

**City of Hood River
City Council – Special Meeting
March 15, 2021**

Council: Mayor Kate McBride, Mark Zanmiller, Megan Saunders, Tim Counihan, Jessica Metta, Erick Haynie, Gladys Rivera

Staff: City Manager Rachael Fuller, Finance Director/ACM Will Norris, City Attorney Dan Kearns, Fire Chief Leonard Damian, Police Chief Neal Holste, Public Works Director Mark Janeck, City Engineer Wade Seaborn, City Recorder Jennifer Gray, GIS Analyst Jonathan Skloven-Gill, MIG Staff: Doug Gabbard, Sam Ault, Todd Chase

Absent:

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor McBride called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Land Acknowledgement Statement and Pledge of Allegiance

II. BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Utility Rate Setting Meeting #3 – Affordability and Final Deliberations, W. Norris

The City Council held two prior meetings on utility rates that discussed the water, sewer, and stormwater rate changes necessary to support the City's capital improvement plan and utility operations. These two meetings focused on incrementally aligning utility charges to user impact. This 3rd and final meeting will focus on affordability programs to assist customers that are unable to pay the full cost of their utilities. The City's existing low-income assistance program was enacted in 2008 and provides a 40% base water discount and 30% base sewer discount for households at 60% Area Median Income (AMI) and less.

City Council will deliberate and provide direction tonight on their desired water, sewer, and stormwater rates for FY2021-22 and any changes to the City's low-income assistance programs. City staff will then return a formal resolution for City Council adoption at the subsequent meeting.

Discussion: Affordability Initiatives – The FCS memorandum and presentation details the City's existing low-income rate assistance program and options to expand it. The memorandum uses an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) measure of affordability to analyze the correct income levels in Hood River to target. Based on this measure, the City is correctly targeting its low-income rate assistance program to households at 60% AMI and less. The memorandum estimates the cost if the City wishes to expand participation to 80% AMI and less.

The memorandum also provides options to improve low-income program participation. The most impactful option is to apply water/sewer credits against electricity bills for low-income households for whom water/sewer costs are built into base rent. City Staff met with Pacific Power and Mid-

Columbia Community Action Council and both can administer this program if the City chooses to offer it. Low-income households are disproportionately tenants in multi-family developments. These living arrangements typically have shared water/sewer accounts that are included in rent while electricity is metered and billed individually.

The FCS analysis estimates that an affordability program for 60% AMI and below that includes low-income households without a water/sewer account in their name will require a city-wide rate increase of 2.41%. Allowing 80% AMI or below to participate will require a 3.34% rate increase. These rate increases assume a target ceiling of 50% of eligible customers in the program (4x current levels) and are applied one-time across all users (residential, non-residential, septic/sludge haulers, and industrial)

Water, Sewer, and Stormwater Rate Changes -

The prior two meetings outlined proposed changes to water, sewer, and stormwater rates. The key points from the prior meetings include:

- a) System-wide 3% annual rate increases.
- b) Incremental alignment of rate burden to user impacts, resulting in larger rate increases for non-residential and typically high sewer strength industries.
- c) Switch from meter size to square foot of impervious surface to calculate stormwater rates.

Staff recommendation: Based on EPA affordability measures, continue to target 60% AMI or less, but expand the low-income assistance program to include households for whom water and sewer charges are included in their base rent via electricity bill offsets. Direct staff to return a Utility Rate Resolution for FY2021-22 based on the FCS analysis and rate recommendations, including a rate credit program for parcels that mitigate their stormwater impacts.

Todd Chase, Doug Gabbard and Sam Ault from MIG were present.

Chase reviewed the Hood Rivers affordability utility rate assistance program. The Hood River City Council adopted Resolution 2008-32 utility rate assurance program in 2008. Currently, participating customers (households) equates to less than 15% of the qualifying households and only 17% of the customer goal.

