item 3: Draft Land Use Program

Joe briefly introduced the Draft Land Use Program technical memo, noting that its purpose is to provide a first look at the amount and types of land use possible within the project area. He introduced Beth Goodman, who provided a presentation of her findings.

Key topics of the presentation included:

* Hood River has a limited supply of land for housing, and a deficit of high-density multifamily residential land.
* The difficulty of expanding the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in the future due to the City’s geographic location.
* “Missing middle” housing types, such as garden apartments, duplexes, and cottages and the need to expand the range of housing.
* Hood River’s EOA identified the project area as a key area for light industrial, commercial, and office development due to its available vacant and unconstrained employment land.
* Beth reviewed the three draft Land Use Alternatives, which include a base case and two scenarios which model the effects of rezoning, reduced lot sizes, and other code changes resulting in a moderate to strong increase in workforce and affordable housing.

### Discussion of the Draft Land Use Program

* The EOA provides guidance for promoting development and redevelopment along Cascade Ave, pursuing opportunities for residential development in commercial zones (such as mixed use development), and preserving large lot sizes in commercial and light industrial zones.
* Discussion of land allocated for parks:
	+ Overview of comments received from TAC meeting.
	+ There is currently no guiding document regarding how much land should be allocated for parks.
	+ The timing of park development in the plan area would be over the long term.
	+ The team will take a second look at the park component of the land use program,

including a community-level park and neighborhood-level parks, will check calculations and approach against the HNA numbers on city-wide park need, and will coordinate with the Hood River park district. Updated information will be shared with the Committees.

* + How does the plan area, and the City as a whole, compare to other cities of similar context in terms of park service?
	+ The amount of land assumed in the initial Land Use Alternatives seems insufficient.
	+ The higher the density of residential areas, the higher the need for access to park amenities.
	+ The trade-offs involved between adding additional land for parks and the number of units that could be built.
	+ The PAC discussed the trade-offs of one larger, consolidated neighborhood park, versus 2-3 smaller ones that are more proximate to their neighborhoods. Maintenance is a key difference between the choices. Very small pocket parks were mentioned as being not very successful in the project area.
	+ Undeveloped open space that doesn’t require maintenance should also be considered.
* Cascade Ave is currently auto-centric so it would need walkability improvements in addition to the development of local services.
* Request for a summary of information on the number of dwelling units needed by various income levels from the HNA.
* Several types of mechanisms and incentives that can be used to encourage high-density development, including code standards and density requirements for developers.
* Concerns about absentee ownership and new housing units becoming vacation homes.
* There is a much higher potential for the development of housing in the plan area as opposed to the rest of the city due to the higher concentration of undeveloped land and larger lots.

## Agenda Item 4: Land Use and Community Design

Joe introduced Ken Pirie, who provided a presentation of the thirteen Smart Growth principles identified for Hood River. Key points of the presentation included:

* Commercial land in Hood River is limited so it will be important to be careful how those lands are developed.
* Parks should be developed keeping in mind that aging and culturally diverse populations use them in various ways.
* Good design can soften the impact of high-density residential development.
* Importance of developing a range of housing densities, including “missing middle” housing types.
* The transportation network should be well-connected and allow for active transportation uses as well as cars.

### Discussion of Land Use and Community Design

* The ability of “missing middle” housing to offer a similar character as single-family housing while using space more efficiently and creating opportunities for integrating lower-income residents into existing neighborhoods.
* The mismatch between the type of housing provided and the local demographics.
* There is an upcoming presentation on “missing middle” housing in Hood River.
* Concerns about congestion and parking, and that the size of the housing unit doesn’t change the number of car trips made by the household.
* Reduced parking standards could compensate for some street parking issues.
* Improvements to neighborhood walkability could potentially accommodate for and replace trips that would otherwise have been made by car.
* Request for a staff person from the parks department to sit on meetings.

# Next Steps

Joe provided an update on recent public involvement activities, including the translation of project materials to Spanish. He reminded members about the upcoming Open House on November 17th, noting that it is a drop-in public event but that there will be a short presentation at 6:45pm. He also noted that there will be an ad in the Hood River News regarding the event.

### Next steps include:

* Set the vision statement and guiding principles.
* Recalculate scenarios in the Land Use Program based on comments regarding insufficient park land.
* Draw alternative plans, including ways to lay out streets and trails, and choose a single preferred alternative based on the evaluation criteria.
* Discussion about what will be required for implementation.
* Make necessary changes to the Transportation System Plan (TSP), Comprehensive Plan, and local codes.
* Develop an infrastructure funding plan.