

Technical Memorandum #12b



DATE: April 25, 2018

TO: City of Philomath Planning Commission and City Council

FROM: Darci Rudzinski, AICP | Angelo Planning Group
Shayna Rehberg, AICP | Angelo Planning Group

SUBJECT: **Philomath Transportation System Plan**
Task 8.3 Implementing Regulations and Development Code Amendments

Overview

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide recommended modifications to Title 18 of the Philomath Municipal Code (PMC), the Philomath Development Code (“code”). Updated development requirements are recommended in order to be consistent with and implement the 2018 Philomath Transportation System Plan (TSP) and to be consistent with the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012, the “TPR”). Updated transportation goals and policies have also been prepared for these purposes and to support the code amendments recommended in this memorandum. Proposed transportation goals and policies are presented in Technical Memorandum #12a.

Proposed code amendments are based on the recommendations in Technical Memorandum #3, Regulatory Framework Review (Table 1 in the March 14, 2016 memorandum) and the draft TSP. The recommended changes to the Development Code are summarized in Table 1, which includes comments regarding the basis for the changes, such as references to applicable TPR requirements and recommendations in the draft TSP.

Following the summary table, the draft proposed code amendments are presented according to numbering in the summary table and in an adoption-ready format, with text that is proposed to be added shown as underlined and text that is proposed to be removed shown as ~~struck through~~. In both Table 1 and the adoption-ready text format, the amendments are presented sequentially as they would appear in PMC Title 18. The proposed code amendment language is based primarily on the State of Oregon Transportation and Growth Management’s Model Development Code for Small Cities, 3rd Edition (“Model Code”) and secondarily on development code language from peer jurisdictions around Oregon.

“Other Issues for Consideration” follows the proposed code amendment language section and explores the following as they relate to code requirements:

- Street and path design standards – Creating consistency between design standards in the TSP and Public Works Design Standards
- Downtown parking requirements – Presenting options regarding evaluation of and changes in requirements
- Neighborhood traffic management – Presenting options for implementing a neighborhood traffic management program



Proposed Development Code Amendments

Summary

As described in the overview, Table 1 provides a summary of the recommended development code amendments and commentary about the basis for these amendments as well as other useful information. The adoption-ready code language itself follows the table, presented in the same order (with the same numbering) as in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Development Code (Philomath Municipal Code Title 18) Amendments

#	Proposed Amendments	Comments
PMC DIVISION 2. LAND USE DISTRICTS		
1	Existing building orientation standards in residential districts (for higher-density housing and uses) and in commercial districts modified to ensure that the building entrances will provide direct access to streets, particularly streets with existing or planned transit stops.	Consistent with OAR 660-012-0045(4)(b), it is recommended that standards be modified to provide access to transit. While existing building orientation standards already generally require that buildings be oriented to the street, there are exceptions to this that should not be permitted when the development is adjacent to existing or planned transit stops.
2	Existing transit amenities provisions in commercial districts augmented by a new section on transit access and supportive facilities under Transportation Improvements standards. A reference to that new section added to existing transit amenities provisions.	OAR 660-012-0045(4)(b) addresses transit-supportive actions and facilities that can be provided at transit stops. While the supportive actions and facilities themselves are addressed in a new code section in Proposed Amendments #16, a reference to that new code section should be included in existing transit amenity-related provisions here in the commercial districts code section.
3	Reference to a new traffic impact study code section added to existing provisions regarding traffic impact studies in industrial districts.	A minor update is necessary to refer to proposed traffic impact study requirements, recommended in Proposed Amendments #15.
PMC CHAPTER 18.65 ACCESS AND CIRCULATION		
4	Reference to a new traffic impact study code section added to existing provisions regarding traffic impact studies in Vehicular Access and Circulation standards.	A minor update is necessary to refer to proposed traffic impact study requirements recommended in Proposed Amendment #15.
5	Driveway access spacing on local streets updated to be consistent with the 2018 TSP.	Access control measures, such as spacing standards, are required to be adopted pursuant to OAR 660-012-0045(2)(a). Subsection (2) requirements are intended to protect transportation



#	<i>Proposed Amendments</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		<p>facilities for their identified functions; they serve to promote safety as well.</p> <p>Access spacing is addressed in PMC 18.65.020(G) as well as in the draft TSP (Table 8, Access Spacing Standards), so requirements need to be consistent between the two documents. Proposed Amendments #5 consist of a simple amendment to the Development Code to create this consistency.</p>
6	<p>Pedestrian Access and Circulation standards modified to more clearly encompass bicycle access and circulation; and to address dedications for future pedestrian/bicycle improvements and potential required off-site improvements.</p>	<p>OAR 660-012-0045(3)(b) establishes requirements for pedestrian and bicycle connections to “neighborhood activity centers” (including schools, parks, transit stops, shopping areas, and employment centers). These proposed amendments articulate the possibility that dedications of land and off-site improvements may be required of development, granted dedications are based on adopted City standards and off-site improvements are tied to development impacts demonstrated by a traffic impact study.</p>
PMC CHAPTER 18.75 VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING		
7	<p>Restrictions on exemptions for off-street parking standards in the Central Commercial (C-1) district removed.</p> <p>Minimum parking space requirements for key Downtown land uses reduced.</p>	<p>An initial set of amendments is proposed here for consideration based on an evaluation of requirements in similarly-sized cities and Model Code (see the Downtown Parking Requirements discussion under “Other Issues for Consideration” in this memorandum). These proposed amendments could also be suspended and used as inputs in a future evaluation and discussion about Downtown parking.</p> <p>The amendments are intended to further reduce parking requirements for the C-1 district and bring requirements for general retail, services, office, and restaurant uses – predominant uses in Downtown – into closer alignment with requirements in the Model Code and other jurisdictions of similar size.</p>
8	<p>Requirements for carpool, vanpool, and rideshare parking added.</p>	<p>Proposed amendments require larger employers to provide preferential parking spaces for carpools, vanpools, and similar ridesharing modes. These amendments are consistent with OAR 660-012-0045(4)(b) and are intended to be one of several measures to encourage more efficient transportation.</p>
9	<p>Standards for providing pedestrian connections through parking lots added.</p>	<p>Establishing thresholds for when connections through parking lots are required as well as design standards for these connections implement</p>



