

**CITY OF UNION OREGON PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION AGENDA**

September 22, 2026 at 5:00pm

Leonard Almquist Chambers located at 342 S. Main Union, OR 97883

For More Information, Please Contact City Hall at 541-562-5197

Zoom Information

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/9315921644?pwd=VW50QUVhV2dwUzF6eW5nYTZGcmVjZz09>

Meeting ID: 931 592 1644

Passcode: 760310

Dial by your location

• +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call** (please silence cell phones)
- 2. Work Session Discussion Topics**
 - a. Application-specific code review (standing agenda item)
 - b. Work Priorities (Exhibit A)
 - c. Commercial Code Draft Amendment (Exhibit B)
 - d. Residential Zone - Minimum Lot Size (Exhibit C)
- 3. Other**
- 4. Adjourn**

If you have a disability that requires any special materials, services, or assistance, please contact City Hall at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at 541-562-5197 so appropriate accommodations can be made.

Exhibit A. Work Priorities

ITEM	TOPIC	2026				2027				2028			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Community Engagement (start with housing discussions and code updates?)	Increase options (ADU, Cottage Clusters, Townhomes, Tiny Homes etc.)												
	Designate areas for higher density housing												
	Minimum lot size												
	Residential Use in Commercial Zone												
	Setback review												
Code Enforcement	Review Code												
	Work with Admin and City Council												
Correct UBG/City Limits	Get history from Celeste												
	Work with Admin and City Council												
	DLCD notice and change												
Code Fixes	RV as residence												
	Variance process												
	Irrigation ditch buffers												
	Stormwater drainage												
	Major vs minor partition vs subdivision												
City Council	Coordination												
Long-term Items	Update the Comprehensive Plan (Comp. Plan)	TBD											
	Update the Transportation System Plan (TSP)	TBD - possible 8/27 TGM Grant Application											
Notes on Needed Updates													
Comprehensive Plan	Out of date												
	Add section on history of city limits and UGB locations												
Transportation Plan	Road design standards are too expensive for city to construct or maintain												

Exhibit B. Commercial Code Draft Amendment

The original proposal is pasted below the following narrative exploring a different option to encourage first-floor use of commercial buildings.

At the August 25, 2026 Planning Commission work session, it was suggested that, instead of a provision to discontinue the residential use if the first-floor commercial use discontinues, that a first-floor vacancy tax be explored instead. The idea behind this is that this would create an incentive to encourage the use of the first floor while also giving the residential renter the assurance that they would not be kicked out if the independent business below them goes out of business.

Research into this model produced the below information:

San Francisco's **Commercial Vacancy Tax** applies when qualifying ground-floor commercial space remains vacant for more than **182 days during a calendar year**. The 182 days may be consecutive or accumulated over the year. It is not connected to residential use of an upper floor, so an upstairs apartment may remain occupied regardless of what happens below.

Where it applies

The tax does **not** apply to every commercial building in San Francisco. It is limited to commercial space that:

- is on the ground floor;
- fronts or is immediately adjacent to a public right-of-way;
- is located in one of the specifically named Neighborhood Commercial or Neighborhood Commercial Transit districts covered by the ordinance; and
- is not residential real estate.

In a mixed-use building, only the qualifying commercial portion is considered. The residential units above it are not taxed under this program.

How the tax is calculated

The tax is based on the number of linear feet of storefront facing the public right-of-way. Beginning with the first taxable year of vacancy, the rate increases as the vacancy continues:

Duration of taxable vacancy	Annual tax
First year	\$250 per linear foot
Second consecutive year	\$500 per linear foot
Third consecutive year and later	\$1,000 per linear foot

For example, a qualifying storefront with 25 feet of street frontage could generate a tax of:

- \$6,250 for the first year;
- \$12,500 for the second consecutive year; and
- \$25,000 annually beginning with the third consecutive year.

The escalation is associated with the vacancy history of the commercial space, not simply with how long the current owner has owned it.

Who is responsible for paying

Responsibility follows the party that controls the space:

- When the space is not leased, the property owner is liable.
- When it is leased but not subleased, the tenant is liable.
- When it is subleased, the subtenant is generally liable.

Owners, tenants, and subtenants of covered spaces have annual filing responsibilities, even when they believe the space was occupied or qualifies for an exemption. This helps the City determine who controlled the premises during the relevant period.

