

**COLUMBIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION & WORKSHOP  
CITY HALL – 1840 SECOND STREET  
MARCH 10, 2015 - 7:00 P.M.**

**PLANNING**

**COMMISSIONERS:**

Laurie Falk, Chair  
Barbara Gordon, Vice-Chair  
Dennis Capik  
Kelly Niles  
Shelly Sandford  
Mark Worrall\*

\*Denotes Commissioner absent

**STAFF:**

Lisa Smith, Planner  
Helen Johnson, Planning Administrative Assistant

**OTHERS:**

Tim Olyer, Columbia City Resident – left at 7:12 p.m.  
Katrina Larson, Columbia City Resident – left at 7:12 p.m.

**MEETING TO ORDER:**

Laurie called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Laurie led the pledge of allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The meeting minutes for January were not ready for approval.

**ELECTION OF NEW PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR**

IT WAS MOVED (BARBARA) AND SECONDED (SHELLY) FOR KELLY TO BE THE NEW PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**CITIZEN INPUT AND REQUESTS:**

Katrina Larson introduced herself and Tim Olyer from 430 "A" Street in Columbia City. She asked the Planning Commission to consider changing the ordinances, to allow for metal portable carport type structures. Katrina commented the canvas ones that are currently allowed, last approximately 2 years and cost \$250.00. With the strong winds the canvas is easily ripped off. They had one that is less than a year old and the back has been ripped off by wind. She stated they are considering the metal structure, because they are more cost effective, they can be colored to match your house and in their opinion are less of an eyesore to the neighbors. A metal structure would not deteriorate and put shreds of vinyl all over the neighbor's yard. She feels the metal structure offers more of a benefit to not only the homeowner, but also the neighbors. Metal structures have a 10 to 20 year warranty as opposed to a 1 to

2 year warranty for the canvas structure. Katrina presented pictures of both types of structures for Commissioners to review.

Lisa stated current code does not allow metal siding on structures. Laurie asked Lisa what the reasoning was behind not allowing metal for a portable structure? Lisa explained that at the time the code was created it was thought that if canvas blows into a neighbor's yard it won't have as much of an impact as a metal carport flying into the neighbor's yard would have. Portable structures by definition are not attached to a permanent foundation; they can be permanently mounted in some way so that they don't fly away.

Barbara asked the residents if they had an attached or detached garage. They currently have an attached garage, but the house is older and there is not room for a boat in the garage. They would like to put their car trailer or boat in the metal structure. Tim stated that he has seen a lot of the canvas style structures in old Columbia City and they look "ratty". Tim said they want to clean things up and put up something that looks nice, it would match the house and they are available in 13 different colors. He feels the code is old and needs to be updated. Tim also stated they are more cost effect than going out and building a new garage, which they would not be able to afford.

The Commissioners agreed that the topic is something that needs to be addressed and will add to the next meeting's agenda.

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

None.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Lisa presented a discussion draft for accessory short-term rentals. She explained that when the Accessory Dwelling Units chapter of the Development Code was presented to the City Council it was discussed at that time something might be needed to regulate short-term rentals.

Barbara questioned if this action was because of the request to occupy an RV or tiny house? Lisa expressed that she doesn't recommend allowing people to live in an RV, it is still portable and there are concerns on how to deal with sewer. She stated she has not been able to find another City code that addresses living in an RV.

Lisa went onto explain that the City Council was concerned that without owner occupancy, ADU's become duplexes, commercial opportunities for home owners. There are density issues and it is more of a business that doesn't belong in a residential area or needs heavy regulation. Lisa explained the other reason for consideration of this ordinance is to address online rentals such as airbnb and others. She said the information presented comes from Portland's code and they had completely replaced the bed and breakfast section of the code with a section called accessory short term rentals, which seems to address these uses a bit better. Lisa expressed that we currently have a home occupation ordinance that works well and thought we could use it to incorporate these short-term accessory rentals.

Lisa stated the Comprehensive Plan has always called for tourism. The City hasn't been able to get the Port to consider their land for tourism and we don't have motels knocking at the door asking to rezone land to commercial, so this proposal might allow the City to get some revenue from transient room taxes and it fits with the tourism goal in the Development Code.

At some point in the future the City Council may consider permitting vacation rental homes by a permit process and limit the numbers to 10 or so. They could be established by a lottery and have heavy regulations placed on them. This could be an opportunity to make money for the City under the transient room tax.

Shelly had expressed concerns that currently there is nothing in place that regulates or limits someone from renting out their house for a week. Lisa stated City Statute by definition would call this use a hotel and they are not allowed in residential zones and is outlined under the Transient Room Tax.

Lisa and Commissioners discussed at length the proposal of short-term accessory rentals being regulated under the home occupation chapter for one room or up to three rooms. After considerable discussion the question was raised, do we really need to be looking at this type of situation at this time?

IT WAS MOVED (SHELLY) AND SECONDED (LAURIE) TO TABLE THIS TOPIC FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION AT AN UNDETERMINED TIME. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Lisa and the Commissioners talked about marijuana regulations. Lisa had gone to the City Council and it was determined why should we write a lot of new code, spending time and money when current codes could accommodate these type of applications. She stated that we could logically process requests under current codes with logically definitions. For example retail sales would be commercial and packaging and processing are industrial. Our codes reference applicable federal law. If an applicant came in, Lisa would refer the applicant to the City Council for determination if the federal law would be applicable.

Lisa stated to the Commissioners that she reviewed the City's Public Works Construction Standards to see if it addressed vision clearance areas we had discussed at previous meetings. There was nothing in that document addressed the concerns. Lisa commented that as we recently did for the DAR sign application, she would suggest to continue addressing with a variance when it comes to areas adjacent to the 80' ROW. The City has received a couple of concerns about trees and bushes effecting VCA and driveways. Staff and Commissioners agreed that it should be looked into and further discussed at a future meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

---

Kelly Niles  
Planning Commission Chair

Attest by:

---

Helen K Johnson  
Planning, Building Administrative Assistant