

**Coalition of Gresham Neighborhood Associations  
September 11, 2018 – Conference Room 2A/2B, Gresham City Hall**

***Meeting Minutes***

<b>NEIGHBORHOOD</b>	<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>NEIGHBORHOOD</b>	<b>ATTENDEES</b>
<b>Centennial</b>	INACTIVE	<b>Northeast</b>	INACTIVE
<b>Central City</b>	INACTIVE	<b>North Gresham</b>	Linda VanDeusen-Price, Linda Parashos
<b>Gresham Butte</b>	Jim Buck, Tracy Slack	<b>Northwest</b>	Kat Todd, Dave Dyk
<b>Historic Southeast</b>	INACTIVE	<b>Gresham Pleasant Valley</b>	Angelene Adler
<b>Hollybrook</b>		<b>Powell Valley</b>	Nichole Burns, Stella Butler
<b>Kelly Creek</b>	Carol Rulla, Mel Roemmich	<b>Rockwood</b>	Catherine Nicewood, John Bildsoe
<b>Mt. Hood</b>	Matt Callison	<b>Southwest</b>	
<b>North Central</b>	Maggie Anderson	<b>Wilkes-East</b>	
<b>Staff &amp; Guests:</b>	<i>Gresham Staff: Steve Fancher, Public Works Director; Bernard Seegar, Director of Finance; Michael Gonzales, Office of Neighborhood and Community Engagement; Guest: Lee Dayfield</i>		

Carol Rulla called the meeting to order at 7:03PM. A quorum was present.

Meeting minutes from 8/14/18 meeting were adopted as presented. No members of the public came forward for comment.

**Parks Planning**

Carol introduced Steve Fancher, Public Works Director, City of Gresham, and Bernard Seegar, Director of Finance, City of Gresham. Steve presented on parks development opportunities.

Steve began by discussing development of the Pleasant Valley Park. This park was planned from the Pleasant Valley plan district in the southwest of Gresham, of which the eastern half of the district has been annexed into City, and the western half is still unincorporated Multnomah County land (but is within the urban growth boundary). This will be the first neighborhood park to be developed in the district, and will be adjacent to Brookside subdivision. The City has collected System Development Charges (SDCs) to pay for this park's development. A recent community meeting was held for planning input. Construction is being planned for 2019.

Beyond the Pleasant Valley Park development, Steve presented the City's plans for master planning of undeveloped park sites in Gresham outside the Pleasant Valley and Springwater plan districts. Six park sites have no master plan. Extensive public outreach was performed in 2009, resulting in a citywide Parks Master Plan. The criteria identified to prioritize limited resources in the 2009 plan were:

- Areas of deficiencies
- Geographic distribution
- Maintenance impacts
- Synergy / multiple benefits

Of that 2009 plan, 3 of 5 parks that were prioritized for development remain undeveloped. The city is now getting feedback from the Planning Commission and Neighborhood Coalition on how to prioritize all of the remaining undeveloped parks sites. A loose goal of one master plan per year (for 6 years) has been established, with public outreach planned for each.

Steve highlighted these projects on a map, relative to neighborhood and population. Based on input from the Planning Commission and the City Council, staff is proposing 2 tiers of priorities for master planning:

Proposed Tier 1 parks priorities:  
1 - SE Community Park

- 2 - SW Community Park
- 3 - Jenne Butte Neighborhood Park
- 4 - East Gresham Neighborhood Park

Proposed Tier 2 parks priorities:  
Columbia View Neighborhood Park  
SE Neighborhood Park

Community parks are larger, intended to serve visitors from the entire city. Neighborhood parks are smaller, with fewer amenities and intended to serve the immediate neighborhood.

Overhead images of each of the 6 park sites were presented, showing the potential for development. Steve also highlighted existing developed parks that have no playground equipment and listed staff's suggested priorities for asset replacements and upgrades.