That allocation is an important feature. A landlord is not necessarily taxed merely because a tenant closes temporarily while continuing to control the premises.

What counts as vacant

A covered commercial space is considered vacant when it is “unoccupied, uninhabited, or unused” for more than 182 days during the calendar year. The standard principally examines whether the space is actually being used—not merely whether it is available for rent.

San Francisco recognizes limited periods that do not count toward the 182-day threshold, including certain periods associated with:

- pending building-permit or conditional-use applications;
- active construction or rehabilitation;
- damage caused by a qualifying disaster; and
- specified major infrastructure projects.

Certain nonprofit occupancy and affordable-housing-related properties also receive exemptions. There is also protection for some commercial tenants who actually operated a business for at least 182 consecutive days under a lease of at least two years.

Simply listing a storefront for lease does not appear to be one of the published exclusions.

Therefore, a landlord generally cannot avoid the tax solely by showing that the property is being advertised, although a particular permitting, construction, or other exemption may apply.

What happens to the revenue

Revenue is placed in San Francisco’s **Small Business Assistance Fund**. After administrative and refund costs, the money is to be used to assist with the maintenance and operation of small businesses in the city. The measure’s stated policy objective is to discourage prolonged storefront vacancies, promote active commercial corridors, and deter owners from holding space vacant indefinitely in anticipation of substantially higher rents.

San Francisco also has a separate vacant-storefront registration program

This may be part of what the Commissioner heard about. In addition to the tax, San Francisco requires vacant storefront owners to:

1. register the storefront within 30 days of becoming vacant;
2. renew the registration annually;
3. provide a professional report regarding the condition and code compliance of the property; and
4. pay an annual registration fee.

The City's current published fee is **\$1,190 annually**, with the possibility of a partial refund when the storefront becomes occupied during the year. Failure to register following a complaint can result in a separate penalty. This program is directed partly at building maintenance, code compliance, public information, and accountability; it is separate from the frontage-based vacancy tax.

What this means for Union

San Francisco's model addresses the concern identified by the Planning Commission without making the legality of an upstairs apartment depend on the success of an unrelated downstairs business. Residential tenants do not have to leave when the commercial space becomes vacant. Instead, the financial consequence falls on the owner or commercial party controlling the vacant premises.

It also has limitations:

- It does not guarantee that a business will occupy the space; an owner may pay the tax.
- A frontage-based charge that is substantial in San Francisco could be disproportionate in a much smaller commercial market.
- It works best when vacancy results from speculative rent expectations, neglect, or a decision not to market usable space.
- **It is less likely to work when the underlying problem is insufficient demand, a deteriorated building, high rehabilitation costs, or a lack of businesses seeking space.**
- San Francisco's own economic analysis reached essentially that conclusion: a narrowly tailored vacancy tax may reduce vacancies caused by speculative or negligent behavior, but it is unlikely to correct vacancies caused by weak market demand and could discourage investment when owners cannot reasonably attract tenants.
- For Union, the most transferable concept may be a graduated vacant-storefront program, rather than copying San Francisco's tax rates. Such a program could include:
 - an initial vacancy grace period;
 - mandatory registration after a defined period;
 - basic maintenance, window-display, and safety standards;
 - an escalating annual fee or tax for prolonged vacancy;
 - exemptions for active rehabilitation, casualty loss, probate, or documented permitting delays; and
 - use of the proceeds for downtown façade improvements, tenant improvements, business recruitment, or small-business assistance.
 - This would preserve the incentive for upper-floor housing while addressing long-term commercial vacancy directly. Because San Francisco's measure is a tax ordinance rather than a development-code occupancy condition, Union would need Oregon-specific legal advice concerning municipal authority, its charter, and any required adoption or voter-approval process before selecting that approach.

Changes as referred to City of Union Planning Commission by City of Union Historic Commission

§ 155.037 GENERAL COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-1).