There were three different measure of affordability they reviewed: USEPA Residential Indicator (RI), Affordability Ration (AR20) and Hours at minimum wage (HM). Industry best practices for measuring affordability and the ability to pay. Chase explained AR20 and HM are more accurate. See slides 5-7 for details.

Chase reviewed water and sewer revenue impacts. See pages 8-9.

Policy considerations. Consider ways to increase participation of low and moderate income households. 50% URAP participation target would expand the program from <111 household to 671 (at 80% of lower of median household income). Discuss expanding income threshold from 60% to 80% of Area Median Household Income. Consider working with Pacific Power to provide credits on customer power bills as a means of providing direct payment. Affordability Untie Rate Program funding options: general fund transfer, other external revenue sources, rate increase (monitor participation for 12 months before determining percentage), overtime, City can also scale all SDC's by home size. 19-56

Council discussion and questions to staff and FCS.

Mayor McBride asked questions to be answered by Council. Question 1: Council member that are in favor of at least continuing what they are doing now to help subsidize at 60% or below. All Councilors agreed. Question 2: Does Council want to help users with a credit on their electric bill, that is subsidized through their water and sewer bill. All Councilors agreed. Question 3: rate credits for non-residential for stormwater runoff, should they be figuring out a model to use? All Councilors agreed. Mayor McBride stated the only thing left for Council to decide on if they go with FCS's recommendations for everything, will they go up to 80% and how is that going to get paid for. Staff recommends using utility funds. Councilor Metta and Counihan voted to go from 60% to 80%. No others voted were in favor. All others want to keep it at 60%. All members of Council agreed paying the subsidy with utility rates, which is currently happening. Councilor Saunders suggested doing a review in one year, to check on usage. All Councilors agreed.

Motion: I move to direct staff to return an FY2021-22 Utility Rate Setting Resolution for City Council consideration based on the FCS Group's rate presentations that includes rate credits for non-residential stormwater runoff mitigation efforts offset by a broad-based rate increase across all stormwater rate payers; and includes low-income rate assistance for 60% Area Median Income and less, offset by a broad-based and phased in rate increase across all water and sewer rate payers and; includes a program to provide low-income households rate credits applied against electricity bills equal to the standard water/sewer discount for low-income households where water and sewer charges are included in their base rent and that holds septic hauls flat and adds inflation adjustments thereafter.

First: Metta

Second: Counihan

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion passed (roll called)

Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Excused: None

IV. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Continuation of Middle Housing Public Hearing File: 2020-37, D. Nilsen

Developing code language for missing middle housing types (duplexes, triplexes and cottages) is a project on the City Council 2020 workplan. The purpose of the project is to establish a clear process and regulatory framework to allow greater diversity of these needed housing types.

At its March 1st workshop Council reviewed the draft code, recommendations, and revised test fit designs to ensure the regulations were drafted to adequately address the Council's policy regarding the regulation and approval of Middle Housing developments.

Based on Council feedback and recommendations, staff made several clarifications to the draft code and prepared a supporting ordinance for approval. Nilsen reviewed the changes made. During its discussion, Council was supportive of removing an outright short-term rental prohibition from the regulations and instead would rely on City's existing licensure regulations as applicable

City-wide.

Prior to the March 8th hearing, it was brought to staff's attention that the legal notice requirement did not accurately calculate the number of days between the legal notice and the hearing by not excluding the actual day of publication. To remedy the legal notice issue, Council continued its hearing to March 15th, where it would accept additional testimony and deliberate prior to taking final action on the proposed legislation.

Mayor McBride reopened the continued public hearing at 7:14 p.m. and read the script and the process regarding public hearing.

Nilsen presented the staff report and presented a PowerPoint presentation. The PowerPoint has been added to the record.