Steve invited Neighborhood Coalition input into planning priorities. Jim Buck asked whether there was an intention to provide play equipment in each neighborhood for equity reasons; Steve replied that is the sort of policy consideration typically made in a master plan, including the 2009 plan.

Mel Roemmich asked whether system development charges (SDCs) could be more effectively used for maintenance of existing assets. Steve replied that SDCs must be used for capital expenses and cannot be used for maintenance. Tracy Slack asked whether prioritization of new parks development was considering the increased operating costs. Bernard Seegar responded that this is a consideration, and that in the current budget cycle, 1 new parks FTE (full time employee) was added to address maintenance needs. Tracy advocated for reviewing development priorities in light of operating costs.

Carol Rulla noted that the master planning effort is intended to allow some improvements to existing park land, especially in areas of the city which have no parks and have been waiting for years for designated park land to be developed. She noted that initial improvements on these sites will likely be minimal, due to lack of funding. Pleasant Valley is getting a park before other areas of the city because nearly 100% of Pleasant Valley SDCs can be used to build the park. In the rest of the city, SDCs can only fund about half the cost. Steve Fancher noted that State law requires that SDCs be used only to serve new development. Since the city lacked a Parks SDC for years, only a portion of new park development in the rest of the city can be funded with SDCs. Carol asked about the annual cost of parks maintenance. Bernard reported that the annual parks budget was about \$2.5M, which includes parks and open space maintenance, recreation programs and internal city support. The maintenance cost of the new Pleasant Valley park is estimated to be \$15,000 per year.

Dave Dyk asked about relationship between master planning and either a referral for a levy or creation of a special district for parks development and operations funding. Steve responded that he was unclear whether a master plan would be required for this or not. Lee Dayfield commented that having a plan helps voters understand what a parks levy or special district would provide.

Stella Butler asked whether this information regarding parks could be presented to NAs. Steve indicated the presentation would be provided. Stella also asked about the East Gresham Park, noting that there are 3 access points to the park but some are blocked with vegetation. She noted that having accessibility from all 3 locations would be ideal.

Angelene Adler noted that the Pleasant Valley Master Plan calls for a Community Park, and asked whether the City will make sure that land for the Community Park is provided. Steve noted that the City has limited ability to require private developers to offer land to the City.

John Bildsoe asked about plans at SW Community Park, specifically whether a boardwalk in the

wetlands would be appropriate. Steve noted that this was a good question which could be explored in the master planning process. John also noted that the Gantenbein property to the north should be considered in thinking about SW Community Park development plans.

Jim Buck asked if developers are given assurances that SDCs will be used for a specific neighborhood. Steve noted that SDC funds can be used throughout the city, guided by Council priorities. Maggie Anderson also asked about the development of SW Community Park, and stated that, when this property was acquired, citizens were promised that it would be maintained in a wetland/natural state. Steve noted that wetlands would be retained and protected, but that some of the property was not actually wetland. He also noted that conflict over natural areas versus development is a common conflict.

Matt Callison noted that significant new housing development is occurring in Mt Hood NA, and advocated for investment in parks in the neighborhood.

Linda VanDeusen-Price asked about process for getting a playground at Kirk Park. Steve noted that Kirk Park is considered a developed park so a new master plan is not required for these asset upgrades. It is primarily a matter of budget funding.

### **Short-Term Rentals**

Bernard Seegar was introduced, and discussed the need for changes to the city's short-term rental regulations. He noted that the market for accommodations is changing rapidly, with online providers of short-term rentals on community platforms (such as AirBnB or HomeAway, for example) increasing in popularity. These short-term rentals are considered transient lodging under State law. The City of Gresham's transient lodging tax (hotel/motel tax) rate is 6%. He noted that the collection of transit lodging taxes in short term rentals is an area of policy focus. The State adjusted the revised code of Oregon, including a 2013 update to address intermediaries (such as Expedia), and then a 2018 update to address short-term rentals on community platforms. The rulemaking process for that is occurring right now; the City of Gresham expects to be able to use the completed State rules in 2019 to allow for collection of taxes on short-term rentals. The League of Oregon Cities has drafted model language for Cities, which will be brought to the Gresham City Council at a November policy development meeting. Bernard noted that the City can collect these taxes through the State, or through voluntary agreements negotiated with specific platform providers.