(A) Uses permitted outright in a General Commercial Zone (C-1). General walk-in commercial uses and operations that are predominately retail or service establishments dealing with ultimate consumers. ~~Single-family residential use of commercial structures within the C-1 Zone shall be permitted only in conjunction with an operational commercial use provided that such residential use is secondary in nature to the main use of the structure for its commercial activities, and the occupying residents are the owners and/or operators of the commercial activities.~~ **Single family, multifamily, studio apartments or short-term residential use will be permitted on upper floors in compliance with all state and city codes and regulations subject to administrative review with occupancy plan.** The residential use shall not be visible from, and shall not deter or obstruct the street front use of, the building for commercial activities. ~~Residential uses of commercial structures shall cease within six months of discontinuance of commercial activity, until such time as a new commercial activity is begun.~~

(B) Conditional uses permitted:

- (1) Churches;
- (2) Church parsonages;
- (3) Community clubs;
- (4) Government structures and land uses;
- (5) Convalescent homes;
- (6) Clinics;
- (7) Libraries;
- (8) Museums;
- (9) Public parks;
- (10) Public utility structures and lines;
- (11) Radio and television transmitters and lines;
- (12) Railroad rights-of-way;
- (13) Schools;
- (14) Light industrial operations;
- (15) Passenger terminals;
- (16) One and two-family dwellings;

- (17) Multi-family dwellings; and
- (18) Overnight recreational vehicle accommodations in conjunction with hotel/motel operations.

(C) Prohibited uses:

- (1) Wrecking yard;
- (2) Travel trailer park;
- (3) Mobile home park;
- (4) Wholesale establishments and warehouses;
- (5) Heavy industrial use;
- (6) Building and related contractor uses;
- (7) Excavating contractor use;
- (8) Heavy retail sales such as, but not limited to:
 - (a) Automotive sales;
 - (b) Tire sales and services;
 - (c) Trailer sales and services; and
 - (d) Pleasure craft sales and rental;
- (9) Drive-in theaters; and
- (10) Race tracks;

(11) Storage, except secondary to primary commercial purpose.

(D) Lot size requirements. Lots shall have size and dimensional standards as necessary for traffic circulation, off-street parking, loading and unloading, and similar activities, as approved by the Planning Commission and City Council from detailed plans presented.

(E) Setback requirements.

(1) Setback requirements for lots adjacent to residential areas shall be the same as the standards in the residential area.

(2) There shall be no setback requirement for lots along Main Street.

(3) Lots other than along Main Street shall have setbacks established for suitable parking and traffic patterns as approved by the Planning Commission and City Council from detailed plans presented.

(Ord. 337, passed 6-11-1979; Ord. 451, passed 7-8-1996; Ord. 512, passed 2-11-2008)

F) Development Standards:

(1) Buildings within the Union Main Street Historic District shall comply with title XV: Land usage Chapter 156 Historic Preservation.

(2) Parking Requirements:

a. Commercial Uses: May use parking on Main Street and side streets.

b. Residential Uses: Studio/Family apartments, 1 space per unit at the back of the building or side streets. No parking on Main Street for residential or short-term rental residents.

(3) Access and circulation:

a. Separate entrances required for residential and commercial uses.

b. Residential entrances may be from street or rear/side access.

c. Loading areas must be screened from public view.

(4) Commercial Frontage Requirements:

a. Ground floor commercial spaces must have direct pedestrian access from the public sidewalk.

b. Display windows encouraged for retail uses.

c. Blank walls exceeding 20 feet in length are prohibited along street frontages where primary pedestrian commercial entrances exist.

(5) Residential Design Standards:

a. Upper-floor residential units may have balconies, terraces (if historically accurate where applicable), or access to roof decks.

(6) Building materials and Architecture:

a. Compatible with the surrounding neighborhood's historical character.

b. Quality, durable materials required for street-facing facades.

c. Mechanical equipment must be screened from public view.

At the August 25, 2026 Planning Commission work session, Planner Jancaitis was also tasked with performing a crosswalk of the above development standards and the below administrative guidelines as well as what is already in the development code. Due to workload challenges, this will be delayed until the October meeting.

Referred to City of Union Planning Commission by City of Union Historic Commission