#	<i>Proposed Amendments</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		connectivity requirements emphasized in OAR 660-012-0045(3)(b).
10	Provisions permitting portions of parking lots to be developed for transit-related uses added.	Consistent with OAR 660-012-0045(4)(e), these proposed amendments clarify, and thereby support, allowable development of transit-related facilities.
11	<p>General and commercial district bicycle parking requirements increased.</p> <p>Requirements added for transit uses.</p>	<p>Modest bicycle parking requirements have been added for transit stops, as required by OAR 660-012-0045(3)(a) and to further support the use of transit and active transportation.</p> <p>The minimum numbers of bicycle parking spaces generally required and required in commercial districts are proposed to be increased based on guidance in the State's Model Code and requirements in peer Oregon jurisdictions.</p>
PMC 18.80.020 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS		
12	Reference to street design standards in TSP and Public Works Design Standards added to Transportation Improvements section.	Transportation improvement standards already include one reference to the TSP, in PMC 18.80.020(A)(1). It is recommended that this be reinforced by adding a reference to the TSP and Public Works Design Standards in a transportation improvements subsection regarding minimum rights-of-way and street sections. This is a minor, administrative amendment.
13	References to TSP Local Street Connectivity Plan added to the Transportation Improvements section.	Multimodal connectivity is emphasized in OAR 660-012-0045(3)(b). This minor proposed amendment provides a link to the connectivity plan included in the 2018 TSP.
14	<p>Requirement for signage indicating future street connections from stub streets added.</p> <p>Maximum allowable cul-de-sac length reduced, with authority granted to the Public Works Director to allow a longer cul-de-sac if necessary for site-specific conditions.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendation in the draft TSP (Local Street Connectivity section), a proposed modification to the City's street improvement requirements addresses signage for stub streets to indicate that future connections to the street system are expected.</p> <p>As recommended in Technical Memorandum #9, Table 11 (Proposed Changes to Connectivity Requirements), proposed amendments generally reduce the maximum allowable length of a cul-de-sac. This change also aligns with the reduction in pavement called for in OAR 660-012-0045(7).</p>
15	A new code subsection for traffic impact study requirements added to Transportation Improvements section.	OAR 660-012-0045(2)(b) requires that standards to protect transportation facilities be adopted in local jurisdictions' land use regulations.



#	<i>Proposed Amendments</i>	<i>Comments</i>
	<p>New section addresses applicability criteria, who prepares the study, determination of study scope and content, review criteria, and conditions of approval.</p>	<p>The existing Development Code has general language about impact studies. However, Technical Memorandum #3 and the Technical Memorandum #9 recommend that transportation-specific impact study requirements be developed and adopted.</p> <p>The proposed new requirements articulate that all development proposals require findings related to traffic generation and set daily trip thresholds for when the City will require a higher level of traffic impact analysis. Proposed language implements OAR 660-012-0045(2)(b), enabling the City to make informed decisions regarding protecting the planned function of transportation facilities impacted by proposed development.</p> <p>Proposed language also clarifies that the City may impose conditions of approval based on the finding of the traffic impact study, consistent with TPR requirements, (OAR 660-012-0045(2)(e) and OAR 660-012-0045(3)(c)).</p>
16	<p>A new subsection regarding transit access and transit supportive facilities (e.g., landing pad, easement or dedication) added to the Transportation Improvements section.</p>	<p>Based on transit-related requirements in OAR 660-012-0045(4)(b), it is recommended that standards be established to clearly require access to transit stops and to provide for transit stop improvements identified in adopted plans and in coordination with transit service provider staff.</p> <p>Proposed transit-supportive facility requirements can be modified if needed to share more of the cost and responsibility of transit stop improvements with the transit service provider, while ensuring that land for planned transit stop improvements will be protected for those future improvements.</p>
PMC 18.105 TYPES OF APPLICATIONS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES		
17	<p>New section added that codifies that specified transportation activities, including operation and maintenance as well as construction of transportation facilities identified in the TSP, do not require land use permitting approval.</p>	<p>These proposed procedural amendments are based on allowances made by OAR 660-012-0045(1)(a), which establish that specified transportation activities should be exempt from land use permitting. The amendments are intended to clarify land use permitting in Philomath, codifying what is likely already existing City practice.</p>
18	<p>Specific references to the new traffic impact study subsection added to</p>	<p>These proposed amendments are minor amendments intended to clearly direct</p>



#	Proposed Amendments	Comments
	impact study provisions under Type II and Type III procedures.	administrators and applicants to these requirements.

PMC CHAPTER 18.120 CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

19	List of possible conditions of approval modified to reflect the multimodal improvements that may be required as a part of development.	<p>These proposed amendments are minor additions to an existing list of possible conditions that may be attached to approval of a conditional use. The proposed language provides more detail about the nature of dedications that may be required and expands the type of multimodal improvements that may be required to include transit.</p> <p>These amendments are driven by requirements related to conditions of approval in OAR 660-012-0045(2)(e) and (3)(c), in addition to a TSP recommendation that: “[a]dding multimodal transportation improvements to mitigate impacts as a potential condition of approval for Type II (administrative) and III (quasi-judicial) review procedures would help protect the function and operation of the planned transportation system.” (Technical Memorandum #9, p. 18)</p>
----	--	--