Tina McNerthney – she finds it concerning the very households the middle housing code is intended to benefit, are not likely as able to be at the table as much as they should be due to the pandemic and meetings being held by Zoom. She believes it is a lot to ask for people to attend a 6pm Monday night meeting by Zoom and the lack of resources to attend meetings by Zoom. It is harder to have conversations with neighbors and others during a pandemic, about important issues. The code is going to allow fourplexes as she understand it, in R-2 Zones or higher. She believes the R-1 zones has the largest lots and it is an equitable thing. It will exacerbate social economic division. The city should implement a citywide standard to avoid the ugly box homes. She believes they should encourage density in the R-1 zones. It will create a more socially economic diverse community.

Lenore Perconti – she rents an ADU but she is speaking on behalf of Mt Hood Meadows and Cooper Spur Report. Mt Hood Meadows is in support of the proposed middle housing code. As an employer, the lack of local affordable housing for middle income workers translates to challenges in retention, recruiting and threatens their ability to innovate and generate business. Data gathered by Meadows indicates most of the core group of staff who are seeking to purchase a home, cannot afford to buy in Hood River or the local area. In exit interviews, housing is one of the main reasons they choose to seek employment and move to a more affordable location outside of the Gorge. Meadows has and will continue to take steps to address housing security for their team. Advocating for the missing middle is one of many efforts they have made to address this issue. The lack of housing inventory in the Gorge is the "nail on the coffin" for employers trying to provide livable wages, retain viable talent and sustain business growth.

Mike Kitts – he sent Council an email and wanted to mention a few main points. He said if people are skeptical of some of the missing middle ideas, they should go by McKinley Court. It is a build he and Greg Crafts did 20 years ago. They built 6 standalone homes on a 15,000 sq ft infill lot. It worked very well and there are 14 off street parking spaces and the homes are around 1,100 sq ft. It fits the neighborhood. He also suggested looking at another project at the end of 30th Street, Tanner Ranch. If the missing middle housing code was in affect now, this area would have cottage style starter homes, instead of 30 large townhomes. The PUD process has become difficult to access in the last 20 years, to the point many developers will not consider it. It forces them to put the larges and tallest structures to offset land and development costs. He will support anything that helps create affordable housing in this town. He does not believe this ordinance goes far enough. It's disappointing to hear people be negative about this. He would like to know why the opponents would deny the opportunity for teachers, nurses, public employees and basically anyone working in this town to have hope of owning a home. Council should make decisions on the public good.

Susan Crowley – there are lots of good aspects to this proposal. She helped along with Heather Staten to organize the missing middle housing presentation that happened in 2016/17. She does have concerns about increased lot coverage and run off. She spoke about overloads on the streets. This town has very old and narrow streets and no continuous sidewalks. She hopes the City will tie middle housing development, to streets that can support them. There are some procedural errors she has mentioned that exist. At list point very few people know what is going on. She thinks the City needs to defer decision making on this, until more people can give good ideas to make this a better package.

Sarah Bellison – she volunteers at the warming shelter. Affordable housing is needed in Hood River. Well decent apartment buildings that are on public transit lines are a good way to use land, reduce homelessness and increase diversity in our town. What the community decides to do once it is done, will be difficult to reverse. They must take this slowly and carefully not giving in to the pressure to develop and grow quickly. Changing setback rules to make it easier for a homeowner to create more housing on the property with ADU's but with enough regulation to prevent full land coverage and overuse of a property is another possibility. She suggested requiring a number of years of reduced rent on an ADU, in exchange for leniency on setbacks to build, could result in more housing. Give tax deductions to local homeowners who build rental properties for long-term rentals, rather than vacation housing.

Matt Rutledge – he has lived in Hood River for 21 years. He has witnessed Hood River change dramatically. He has friends, neighbors and colleagues who are currently searching for affordable housing in Hood River. He agrees they are in a housing crisis that needs to be addressed. However, he must recommend that Council not approve the proposed zoning changes. While these changes may increase the quantity of developable land, it does not ensure these developments will fit the missing middle needs. There is no assurance developers will build housing that is pricing and accessible by middle income residence. It provides an opportunity for developers to cash in on more dense zoning and build dwellings that maximize profits in a demand driven economy. The quality of life of existing homeowners will be significantly impacted by the proposed changes. The zoning will impact those who already own modest homes, that are the backbone of the community.