Administrative Guidelines for Residential Use Permits
In Commercial Zone

1. Address:
 - a. Zone
 - b. Is property located in Union Main Street Historic District __yes__no
 - i. If yes is property on City of Union's Landmark Registry? __yes__no
2. Type of Residential Use
 - a. Owner-operator of commercial business on property __yes__no
 - b. Single Family, Multifamily, Studio apartment(s), Short-term Rental, other (circle one). If other describe: _____
 - c. Upper story residential use __yes__no
 - d. Ground level residential use (may not be more than 1/3 of ground level sq ft) __yes__no.
 - i. Square feet of total building _____
 - ii. Square feet of proposed residential use _____
 - iii. Percent of Ground Level SqFt _____%
3. Separate entrance for residential use location cannot be through commercial business:
 - a. Street front
 - b. Rear of building
 - c. Side of Build
4. Parking Requirement:
 - a. Onsite: located on property of residential use
 - i. Side of Building (not on public right of way)
 - ii. Back of Building (not on public right of way, i.e. alley)
 - iii. Front of Building-such parking is not permitted.
 - b. Street parking (public right of way): this requires a City of Union parking permit per unit with an annual fee of \$25.00 (July 1 to June 30) and entitles parking on side streets only NOT ON MAIN STREET, complaint may result in voiding residential parking permit.
5. Building Materials and Architecture:
 - a. Compatible with surrounding building historic character
 - b. Quality, durable materials required for street-facing facades
 - i. Facades to be restored to resemble 1997 David York Street Scape Drawings for his Historic Architectural Review.
 - ii. Mechanical equipment must be screened from public view
6. Occupancy Permit by Building inspector is required. Occupancy Permit __yes__no

Exhibit C. Residential Zone - Minimum Lot Size

The City could develop an administrative review pathway to approve a 5,000-square-foot lot with 50 feet of frontage when the listed standards are met. This is in line with Union's historic 50-by-100-foot platting pattern and avoids the discretionary hardship findings currently required for lot-size exceptions and land-division modifications.

Recommended amendment to § 155.041(D)

Replace § 155.041(D)(1)

(1) Minimum lot area. The minimum lot size for a new lot or parcel in the Residential Zone (R) shall be 7,500 square feet, except that the minimum lot size may be reduced to 5,000 square feet through the administrative small-lot approval process in division (D)(6).

Replace § 155.041(D)(4)

(4) Minimum lot frontage. Minimum lot frontage shall be 60 feet, except:

- (a) A lot approved through the administrative small-lot approval process in division (D)(6) may have a minimum frontage of 50 feet; and
- (b) A lot fronting on the curved portion of a cul-de-sac may have a minimum frontage of 30 feet.

Add a new § 155.041(D)(6)

(6) Administrative small-lot approval.

(a) Applicability. An applicant may request administrative approval to create one or more residential lots or parcels containing at least 5,000 square feet and having at least 50 feet of frontage. The request shall be submitted concurrently with any required partition, subdivision, property-line adjustment, or other development application.

(b) Approval required. The City Planning Official shall approve the requested reduction in lot area and frontage when the application demonstrates compliance with all of the following standards:

1. Each resulting lot or parcel contains at least 5,000 square feet.
2. Each resulting lot or parcel has at least 50 feet of frontage on a public street or on a private street approved in accordance with Chapter 152, except that frontage on the curved portion of a cul-de-sac may be reduced to 30 feet.
3. Each resulting lot or parcel will be connected to city water and city sewer.
4. Existing water and wastewater facilities have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development in compliance with applicable city and state standards; or improvements meeting those standards will be constructed as provided in division (D)(6)(d).
5. Each resulting lot or parcel complies with the applicable street access, street improvement, emergency access, fire protection, and utility requirements of Chapter 152.

6. Stormwater generated by the proposed development can be managed in compliance with § 152.10(H) and other applicable city and state standards.

7. Each resulting lot or parcel complies with all other applicable standards of this chapter and Chapter 152. Approval under this division does not authorize a reduction to any other dimensional or development standard.

(c) Infrastructure-capacity verification.

1. The Public Works Director shall provide written verification of water and wastewater capacity based upon applicable city facility plans, utility maps, system-capacity records, adopted public works standards, and state requirements.

2. Water-capacity verification shall address domestic water service, system pressure, and required fire flow.

3. Wastewater-capacity verification shall address the capacity of the applicable collection facilities and the City's wastewater treatment system.

4. When available city records do not demonstrate that the applicable capacity standards are met, the applicant may submit an analysis prepared and stamped by a professional engineer licensed in Oregon. The analysis shall identify the applicable standards, projected demand, available capacity, and any improvements necessary to satisfy the standards.

5. The City may deny the requested reduction based on insufficient infrastructure capacity only when the written decision identifies the applicable capacity or performance standard that is not met and explains why the deficiency cannot be corrected through improvements authorized under division (D)(6)(d).

(d) Required infrastructure improvements.