PMC CHAPTER 18.135 ANNEXATION AND AMENDMENTS

20	Existing TPR compliance requirements updated to more simply refer to TPR Section -0060.	<p>OAR 660-012-0060 has been amended since the City adopted PMC 18.135.050 (Transportation planning rule compliance), which applies to legislative amendments. The most recent amendments to Section -0060, effective in 2012, included new language that allows a local government to exempt a zone change from the “significant effect” determination if the proposed zoning is consistent with the comprehensive plan map designation and the TSP. Amendments also included a new “balancing test” available for jurisdictions to weigh land use amendments that will create industrial or traded-sector jobs, as defined by the TPR.</p> <p>Instead of updating the existing code section to duplicate current Section -0060 language, it is recommended that the code language be modified to simply refer to Section -0060. This approach prevents the code section from becoming lengthy and, more importantly, will accommodate future amendments of Section -0060 without necessitating amendment of the code section. A minor, “housekeeping” type of amendment is also proposed: to expand the title of the chapter to reflect that the chapter addresses development</p>
----	---	--



#	Proposed Amendments	Comments
		code and land use district map amendments, and not just annexations.
PMC CHAPTER 18.155 VARIANCES		
21	Criteria for transportation improvement variances added to an existing section on Class B variances.	<p>These proposed amendments can also be considered as code “housekeeping.” As noted in Technical Memorandum #3, Class B variance criteria for transportation improvements are currently not in established in either PMC 18.80.020(B) or PMC 18.155.050(A)(6).</p> <p>The proposed criteria are modeled after criteria for a Type II variance to vehicle access requirements, variance procedures outlined in Public Works Design Standards Section 1.1(e), and variance criteria discussed in Technical Memorandum #9 (p. 8).</p>

Adoption-Ready Code Amendment Language

Note: The symbol [...] is used to represent where code language exists but has been removed in order to create briefer, more focused and readable proposed code amendment language.

Proposed Amendments #1 – Building Orientation to Transit Stops

PMC Division 2 Land Use Districts

Chapter 18.35 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

18.35.080 Building orientation.

[...]

B. Applicability. This section applies to: single family attached townhomes that are subject to site design review (three or more attached units); multifamily housing; neighborhood commercial buildings; and public and institutional buildings, which receive the public.

C. Building Orientation Standards. All developments listed in subsection (B) of this section shall be oriented to a street. The building orientation standard is met when all of the following criteria are met:

- 1. Compliance with the setback standards in PMC 18.35.030.*
- 2. All buildings shall have their primary entrance(s) oriented to the street. Multifamily and neighborhood commercial building entrances may include entrances to individual units, lobby entrances, or breezeway/courtyard entrances (i.e., to a cluster of units or commercial spaces). Alternatively, a building may have its entrance oriented to a side yard when a direct pedestrian walkway is provided between the building entrance and the street in accordance with the standards in Chapter 18.65 PMC, Access and Circulation. In this case, at least one entrance shall be provided not more than 20 feet from the closest sidewalk or street.*
- 3. Where applicable, the primary building entrance shall be oriented to the site’s frontage that is adjacent to an existing or planned transit stop in order to provide more direct access to transit. Where a transit stop exists or is planned on, or directly adjacent to, the site, orienting the primary entrance to a side yard shall not be permitted.*

Chapter 18.40 COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

18.40.050 Block layout and building orientation.



[...]

D. Building Orientation Standard. All of the developments listed in subsection (A) of this section shall be oriented to a street. The building orientation standard is met when all of the following criteria are met:

- 1. The minimum and maximum setback standards in PMC 18.40.030.*
- 2. Buildings have their primary entrance(s) oriented to (facing) the street. Building entrances may include entrances to individual units, lobby entrances, entrances oriented to pedestrian plazas, or breezeway/courtyard entrances (i.e., to a cluster of units or commercial spaces). Alternatively, a building may have its entrance facing a side yard when a direct pedestrian walkway not exceeding 20 feet in length is provided between the building entrance and the street right-of-way, except where the site's frontage is adjacent to an existing or planned transit stop, in which case the primary building entrance shall be oriented to that frontage to provide more direct access to transit.*

Chapter 18.50 PUBLIC DISTRICTS

18.50.040 Property development standards.

[...]

D. Building Height. The maximum height shall conform to that of the abutting property zone requirements. Where two or more different zones are applicable the most restrictive shall apply. There shall be no windows or doors in walls facing a residential zone unless greater than 15 feet of separation is provided, except emergency exit doors.

E. Building Orientation. Buildings in this district with public access shall have their primary entrance(s) oriented to (facing) the street. Where the site's frontage is adjacent to an existing or planned transit stop, the primary building entrance shall be oriented to that frontage to provide more direct access to transit. Where there are no existing or planned transit stops adjacent to the site, a building may have its entrance facing a side yard when a direct pedestrian walkway not exceeding 20 feet in length is provided between the building entrance and the street right-of-way.

FE. Access. Every newly created lot shall have a legal access. No street frontage shall be required by this or any other provision of this title.

GF. Exterior Lighting. Exterior lighting shall be located in such a manner as not to face directly, shine or reflect glare onto an adjacent street or property.

Proposed Amendments #2 – Transit Amenities and Supportive Facilities

PMC Division 2 Land Use Districts

Chapter 18.40 COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

18.40.080 Pedestrian and transit amenities.

[...]

A. Purpose and Applicability. This section is intended to complement the building orientation standards in PMC 18.40.050, and the street standards in Chapter 18.65 PMC, by providing comfortable and inviting pedestrian spaces within the commercial districts. Pedestrian amenities serve as informal gathering places for socializing, resting, and enjoyment of the city and contribute to a walkable district. This section applies to all of the following types of buildings:

- 1. Three or more single-family attached townhomes on their own lots (i.e., townhomes subject to site design review) and multifamily dwellings;*
- 2. Public and institutional buildings, except that the standard shall not apply to buildings which are not subject to site design review or those that do not receive the public (e.g., buildings used solely to house mechanical equipment and similar uses); and*
- 3. Commercial and mixed-use buildings subject to site design review.*

B. Guidelines and Standards. Every development shall provide pedestrian amenities such as but not limited to the following listed in subsections (B)(1) through (B)(5) of this section. Pedestrian amenities may be provided within a public right-of-way when approved by the applicable jurisdiction.