Justine van Houte – she moved to Hood River in 2003 and feels very lucky to have be able to buy a home at that time. She agrees the affordable housing issue needs to be addressed. Since 2003 she has seen the city grow immensely. Congestion in the Heights has got worse and traffic flows are difficult. Over the years, she has watched development on smaller size parcels with multiple dwellings. She has friends who cannot buy homes here because of the availability of homes and the high costs. She used to live in another resort town in Colorado which has many similar challenges. She believes they have done a good job of building affordable housing for essential workers. They are much like the Mike Kitts developments. She asked Council to think of sustainable long-term solutions for Hood River; subsidized, deed restricted, primary homeowner, purposely built developments are the answer. There are good examples of this in many resort towns.

Brian Towey – there is a lot that he likes about this code, but he is concerned about the effect it would have on roads, parking, and safe routes to school. He hopes they find a way to make parking available. It is important that this code be consistent with the needs and desires of the community. The proposed code delivers unintended consequences while falling short of meeting the community's expectations. The community has stated clearly there is a need for affordable and

workforce housing. This proposal does not deliver that. It would be nice if changes to the code would align with the original stated intent from comments received in surveys.

Kim Lubin – she is new to the community and affordable housing is important to her. She is moved to speak because of some personal experience she has had in Hood River. She sees people who are not housed. They have jobs in the medical field, and they have to stay with friends, family or in their car because they cannot find housing. When she heard about this meeting and thought of the people she knows, it occurred to her that something is off. She wanted to share her experience and supports the City's work on this issue.

Brian Robb – he has lived in Hood River for over 34 years, coming from Bend. Bend is a prime example of how a massive increase in population can have many adverse effects and work to destroy the quality of life in a small town. He is in contact with many longtime Bend residents and they are almost unanimously appalled by what has happened to their community. If Ordinance 2061 were to become law, Hood River may very well head down the unfortunate path of Bend. While Zoom is necessary to avoid spreading the deadly virus, it utterly fails in providing the in person public input needed for Council to conclude that the citizens of this town truly want. Developers and special interest use the Zoom system to their advantage, and they are comfortable with its operation. Whereas the public is left out. He reviewed reasons why he believes the ordinance is deeply flawed. He asked the City to put the brakes on this development approach and wait for in person public hearing to occur. Allow all segments of the community to be given equitable access to information and the fair opportunity to provide input.

Linda Maddox – the changes to the current zoning code will change the look, feel and livability of the City. It is a large change in public policy regarding what is allowed to be built in all residential zones. It is developer driven and the City will lose control over zoning. Ruining the City and the place we call home for grown at all cost. This new ordinance allows too much development in this small City. If the new code becomes law, there is no assurance for any landowner or homeowner what type or kind of very dense development will be adjacent or across the street from their own property. It is unnerving and no security in homeownership under this scenario. Please reject this ordinance. She believes they can do better. She asked Council to read her submitted written testimony.

Lara Dunn – she voiced her support. The changes that will promote the building of smaller and less expensive housing types to help alleviate affordability crisis. Her only concern is there is very little they can do to stop investors buying up homes to use as second homes and driving up the prices out of range for local families to purchase. She believes it important for all members of the community to be able to afford comfortable housing, but she does not believe homeownership needs to be upheld as an important goal. Renting opportunities are also very important. She would like the City to invest in rental property, that would target middle income groups.

Adam Smith –he moved to Hood River 10 years ago when he was hired to teach at Hood River Middle School. He asked Council to commit to fostering diverse housing options for those working in the community. Council members have elected to represent a broad array of interest in the community. This is no easy task. As Council continues to approach issues around housing, he asks that they be visionary and do all that you can to support the community which you serve. When you make decisions consider whether you are doing so because it is the least disruptive or the right path that allows people to afford living here, that are a part of this community.