1. When existing infrastructure does not have sufficient capacity, administrative approval shall be granted if the applicant submits improvement plans demonstrating that the proposed improvements will provide the required capacity.

2. Improvement plans shall be prepared by a professional engineer licensed in Oregon when required by state law or city engineering standards and shall be approved by the City before construction begins.

3. The applicant shall construct required improvements at the applicant's expense in accordance with § 152.11(C), subject to applicable requirements governing proportionality and the allocation of costs for oversized facilities.

4. Required improvements shall be completed before final plat approval or secured through a performance agreement and financial surety in accordance with § 152.11(D).

5. Notwithstanding an approved performance agreement, water, wastewater, street access, fire protection, and other facilities necessary for safe occupancy shall be installed and operational before the City authorizes occupancy of a dwelling served by those facilities.

(e) Administrative procedure.

1. The reduction authorized by this division is the same administrative approval process as if the lot size were 7,500 sq ft and is not a conditional use, variance, or modification under § 155.062, §§ 155.068 through 155.070, or § 152.12.

2. No separate public hearing shall be required for the reduction.

3. The City Administrator shall issue a written decision identifying each applicable standard and stating whether the application satisfies that standard.

4. If the application does not satisfy an approval standard, the decision shall identify the specific deficiency and the modification or infrastructure improvement, if any, that would bring the application into compliance.

5. Conditions of approval may be imposed only when necessary to ensure compliance with an applicable clear and objective standard.

(f) Relationship to land-division approval. Approval under this division authorizes only the reduced lot area and frontage. When a partition, subdivision, or other land-use approval is required, the applicant shall also obtain that approval before recording or developing the resulting lots or parcels.

I would also flag the corner-lot setback provision for later discussion. Requiring two 20-foot front yards on a 50-foot-wide corner lot may leave an unusually narrow building envelope.

City of Union, Oregon

PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

CITY OF UNION, OREGON PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

September 22, 2026 at 6:00pm

Leonard Almquist Chambers located at 342 S. Main Union, OR 97883

For More Information, Please Contact City Hall at 541-562-5197

Zoom Information

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/9315921644?pwd=VW50QUVhV2dwUzF6eW5nYTZGcmVjZz09>

Meeting ID: 931 592 1644

Passcode: 760310

Dial by your location

• +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

- 1. Call to Order, Roll Call** (please silence cell phones)
- 2. Minutes**
 - a. August 25, 2026 – Planning Commission Work Session Minutes (Attachment A)
 - b. August 25, 2026 – Planning Commission Meeting Minutes (Attachment B)
- 3. New Business**
 - a. **College Bridge** – Willard Bertrand
- 4. Chair and Commissioner Items**
 - a. Land use planning work priorities (See Exhibit A of the July 28, 2026 minutes)
 - b. Commercial Code Draft Amendment (Attachment D)
 - c. Residential Zone - Minimum Residential Lot Size
- 5. Public Comment** (All speakers are entitled to 3 Minutes)
- 6. Upcoming**
- 7. Adjourn**

If you have a disability that requires any special materials, services, or assistance, please contact City Hall at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at 541-562-5197 so appropriate accommodations can be made.

City of Union, Oregon



PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

PLANNING COMMISSION – WORK SESSION

Minutes for August 25, 2026 at 5:00 p.m.

Leonard Almquist Chambers located at 342 S. Main Union, OR 97883

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

CM White begins the meeting at 5:06 pm, notes that it is being recorded and requests that everyone silence their cell phones. He invites Commissioners and staff to introduce themselves:

Planning Commissioners present: Brookshire, Droke, Hall, Seale, Steinbeigle, White.

City staff present: Heather Daggett.

Contract Planner: Jean Jancaitis with Plan Ahead Consulting, LLC.

City Council liaison: Trisha Seale.

2. Work Session Discussion Topics

- a. Application-specific Code Review Planner Jancaitis presents the draft Findings Report for MjP#2026-02 REED. She notes that the version included in the Commission packet was reviewed by the City's legal counsel, who recommended significant revisions. The Commissioners review an updated version.