1. A plaza, courtyard, square or extra-wide sidewalk next to the building entrance with a minimum width of 10 feet.
2. Sitting space (i.e., dining area, benches or ledges) between the building entrance and sidewalk (minimum of 16 inches in height and 30 inches in width).
3. Building canopy, awning, pergola, or similar weather protection (minimum projection of four feet over a sidewalk or other pedestrian space).
4. Public art that incorporates seating (e.g., fountain, sculpture, etc.).
5. Transit amenity, such as bus shelter or pullout, in accordance with the city's transportation plan and adopted transit service provider plans. See PMC 18.80.020(W), Transit Access and Supportive Facilities.

Proposed Amendments #3 – References to Traffic Impact Study Requirements

PMC Division 2 Land Use Districts

Chapter 18.45 INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS

18.45.070 Special standards for certain uses.

A. Uses with Significant Noise, Light/Glare, Dust, Vibration, or Traffic Impacts.

[...]

2. Traffic. ~~Uses that are likely to generate unusually high levels of vehicle traffic due to shipping and receiving. "Unusually high levels of traffic" means that the average number of daily trips on any existing street would increase by 15 percent or more as a result of the development.~~ The city may require a traffic impact study analysis prepared by a qualified professional and in accordance with the traffic impact study requirements in PMC 18.80.020(V) prior to deeming a land use application complete, and determining whether the proposed use requires conditional use approval. Applicants may be required to provide a traffic analysis for review by ODOT for developments that increase traffic on state highways.

Proposed Amendments #4 – References to Traffic Impact Study Requirements

PMC Chapter 18.65 ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

18.65.020 Vehicular access and circulation.

[...]

- D. Traffic Impact Study Requirements. The city or other agency with access jurisdiction may require a traffic impact study prepared by a qualified professional to determine access, circulation and other transportation requirements. (See also PMC 18.80.020, Transportation improvements, including traffic impact study requirements in PMC 18.80.020(V).)

Proposed Amendments #5 – Access Spacing Consistent with the TSP

PMC Chapter 18.65 ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

18.65.020 Vehicular access and circulation.

[...]

- G. Access Spacing. Driveway accesses shall be separated from street intersections in accordance with the following standards and procedures:

1. Local Streets. A minimum of ~~35~~15 feet separation as measured from the sides of the driveway to a parallel street shall be required, except as provided in subsection (G)(3) of this section.



Proposed Amendments #6 – On-Site and Off-Site Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

PMC Chapter 18.65 ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

18.65.030 Pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation.

A. Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation. To ensure safe, direct and convenient pedestrian and bicycle circulation, all developments, except single-family detached housing (i.e., on individual lots), shall provide a continuous pedestrian and/or multi-use pathway system. (Pathways only provide for pedestrian circulation. Multi-use pathways accommodate pedestrians and bicycles.)

[...]

3. Connections within Development. For all developments subject to site design review, pathways shall connect all building entrances to one another. In addition, pathways shall connect all parking areas, storage areas, recreational facilities and common areas, and adjacent developments to the site, as applicable. Dedications also may be required in order to allow existing facilities to be improved to city standards in the future or to otherwise provide for the construction of pedestrian and bicycle improvements identified in adopted plans.

4. Connections from Development. Off-site pedestrian and bicycle facilities that provide connections from the proposed development may be required consistent with findings from a traffic impact study. See PMC 18.80.020(V) for traffic impact study requirements.

Proposed Amendments #7 – Parking Requirements for Commercial Uses

PMC Chapter 18.75 VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING

18.75.030 Vehicle parking requirements.

[...]

In the C-1, central commercial zone, any building or structure ~~constructed prior to January 1, 2015,~~ shall be exempt from the off-street parking standards if the owner signs and records on the property a non-remonstrance agreement against the formation of a future parking district. Such buildings or structures may be modified internally, allow for a change of use, or expand the use provided the gross building volume is not increased. If an increase in gross building floor area is requested, off-street parking will only be required for that incremental increase.

A. Vehicle Parking – Minimum Standards.

[...]

2. Commercial Uses.

[...]

b. Business, General Retail, Personal Services.

General: One space for ~~350~~400 square feet of gross floor area. Furniture and appliances: One space per ~~750~~1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

[...]

e. Offices. Medical and dental offices, one space per 350 square feet of gross floor area; general offices, one space per ~~450~~500 square feet of gross floor area.

f. Restaurants, Bars, Ice Cream Parlors and Similar Uses. One space per four seats or one space per ~~400~~150-200 square feet of gross leasable floor area, whichever is less.

Proposed Amendments #8 – Carpool/Vanpool/Rideshare Parking

PMC Chapter 18.75 VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING

18.75.030 Vehicle parking standards.

[...]

F. Disabled Person Parking Spaces.



G. Carpool/Vanpool/Rideshare Parking. Parking areas that have designated employee parking and more than 20 vehicle parking spaces shall provide at least 10% of the employee parking spaces (minimum two spaces) as preferential carpool, vanpool, and similar rideshare parking spaces. Preferential carpool, vanpool, and rideshare parking spaces shall be closer to the employee entrance of the building than other parking spaces, with the exception of ADA accessible parking spaces.

Proposed Amendments #9 – Pedestrian Connections Through Parking Lots

PMC Chapter 18.75 VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING

18.75.030 Vehicle parking standards.

[...]