Ben Mitchell – this is the third time he has spoken about this. It is important to him. It is

discouraging to hear people who already own homes in this town speaking against this proposal. He understands some are acting in good faith and want to see this plan even better than it is now. He is not sure if everyone is. He hears the same complaints repeatedly, that come up in other cities regarding affordable housing. He feels they are used as excuses to do away with this housing as opposed to things that people care about. He does not believe it's the homes that make this town beautiful, it's the people that live here. He wants to live with people that live and work in this community and build a life here. There has been a lot of talk about character and to him that is far more important character to judge, not about what a house looks like.

John McGrory – he is proud to see so many people in the community voicing their concerns. He does not believe the City has given sufficient notice to the community about this. In the past few weeks more people have found out about this by word of mouth. Without giving people the opportunity to know what is going on and listening, we do not have democracy or fairness. He asked Council not to close public testimony tonight and do not take action. He supports with ordinance with respect to some parts of the City. He thinks it needs a targeted approach. It cannot be imposed City wide. He spoke about his concerns regarding the changes that would be imposed on R-1 lots.

Heather Staten, Thrive Hood River – she wanted to remind Council how unradical this proposal is by comparing what is allowed under the draft code to what is allowed under the current load. The incentive this code provides developers is they can build more doors, if they build smaller homes. You have heard testimony this code allows too much development on a lot and these projects will dwarf their neighbors. The truth is this code allows considerably less mass than the current code because there is a very strict limit on square footage. She gave examples. The current PUD ordinance allows much smaller lots in all the zones right now that's in existing code. While this code would allow more dwelling units per lot, there is actual more danger that the financial incentives will favor for the wealthiest people. Middle housing is not supposed to be a silver bullet that solves all of Hood River's housing problems. As the expert at EcoNorthwest said, they need many incentives and strategies to successfully address Hood River's housing issues. Approve this code and move on to the other strategies.

Polly Wood, Hood River – she generally supports middle housing. Incorporating a number of different housing will go a long way to address the City's lack of available housing. The missing middle or smaller housing options is an old housing concept that has stood the test of time and can revitalize and create great mix neighborhoods. She sees remanence of a form in the older neighborhoods, and it is part of what has made them work. Adding to community authenticity, it is high time they bring back a compatible form with the existing neighborhoods. She wanted to bring up a point that has not been brought up tonight, the importance of preserving older trees as we step into creating middle housing and the towns urban canopy. She is happy to see large trees preserved. It makes all the difference in the esthetics and the livability of having more dense housing. She spoke about the concern about parks. Parks and Rec took big step by entering into a two-year option agreement, to buy the Blackman and Skakel property near Westside Elementary School. She wanted everyone to know there are prospects for a park.

Aaron Baumhackl – signed up but did not speak.

Doug Archbald, Hood River – he has been a resident and a realtor since 2004. In the past 5 years, housing affordability has become an increasing acute concern for himself, clients, local residences, and City Council. They are right to be concerned. The ability for local people to live in the town which they work is crucial to everyone's quality of life. Unfortunately, Hood River has been trending

steadily away from that reality for decades. While today's home values seem astronomical, they are only a data point on the upward growth curve in prices in our town. The desirability of the area combined with geographic and regulatory constraints to grown, suggest the real-estate prices are headed to some of the notorious expensive zip codes in the country. Working remotely becoming the new normal, this trend will drive values of homes up in the area more aggressively in the coming years. Now is the time to take dramatic action to create affordable housing options for the future. The middle housing ordinance has the potential to achieve it; increasing the variety of housing types and providing for small homes and increasing opportunities for infill projects. The ordinance does not provide any mechanisms by which these new projects will create affordable homes. Increasing supply alone has not and will not drive prices down. The only thing that will achieve affordability is for homes to be sold below market value and to be deed restricted to remain below market value in perpetuity. This is a strategy other resort towns have done successfully. Allowing residents to live and own in the communities where they work. This is a massive undertaking. He asked Council to pause the passage of the ordinance and instead undertake hard work necessary to create an affordable housing ownership program.