Commissioners request the following edits:

- Create a new Finding 1 that details the facts considered when the application was changed from a minor to a major partition.
- Delete the extraneous "I" in paragraph 2 of what is now Finding 2.
- In the "Conditions of Approval" section:
 - Condition 1: Emphasize that the designation of Wapiti Way remains a "Local Road" in the TSP.
 - Condition 3: Add "Local Road" standards.
 - Condition 4: Remove the duplicate phrase "the applicant shall".
 - Add a condition between Conditions 6 and 7: "As required by Section 152.10(11), the shadow platted lines shall be used to identify dwelling and structure setback requirements of the two new parcels. For example, a new home must be placed on one of the shadow plat lots and abide by the setbacks of that individual shadow platted lot so the development does not preclude further urbanization.

- b. Work Priorities Commissioners review the Work Planning Gantt chart. They add a note that the reason the Transportation System Plan (TSP) needs updating is that the road design standards are too expensive for the city to construct and

City of Union, Oregon

PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

maintain. They decide to vote on a recommendation to City Council that the city apply for a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant in 2027.

c. Residential Use in
the Commercial
Zone: Code Update

Commissioner Brookshire recuses himself from the discussion and joins the meeting audience.

The Commission agrees to include another change in the recommendation changing Section 155.037(A) to read, “uses allowed with a permit”. They discuss whether the residential use of an upper floor should be a Type I or Type II decision. Commissioners agree to recommend a Type I review process to preserve private property rights and encourage increased use of downtown properties.

Commissioners discuss the suggested removal of the last sentence of section (A), “Residential uses of commercial structures shall cease within six months of discontinuance of commercial activity, until such time as a new commercial activity is begun.” Commissioners express concern that retaining this requirement creates too much uncertainty for residential tenants. Commissioner Steinbeigle instead suggests researching the San Francisco’s commercial vacancy tax model as it applies to ground-floor commercial spaces. Planner Jancaitis agrees to research this model.

Commissioners request clarification on how the suggested “Administrative Guidelines for Residential Use Permits in the Commercial Zone” relate to the code. Planner Jancaitis agrees to prepare a crosswalk comparing the guidelines with the code so the Commissioners can decide whether additional design guidelines need to be added to the suggested updates.

d. Minimum
Residential Lot Size

Commissioner Hall proposes to decrease the minimum residential lot size from 7,500 sq. ft. to 5,000 sq. ft. in some areas of the city.

Planner Jancaitis asks which areas of the City are appropriate for the reduced lot size and how those areas should be distinguished—for example, through a new zoning district, designated blocks within the existing R-1 Zone, or another approach. A Commissioner suggests another option: allowing 5,000-square-foot lots through a conditional approval process based on the availability and adequacy of infrastructure.

Commissioners discuss the necessary water and sewer infrastructure for increased density. Commissioners generally agree that existing water and sewer infrastructure could accommodate the increased density in most areas of the City.

City of Union, Oregon



PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

4. Other

None.

5. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment

The next Planning Commission Work Session is September 22, 2026 at 5:00 pm. It will be held at the City of Union City Hall.

CM White adjourns the meeting at 5:59 pm.

Notice: For questions regarding this meeting, please contact City Hall at 541-562-5197.

Signature

Date

City of Union, Oregon

PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes for August 25, 2026 at 6:00pm

Leonard Almquist Chambers located at 342 S. Main Union, OR 97883

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

CM White begins the meeting at 6:00 pm, notes that it is being recorded and requests that everyone silence their cell phones. He invites Commissioners to introduce themselves:

Planning Commissioners present: Brookshire, Droke, Hall, Seale, Steinbeigle, White.

City staff present: Heather Daggett.

Contract Planner: Jean Jancaitis with Plan Ahead Consulting, LLC.

City Council liaison: Trisha Seale.

2. Minutes

CM Hall makes a motion to approve the July 28, 2026 Planning Commission Work Session and Meeting minutes.

CM Steinbeigle seconds the motion.

[CM Brookshire – Yes;
CM Droke – Yes;
CM Hall - Yes;
CM Seale – Yes;
CM Steinbeigle – Yes;
CM White - Yes;

Motion passes 6-0-0]

The July 28, 2026 Planning Commission Work Session and Meeting minutes are approved.

3. New Business

a. FINDINGS MjP#26-02 REED

CM Brookshire makes a motion to approve the Findings Report for MjP#26-02 Reed with the following updates:

- Create a new Finding 1 that details the facts considered when the application was changed from a minor to a major partition.
- Delete the extraneous “I” in paragraph 2 of what is now Finding 2.
- In the “Conditions of Approval” section:

City of Union, Oregon

PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

- Condition 1: Emphasize that the designation of Wapiti Way remains a “Local Road” in the TSP.
- Condition 3: Add “Local Road” standards.
- Condition 4: Remove the duplicate phrase “the applicant shall”.
- Add a condition between Conditions 6 and 7: “As required by Section 152.10(11), the shadow platted lines shall be used to identify dwelling and structure setback requirements of the two new parcels. For example, a new home must be placed on one of the shadow plat lots and abide by the setbacks of that individual shadow platted lot so the development does not preclude further urbanization.