F. Disabled Person Parking Spaces.

G. Carpool/Vanpool Parking...

H. Internal Pedestrian Connections. Internal pedestrian connections shall be provided in parking lots with more than ten (10) parking spaces located in commercial districts and in parking lots with more than thirty (30) parking spaces located in non-commercial districts. These connections shall be a minimum of five (5) feet wide and distinguished from vehicular areas through changes in elevation or contrasting paving materials (such as light-color concrete inlay between asphalt). Paint or thermo-plastic striping and similar types of non-permanent applications may be approved for crossings of parking lot areas that do not exceed 24 feet in crossing length.

Proposed Amendments #10 – Transit-Related Uses in Parking Lots

PMC Chapter 18.75 VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING

18.75.030 Vehicle parking standards.

[...]

F. Disabled Person Parking Spaces.

G. Carpool/Vanpool Parking...

H. Internal Pedestrian Connections...

I. Transit-Related Facilities in Parking Lots. Parking spaces and portions of parking lots may be used for transit-related uses such as transit stops and park-and-ride or rideshare areas, provided minimum parking space requirements can still be met.

Proposed Amendments #11 – Bicycle Parking

PMC Chapter 18.75 VEHICLE AND BICYCLE PARKING

18.75.040 Bicycle parking requirements.

A. Number of Bicycle Parking Spaces. A minimum of two bicycle parking spaces per use for all uses with greater than 405 vehicle parking spaces. The following additional standards apply to specific types of development:

[...]

5. Commercial Districts. Within the commercial districts, bicycle parking for customers shall be provided at a rate of at least ~~one~~ two (2) spaces per use. Individual uses may provide their own parking, or spaces may be clustered to serve up to six (6) bicycles. Bicycle parking spaces should be located in front of the ~~uses~~ stores along the street, either on the sidewalks or in specially constructed areas such as pedestrian curb extensions. Bicycle parking shall not interfere with pedestrian passage, leaving a clear area of at least 48 inches between bicycles and other existing and potential



obstructions. Customer spaces may or may not be sheltered. When provided, sheltered parking (within a building, or under an eave, overhang, or similar structure) should be provided at a rate of one space per 10 employees, with a minimum of one space per usestore.

[...]

7. Transit stops. A minimum of two spaces shall be provided per transit stop. A greater number of spaces may be required for transit centers and transit park-and-rides, as determined through a discretionary site design review or conditional use permit process.

Proposed Amendments #12 – References to Street Design Cross-Sections

PMC Chapter 18.80 PUBLIC FACILITIES STANDARDS

18.80.020 Transportation improvements.

[...]

G. Minimum Rights-of-Way and Street Sections.

Street rights-of-way and improvements shall conform to the applicable design specification in the transportation system plan and public works design standards.

~~Where a range of width is indicated, the width shall be~~ Final design and location shall be determined by the decision-making authority based upon the following factors:

1. Street classification in the comprehensive plan and/or transportation system plan;
2. Anticipated traffic generation;
3. On-street parking needs;
4. Sidewalk and bikeway requirements based on anticipated level of use;
5. Requirements for placement of utilities;
6. Street lighting;
7. Minimize drainage, slope, and sensitive lands impacts, as identified in Chapter 18.55 PMC and/or the comprehensive plan;
8. Street tree location, as provided for in Chapter 18.70 PMC;
9. Protection of significant vegetation, as provided for in Chapter 18.70 PMC;
10. Safety and comfort for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians;
11. Street furnishings (e.g., benches, lighting, bus shelters, etc.), when provided;
12. Access needs for emergency vehicles; and
13. Transition between different street widths (i.e., existing streets and new streets), as applicable.

Proposed Amendments #13 – References to Local Street Connectivity Plan

PMC Chapter 18.80 PUBLIC FACILITIES STANDARDS

18.80.20 Transportation improvements

[...]

H. Future Street Plan and Extension of Streets.

1. A future street plan shall be filed by the applicant in conjunction with an application for a subdivision or partition in order to facilitate orderly development of the street system. The plan shall show the pattern of existing and proposed future streets from the boundaries of the proposed land division consistent with the Local Street Connectivity Plan in the transportation system plan and shall include other parcels within 100 feet surrounding and adjacent to the proposed land division. The street plan is not binding; rather, it is intended to show potential future street extensions with future development.

[...]

4. Proposed streets or street extensions shall be located to provide direct access to existing or planned commercial services and other neighborhood facilities, such as schools, shopping areas and



parks and transit facilities, consistent with the Local Street Connectivity Plan in the transportation system plan.

Proposed Amendments #14 – Street Connectivity

PMC Chapter 18.80 PUBLIC FACILITIES STANDARDS

18.80.020 Transportation improvements.

[...]

H. Future Street Plan and Extension of Streets

[...]

2. Streets shall be extended to the boundary lines of the parcel or tract to be developed to permit a satisfactory future division of adjoining land. The point where the streets temporarily end shall conform to subsections (H)(2)(a) through (H)(2)(ed) of this section:

a. These extended streets or street stubs to adjoining properties are not considered to be cul-de-sacs since they are intended to continue as through-streets when the adjoining property is developed.

b. A barricade (e.g., fence, bollards, boulders or similar vehicle barrier) shall be constructed at the end of the street by the subdivider and shall not be removed until authorized by the city or other applicable agency with jurisdiction over the street. The cost of the barricade shall be included in the street construction cost.

c. Temporary turnarounds (e.g., hammerhead or bulb-shaped configuration) shall be constructed for stub streets over 150 feet in length.

d. Notification that the stub street is planned for future extension shall be posted where the street improvement ends.

[...]

J. Cul-de-Sacs. A dead-end street shall be no more than ~~300~~600 feet long. The public works director may approve longer cul-de-sac lengths, not to exceed 600 feet, where site-specific conditions such as and shall only be used when environmental or topographical constraints, existing development patterns, or compliance with other standards in this title preclude street extension and through-circulation.

Proposed Amendments #15 –Traffic Impact Study Requirements

PMC Chapter 18.80 PUBLIC FACILITIES STANDARDS

18.80.020 Transportation standards.

[...]