Council took procedure questions from:

Paula – asked if the hearing could be postponed allowing more testimony. Kearns responded. It is Council's direction.

Brian Carlstrom – he does not believe the Zoom format is the way to make decisions. Kearns noted the options are limited due to the pandemic. Council could choose to hold off until the pandemic is over, and the governor lifts the orders that restrict public gatherings. This provides public participation.

Susan Crowley – she has not waived the earlier procedural objections she had to lack of public notice. Its not just the 20-day notice rule that was violated, there is also a comp plan provision on Goal 2 that states by any possible means the City is supposed to alert the public on a hearing date. That is something she does not believe has been addressed and that Council complied with. Kearns responded this is the third public hearing on this package proposal. The City has provided abundant and on going notice to the public regarding the schedule and the substance before Council. He hears a lot of people objecting to how the proposal has wharfed over time. That is the nature of legislative proposals. He thinks the City Council would acting irresponsible if it schedules a hearing on a legislative package and it did not change over time. It has changed in response to the abundant of public testimony and participation that is still going on in this matter. That is the nature of legislative packages as they move through the process. It is not pretty but it has to change in response to what the Planning Commission and Council hears, and he believes it has.

Marty – she stated there was a question for Nilsen regarding whether the changes had anything to do with R-1 zoning. She has not heard his response. Mayor McBride stated he will answer the question during deliberations.

Susan Frolick – she submitted something in writing and hopes Council reads it.

Break 8:45p.m. – 8:51p.m.

Motion: I move to close the public hearing and move into deliberations.
First: Counihan
Second: Saunders

Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Rivera
Nays: Haynie
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Nilsen answered the question regarding changes to the R-1 zone. The ordinance as drafted does have changes to the R-1 zone. Currently what is permitted today is a single-family home. The addition to an ADU was allowed as an added dwelling. As drafted the middle housing code would allow a duplex, either in an attached or detached configuration limited to the house size. It would not allow a quad; four unit attached unit. It does introduce the idea of duplex into R-1 which has not been permitted in the past.

Mayor McBride asked Nilsen to clarify what can and cannot happen on some of the lot's density wise. She feels there is still confusion in the public from what she heard in some of the testimony this evening.

Nilsen reiterated what he stated at the being of the hearing. He purposes of the middle code, there is an area per dwelling unit that is set in each of the zones. For R-2 and R-3 at the upper reaches, there is a 1 unit per 1,500 sq ft area or density rate. On a single family or typical lot, that would allow three dwelling units on a 5,000 sq ft lot which is the typical minimum lot size. They do provide a bonus for units under 800 sq ft, which would allow four dwelling units. At the upper reaches and the maximum dwelling, you would need an upwards of 15,000 sq ft to start realizing some of the maximum dwelling. In R-2 you would need a 15,000 sq ft lot in order to develop eight dwelling units, which is the maximum project size as set by this code. In R-3, the same requirement would be allowed a little larger project but no more than 12 units for that project. Nilsen showed the graphic from his PowerPoint presentation.

Council spent time asking questions to Nilsen for further clarification on the proposed code.

There was discussion regarding landscaping requirements. Councilor Saunders asked Nilsen would everyone interrupt "planted landscape" to mean natural or does planted imply some active work? They can make sure it is clarified; a natural area could be included in language if Council feels that is necessary. Councilor Saunders would like it clarified if other members of Council agree. Council agreed to add language for clarification.

Councilor Saunders stated the max unit be 1,200 sq ft unless you have a garage, it can be 1,500 sq ft. Is that true for all the unit types or just particular ones? Nilsen answered all unit types. She stated there are three different places in the code where it is confusing about the 1,200 sq ft versus the 1,500 sq ft. She suggested some clean up. Nilsen will make cross reference for clarification.