Bernard noted that another issue is what land use restrictions should apply for short-term rentals. He gave some comparisons with other cities:

- The City of Gresham code currently requires a Type 2 land use application, intended for bed and breakfast, at a total cost of \$4,347. Tracy Slack asked whether the bed and breakfast permitting practices have been enforced for current AirBnB hosts. Bernard said that the city enforces only if a non-permitted host is reported. The city gets many inquiries about starting AirBnBs but has only had 3 applications. Tracy noted that Gresham Butte NA recently had a contentious Early Neighborhood Notification meeting for an AirBnB.
- City of Salem allows short-term rentals of an owner-occupied home, with 3 rooms for rent or less, and does not require a land-use application. More than 3 rooms or a whole house rental results in a Type 3 conditional use permit, with neighborhood notification requirement and self-certification for health and safety requirements. All must pay a \$180 annual license fee.
- City of Ashland only allows short-term rentals in areas zoned for multi-family. They also require that the home is at least 20 years old. (This is intended to disincentivize investor behavior.) They require a Type 1 conditional use permit, with a \$1,071 fee. There is also an \$75 annual license fee and a \$226 annual safety inspection by the Fire Department
- City of Bend requires a \$700 land use permit (higher if the whole house is rented), no neighborhood notice requirement (unless the whole house is rented), and parking requirements. There is also an initial \$275 license fee and \$200 annual renewal fee.

- City of Cannon Beach has very strict total limits, with a lottery for openings.

Based on a limited survey of online short term rentals in Gresham this spring, City transient lodging tax revenue impact forecasts for Gresham are expected to be modest. Bernard noted that there is a wide spectrum of possible regulations for permitting and land use.

One key policy question that is raised is whether rental of owner-occupied partial homes is different than a whole-home rental. This is an area where City Council will be asked to express a policy preference.

Carol Rulla suggested that the City offer a survey, similar to the ADU policy development preference survey, as an effective way to solicit input and feedback from the community.

Tracy Slack noted that equity considerations are an important thing to consider, for existing hosts who may not be licensed (or who may be). Bernard noted that, if the costs were reduced, there would likely be a reimbursement to those who had paid the large bed and breakfast permitting fee.

Lee Dayfield noted that feedback mechanisms on this policy area should ask respondents about their experience with short-term rentals to gauge level of expertise. Jim Buck agreed that it would be good to know if respondents had rented through online platforms. Carol Rulla noted that input from those who live next to a short-term rental would also be good. Nichole Burns stated that, based on her experience as an owner of both short-term and long-term rental properties, she would prefer to live next to a short-term rental property.

Mel Roemmich asked whether ADUs could be used for short-term rentals. Bernard said that this is not allowed per current city code. Steve noted that compliance with this is generally a complaint-driven process.

Nichole Burns noted that the City revenue estimates may be low.

Carol Rulla noted that one policy example is the food cart code, where the barriers for registration are low, but complaints are a driver for increased scrutiny and additional requirements.

Bernard asked whether Coalition members felt a different land use process would be needed for a short-term rental with only a few rooms for rent versus a whole house. Coalition consensus was that a different process was warranted for the two situations.

### **Neighborhood and City News and Reports**

Carol Rulla asked whether the Coalition was supportive of a candidate forum for City Council and Mayor candidates. Several Coalition members expressed support for this and the consensus was to host a forum on October 23.

Michael Gonzales provided ONCE updates:

- Gresham Barlow School facilities for NA meetings continues to be available, through a process that the district has in place. Fees are waived, and no requirements for liability insurance.
- The City continues to encourage the use of MyGresham website and mobile application. A survey for the experience with this tool is being opened.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00PM.