U. Street Cross-Sections...

V. Traffic Impact Study.

1. Traffic Impact Study - Applicability – A traffic impact study shall be submitted with a land use application if any of the conditions in 18.80.020(V)(2)a-e apply.

a. The proposed development is estimated to generate 1,000 or more trips daily on any arterial or collector street;

b. The proposed development is estimated to generate 200 or more trips daily on any local street, including alleys and mid-block lanes;

c. The proposal is immediately adjacent to an intersection that is functioning at a level of service below LOS D, the city's minimum acceptable operating condition during the weekday peak hour;

d. An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Map or a zone change is proposed;

e. The road authority indicates in writing that the proposal may have operational or safety concerns along its facility(ies); or

f. A Traffic Impact Analysis is required by Benton County or by ODOT pursuant to OAR 734-051.



2. Preparation. The traffic impact study shall be prepared by a professional engineer registered in the State of Oregon. The study scope and content shall be determined in coordination with the city public works director or designee, consistent with the traffic impact study guidelines appended to the transportation system plan. Traffic Impact Analyses required by Benton County or ODOT shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of those road authorities. Preparation of the study report is the responsibility of the land owner or applicant.

3. Approval Criteria. The traffic impact study report shall be reviewed according to the following criteria:

- a. The study complies with the content requirements set forth by the city and/or other road authorities as appropriate;
- b. The study demonstrates that adequate transportation facilities exist to serve the proposed land use action or identifies mitigation measures that resolve identified traffic safety problems in a manner that is satisfactory to the road authority;
- c. For affected city facilities, the study demonstrates that the project meets mobility and other applicable performance standards established in the adopted transportation system plan, and includes identification of multi-modal solutions used to meet these standards, as needed; and
- d. Proposed design and construction of transportation improvements are in accordance with the design standards and the access spacing standards specified in the transportation system plan.

4. Conditions of Approval.

- a. The city may deny, approve, or approve a proposal with conditions necessary to meet operational and safety standards; provide the necessary right-of-way for planned improvements; and require construction of improvements to ensure consistency with the future planned transportation system.
- b. Construction of off-site improvements may be required to mitigate impacts resulting from development that relate to capacity deficiencies and public safety; and/or to upgrade or construct public facilities to city standards.
- c. Where the existing transportation system is shown to be impacted by the proposed use, improvements such as paving; curbing; installation of or contribution to traffic signals; and/or construction of sidewalks, bikeways, access ways, paths, or streets that serve the proposed use may be required.
- d. Improvements required as a condition of development approval, when not voluntarily provided by the applicant, shall be roughly proportional to the impact of the development on transportation facilities. Findings in the development approval shall indicate how the required improvements directly relate to and are roughly proportional to the impact of development.

Proposed Amendments #16 – Transit Access and Supportive Facilities

PMC Chapter 18.80 PUBLIC FACILITIES STANDARDS

18.80.020 Transportation improvements.

[...]

U. Street Cross-Sections...

V. Traffic Impact Study...

W. Transit Access and Supportive Facilities. Development that is proposed adjacent to an existing or planned transit stop, as designated in an adopted transportation or transit plan, shall provide the following transit access and supportive facilities in coordination with the transit service provider:

- 1. Reasonably direct pedestrian connections between the transit stop and primary entrances of the buildings on site. For the purpose of this Section, "reasonably direct" means a route that does not deviate unnecessarily from a straight line or a route that does not involve a significant amount of out-of-direction travel for users.
- 2. The primary entrance of the building closest to the street where the transit stop is located is oriented to that street.



- 3. A transit passenger landing pad that is ADA accessible.
- 4. An easement or dedication for a passenger shelter or bench if such an improvement is identified in an adopted plan.
- 5. Lighting at the transit stop.
- 6. Other improvements identified in an adopted transportation or transit plan.

Proposed Amendments #17 – Permitting for Transportation Activities

PMC Chapter 18.105 TYPES OF APPLICATIONS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

18.105.025 Exclusions from permits.

The following activities are permitted in each land use district but are excluded from the requirement of obtaining a land use permit. Exclusion from the permit requirement does not exempt the activity from otherwise complying with applicable standards, conditions, and other provisions of the Philomath development code.

A. Operation, maintenance, and repair of existing transportation facilities identified in the transportation system plan;

B. Dedication of right-of-way, authorization of construction, and the construction of transportation facilities and improvements, where the improvements are planned improvements identified in the transportation system plan or are otherwise consistent with clear and objective dimensional standards;

C. Changes in transit services.

Proposed Amendments #18 – References to Traffic Impact Study Requirements

PMC Chapter 18.105 TYPES OF APPLICATIONS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

18.105.040 Type II procedure (administrative).

[...]

B. Application Requirements.

[...]

2. Submittal Information. The application shall:

[...]

d. Include an impact study for all land division applications. The impact study shall quantify/assess the effect of the development on public facilities and services. The study shall address, at a minimum, the transportation system (pursuant to traffic impact study requirements in PMC 18.80.020(V)), including pedestrian ways and bikeways, the drainage system, the parks system, the water system, the sewer system, and the noise impacts of the development. For each public facility system and type of impact, the study shall propose improvements necessary to meet city standards and to minimize the impact of the development on the public at large, public facilities systems, and affected private property users. In situations where this title requires the dedication of real property to the city, the applicant shall either specifically agree to the dedication requirement, or provide evidence that shows that the real property dedication requirement is not roughly proportional to the projected impacts of the development.

18.105.050 Type III procedure (quasi-judicial).

[...]

B. Application Requirements.

[...]