Mayor McBride stated Council in general but not 100% have been getting closer to what they want and most have been in favor of what is being proposed. She would like to discuss some of the issues they have not make final decision on. She listed the items to still be discussed and decided: alley access being only from an alley, distance between the interior of the units, the number of cars per unit, parking in front of the units, and height requirements. She asked Council if they are good with all other items besides the ones she just listed. All Council members had their hands up except Councilor Haynie and Councilor Saunders.

Councilor Haynie would like to speak about his proposed amendment to process.

Councilor Saunders has two items to add to the list related to R-1 zone. The maximum for development currently says six cottages. She would like to clarify given cottages are now the same size as other units. Is that just for cottages or if it would apply for other housing unit types under the middle housing code? She would still like to see the City incentivizing smaller units under 800 sq ft in the R-1 zone, like R-2, R-3, and C-1.

Councilor Zanmiller suggested talking about STR's in the C-1 column as mentioned by Councilor Haynie.

Mayor McBride stated it is 9:30p.m. There are 10 items to discuss. Council agreed to continue the discussion until 10:00p.m. Council would then schedule a special meeting to continue the discussion for a later date.

Councilor Haynie spoke about his proposal. The idea is to create a reporting mechanism, so if they find themselves in a situation where there are unintended consequences, they will have some type of structure in place within this code to facilitate an annual review. He put a proposal together this afternoon and send out by email. This suggests the Planning Director once a year in January, after confirming with the City Manager, Fire Chief, Public Works Director and Police Chief, provide an annual report during a public meeting on what has been the product of this code. Is this code achieving its stated purposes? He is trying to bridge what he sees as a gap in public support for this, between those who are in favor of it and those who are concerned about unintended consequences.

Mayor McBride selected height on the list to discuss first. This was discussed during the last meeting. Council has received comments from the public. The Planning Commission vote was 6-0 stating to tackle this city-wide, not just for middle housing. Councilor Zanmiller agrees with the code as presented. Councilor Counihan stated he would defer to the Planning Commission recommendation; he is not sure if it is fully vetted yet. Councilor Saunders agreed with Councilor Counihan. She is taking the Planning Commissions recommendation seriously. She would like to address height as a larger City issue. Councilor Metta agreed with Councilor Zanmiller. Councilor Haynie is aligned with Councilor Zanmiller and Metta. Councilor Rivera agreed with Councilor Zanmiller, Metta and Haynie. Mayor McBride agrees with Councilor Counihan and Saunders. Vote 4-3; in favor of keeping the code as written in the missing middle.

Discussion on cars per unit. The recommendation has been somewhere between .75 or 1 unit. Council has heard a lot of testimony about parking. Councilor Zanmiller, Metta, Haynie and Mayor McBride voted for 1 parking spots per unit. Councilor Haynie voted for 1 parking spot per unit but would say more than one if it was a choice. Councilor Sanders, Counihan, Rivera voted for .75 parking spots per unit. 4-3 vote for one car per unit.

Discussion on distance between interior units. Council had discussed this and agreed to the distances on the setbacks for the exterior but there is talk about potentially making the distances inside smaller. Nilsen spoke about the discussion he had with builders. Councilor Saunders, Counihan, Zanmiller and Mayor McBride voted for six feet. Councilor Haynie and Metta voted for 10 feet. Councilor Rivera was unsure. 6-2 vote for six feet.


Mayor McBride stated its 10:00p.m. and suggested continuing the hearing and discussion for another date. Council agreed to schedule a special meeting on March 29 to continue the

discussion.

Motion: I move to continue the hearing no earlier than 6:00p.m. March 29.
First: Haynie
Second: Rivera
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Mayor McBride announced with the resignation of Fuller, Council needs to think about starting the process for recruitment. Mayor McBride, Councilor Zanmiller and Councilor Haynie will help in the RFP selection for a firm for the recruitment process.

V. **ADJOURN** – Adjourned by unanimous consent at 10:09 p.m.



Jennifer Gray, City Recorder



Kate McBride, Mayor

Approved by City Council on April 12, 2021