2. Content. Type III applications shall:

[...]

d. Include an impact study for all Type III applications and a traffic impact study for land use actions pursuant to PMC 18.80.020(V). The impact study shall quantify/assess the effect of the development on public facilities and services. The study shall address, at a minimum, the



transportation system, including pedestrian ways and bikeways, the drainage system, the parks system, the water system, the sewer system, and the noise impacts of the development. For each public facility system and type of impact, the study shall propose improvements necessary to meet city standards and to minimize the impact of the development on the public at large, public facilities systems, and affected private property users. In situations where this title requires the dedication of real property to the city, the applicant shall either specifically agree to the dedication requirement, or provide evidence that shows that the real property dedication requirement is not roughly proportional to the projected impacts of the development.

Proposed Amendments #19 – Multimodal Improvements in Conditions of Approval

PMC Chapter 18.120 CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS

18.120.040 Criteria, standards and conditions of approval.

[...]

C. Conditions of Approval. The city may impose conditions that are found necessary to ensure that the use is compatible with other uses in the vicinity, and that the negative impact of the proposed use on the surrounding uses and public facilities is minimized. These conditions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 1. Limiting the hours, days, place and/or manner of operation;*
- 2. Requiring site or architectural design features which minimize environmental impacts such as noise, vibration, exhaust/emissions, light, glare, erosion, odor and/or dust;*
- 3. Requiring larger setback areas, lot area, and/or lot depth or width;*
- 4. Limiting the building height, size or lot coverage, and/or location on the site;*
- 5. Designating the size, number, location and/or design of vehicle access points or parking areas;*
- 6. Requiring street right-of-way to be dedicated and street(s), sidewalks, curbs, planting strips, pathways, or trails to be improved;*
- 7. Requiring landscaping, screening, drainage, water quality facilities, and/or improvement of parking and loading areas;*
- 8. Limiting the number, size, location, height and/or lighting of signs;*
- 9. Limiting or setting standards for the location, design, and/or intensity of outdoor lighting;*
- 10. Requiring berms, screening or landscaping and the establishment of standards for their installation and maintenance;*
- 11. Requiring and designating the size, height, location and/or materials for fences;*
- 12. Requiring the protection and preservation of existing trees, soils, vegetation, watercourses, habitat areas, drainage areas, historic resources, cultural resources, and/or sensitive lands (Chapter 18.85 PMC);*
- 13. Requiring the dedication of sufficient land to the public in accordance with adopted plans and standards, and/or construction of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-related pathways facilities in accordance with the adopted plans.*

Proposed Amendments #20 – Compliance with TPR Section -0060

PMC Chapter 18.135 ANNEXATIONS AND AMENDMENTS

18.135.050 Transportation planning rule compliance.

A. When a development application includes a proposed comprehensive plan amendment or land use regulation (including land use district) change, the proposal shall demonstrate it is consistent with the adopted transportation system plan and the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the impacted facility or facilities. Proposals shall be reviewed to determine whether they significantly affect a



~~transportation facility pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-012-0060 (Transportation Planning Rule - TPR). Where it is found that a proposed amendment would have a significant effect on a transportation facility in consultation with the applicable roadway authority, the city shall work with the roadway authority and applicant to modify the request or mitigate the impacts in accordance with the TPR and applicable law, the proposal shall be reviewed to determine whether it significantly affects a transportation facility, in accordance with OAR 660-012-0060. Significant means the proposal would:~~

- ~~1. Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility. This would occur, for example, when a proposal causes future traffic to exceed the capacity of "collector" street classification, requiring a change in the classification to an "arterial" street, as identified by the comprehensive plan/transportation system plan; or~~
- ~~2. Change the standards implementing a functional classification system; or~~
- ~~3. Allow types or levels of land use that would result in levels of travel or access what are inconsistent with the functional classification of a transportation facility; or~~
- ~~4. Reduce the level of service of the facility below the minimum acceptable level identified in the comprehensive plan/transportation system plan.~~

~~B. Amendments to the comprehensive plan and land use standards which significantly affect a transportation facility shall assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity, and level of service of the facility identified in the transportation system plan. This shall be accomplished by one of the following:~~

- ~~1. Limiting allowed land uses to be consistent with the planned function of the transportation facility;~~
- ~~2. Amending the transportation system plan to ensure that existing, improved, or new transportation facilities are adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirement of the transportation planning rule; or~~
- ~~3. Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes of transportation.~~

Proposed Amendments #21 – Variances for Transportation Improvements

PMC Chapter 18.155 VARIANCES

18.155.030 Class B variances.

A. Class B Variances. Due to their discretionary nature, the following types of variances shall be reviewed using a Type II procedure, in accordance with Chapter 18.105 PMC:

[...]

~~6. Variances to Transportation Improvement Requirements (PMC 18.80.020). The city may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a variance to the transportation improvement standards of PMC 18.80.020, based on the criteria for granting variances provided in PMC 18.80.020(B) after finding compliance with criteria in PMC 18.155.030(A)(6)(a)-(d). When the provisions of that chapter cannot support a variance request cannot meet these criteria, then the request shall be reviewed as a Class C variance.~~

- ~~a. There is a significant constraint presented by existing topography, physical and environmental conditions, right-of-way, development, and/or legal agreements;~~
- ~~b. There are opportunities identified for implementing innovative transportation treatments;~~
- ~~c. The variance meets the intent of the transportation improvement standards; and~~
- ~~d. The requested variance will not compromise safety, nor adversely impact other properties.~~



Other Issues for Consideration

Street and Path Design Standards

The Philomath Development Code does not include transportation design standards; code requirements refer to the TSP for transportation design standards and to Public Works standard specifications for public facilities construction standards. Consistency between the design standards on which the draft TSP is based and the Public Works Design Standards (PWDS) is needed.

To assist the City in identifying PWDS updates, Table 2 identifies design standards that have been proposed for the City’s transportation system (see Technical Memorandum 9, Figures 3-8 and Tables 4-9) and Standard Detail Drawings that are included in Appendix A of the PWDS. The dimensions noted in the table are “curb to curb” pavement widths.

Table 2: Summary of Design Standards in the Draft TSP and PWDS

Updated Transportation System	PWDS
28’-36’ Local Street Cross-Section (Figure 6 and Table 7, Tech. Memo. #9)	36’ Residential (Local) Street Minimum Section (Detail No. 201) 28’ Residential Cul-de-Sac Minimum Section (Detail No. 201A)
44’-46’ Minor Collector Cross-Section (Figure 5 and Table 6, Tech. Memo. #9)	36’ Minor Collector Street Minimum Section (Detail No. 202)
44’-50’ Major Collector Cross-Section (Figure 4 and Table 5, Tech. Memo. #9)	36’ Major Collector Street Minimum Section (Detail No. 202A)
-	36’ Commercial/Industrial Street Minimum Section (Detail No. 203)
41’-48’ Minor Arterial Cross-Section (Figure 3 and Table 4, Tech. Memo. #9)	42’ Arterial Street Minimum Section (Detail No. 204)

In addition, the TSP update process addressed standards for new types of transportation facilities and treatments. These facilities and standards are listed below.

- Proposed shared-use path typical cross-section standards (Figures 7a and 7b and Table 8, Tech. Memo. #9)
- Proposed concept for US20/OR34: Green Street to East UGB (Figure 8 and Table 9, Tech. Memo. #9)
- “Yield roadways” as interim local street improvements (Figure 12, Tech. Memo. #9)
- Conceptual Main Street improvements (Figure 13, Tech. Memo. #9 and figures in 2009 Downtown Design Plan and Business Mix Study)

These standards are not included in the PWDS or in the body of the draft TSP. The City should consider how these recommended treatments and standards will be referred to for future facility design guidance.



Downtown Parking Requirements

With the implementation of the Downtown Safety and Streetscape Project, and to respond to future commercial development, it is expected that the City will re-evaluate minimum parking requirements in Downtown. Parking requirements are organized in the code by land use, not land use district, except for existing special provisions that apply to the C-1 district that exempt the district from off-street parking requirements (with some restrictions).

Outside of the special C-1 district parking provisions, parking requirements for predominant uses in Downtown (retail, general services, offices, and restaurants) were reviewed in preparing this memorandum. Table 2 provides a comparison of existing requirements in Philomath and requirements in Model Code¹ and two other similarly sized jurisdictions. In this comparison, Philomath's existing parking requirements are slightly higher for selected uses.

An initial set of potential changes to special parking provisions in the C-1 district and to minimum parking requirements in "Downtown" use categories is presented in this memorandum as Proposed Amendments #7. There are several options available to the City related to Downtown parking requirements, including: pursuing these proposed amendments as part of the TSP adoption process; creating and adopting a policy as part of this process, which expresses the City's intention to evaluate and "right-size" Downtown parking (see draft proposed policies in Technical Memorandum #12a); and/or carrying this information into a future evaluation and discussion about Downtown parking.

Table 3: Comparison of Minimum Parking Requirements

Use	Philomath	Model Code	Scappoose	Talent
Retail	1 space per 350 sf Bulk: 1 space per 750 sf	1 space per 400 sf Bulk: 1 space per 1,000 sf	1 space per 400 sf (min. 4 spaces)	1 space per 400 sf
Office	1 space per 450 sf	1 space per 500 sf	1 space per 500 sf	1 space per 450 sf
Restaurant	1 space per 100 sf	1 space per 200 sf	1 space per 120 sf	1 space per 100 sf

Neighborhood Traffic Management

Technical Memorandum #9 noted that the City does not have currently a formal neighborhood traffic management program, and provided guidance regarding program elements if such a program were desired. One thread of the guidance proposed providing a formalized process for community members who are concerned about the traffic on their neighborhood streets. New policy can provide the basis for this kind of process, which is addressed in Technical Memorandum #12a.

Another thread of the guidance in Technical Memorandum #9 stated the following:

For land use proposals, in addition to assessing impacts to the entire transportation network, traffic studies for new developments must also assess impacts to residential streets. A recommended threshold to determine if this additional analysis is needed is if the proposed project at ultimate buildout increases through traffic on any one residential street by 200 or more vehicles per day. Once the analysis is performed, the threshold

¹ Transportation Growth Management, Model Development Code for Small Cities (3rd Edition; October 2012).



used to determine if residential streets are impacted would be if their daily traffic volume exceeds 1,200 vehicles.

The Beaverton Development Code provides an example of what implementing this guidance could look like:

Traffic Management Plan. [ORD 4302; June 2004] Where development will add 20 or more trips in any hour on a residential street, a Traffic Management Plan acceptable to the City Engineer shall be submitted in order to complete the application. A residential street is any portion of a street classified as a Local Street or Neighborhood Route and having abutting property zoned R2, R4, R5, R7, or R10. [ORD 4584; June 2012]

1. For each development application that requires a Traffic Management Plan, the Plan shall identify:

A. The hours when the added trips from the development will be 20 or more vehicles per hour.

B. The existing volume of trips on the residential street during each of those same hours.

C. The volume of trips that the development will add on the residential street during each of those same hours.

D. Recommended traffic management strategies designed to City standards to mitigate the impacts of the increased trips attributed to the development. Potential traffic management strategies include, but are not limited to, any combination of speed humps, curb extensions, intersection treatments, and traffic control devices.

2. The Traffic Management Plan shall discuss whether the recommended improvements both on-site and off-site are justified, reasonably related to, and roughly proportional to the impacts of the proposed development and shall include information sufficient for the City to assess whether the proposed mitigation strategies are reasonably related and roughly proportional to the level of impact. (BDC Section 60.55.15)

If the City wishes to codify a Neighborhood Traffic Management program, then development code language like the language above can be considered for inclusion in proposed code amendments. Otherwise, the guidance and sample language in this section can be retained for potential future reference and use.