CM Hall seconds the motion.

[CM Brookshire – Yes;
CM Droke – Yes;
CM Hall - Yes;
CM Seale – Yes;
CM Steinbeigle – Yes;
CM White - Yes;

Motion passes 6-0-0]

MjP#26-02 Reed moves to the City Council for consideration of the recommended modifications.

b. COLLEGE BRIDGE

Willard Bertrand requested time on the agenda to discuss the ODOT College Bridge construction. Due to confusion regarding the meeting date, the College Bridge discussion is postponed to the September meeting.

4. Chair and Commissioner Items

a. Land Use Planning
Priorities

Commissioners discuss the need to update the Transportation System Plan (TSP), particularly its road design standards. Commissioners note that some existing standards are too costly for the City to construct and maintain. Commissioners recommend that Council review the document and the road design standards to identify any needed updates and decide whether the City should apply for a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant in 2027 to pay for the needed updates.

CM Brookshire makes a motion to recommend that the City Council review the Transportation System Plan (TSP) because the Planning Commission is finding conflicts between TSP standards and street standards the City is willing and able to accept and maintain. The

City of Union, Oregon



PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

recommendation includes that the Council consider updating the TSP through an ODOT/DLCD grant process.
CM Hall seconds the motion.

[CM Brookshire – Yes;
CM Droke – Yes;
CM Hall - Yes;
CM Seale – Yes;
CM Steinbeigle – Yes;
CM White - Yes;

Motion passes 6-0-0]

Planner Jancaitis will forward to the recommendation to City Council.

b. Commercial Code Update

Commissioner Brookshire recuses himself from the discussion and joins the meeting audience.

Commissioners review the Commercial-zone residential-use amendments that remain under development. The Commission discusses removing the proposed requirement that residential use cease when commercial activity is discontinued and instead researching a commercial vacancy strategy. Commissioners also discuss revisions to the administrative-review checklist. Planner Jancaitis will cross-reference the administrative-review checklist with applicable code provisions and identify areas where additional objective standards may be needed.

c. Minimum Residential Lot Size

Commissioners discuss several approaches for allowing smaller residential lots, including allowing 5,000-square-foot lots through a conditional approval process based on the availability and adequacy of infrastructure.

Planner Jancaitis agrees to develop draft Residential Zone amendments for Commission review that provide options for reducing the minimum lot size from 7,500 square feet to 5,000 square feet.

5. Public Comment

Jodi Seale of 671 West Brian

Jodi Seale comments on draft updates to the Residential Zone that would allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as a permitted use. Overall, she considers some of the proposed standards more restrictive than necessary. First, she requests that a separate water and sewer hookup not be necessary because it can add to construction costs and create a barrier to development. Second, she requests that the proposed maximum ADU size be increased to 900 square feet. Third, she questions the proposed

City of Union, Oregon

PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

requirement that an ADU be at least 25 percent smaller than the primary dwelling. She also questions why the overall code update process takes so long when the rest of the state is mandated to allow Accessory Dwellings. She does appreciate the work that the Commission is doing, but expresses concern about the length of the process, noting her desire to have an ADU available for her 80-year-old mother.

Planner Jancaitis offers that only communities of greater than 2,500 people are required by state law to permit Accessory Dwellings and that the Planning Commission is being proactive with preparing ahead of hitting that population mark. She acknowledges the frustration with the length of the process but emphasizes the importance of public involvement and the City's interest in retaining local control over its development standards.

Commissioners note their appreciation for her feedback.

Seale switches topics to question how the issue of the city limits being outside the urban growth boundary (UGB) is being resolved.

Commissioners and Planner Jancaitis summarize information provided by Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff during a June 30, 2026 meeting (Exhibit B of the July 28, 2026 Meeting Minutes). DLCD staff indicate that having the City limits outside the UGB is atypical but not a concern and does not require a change to the existing boundary configuration. Future Comprehensive Plan and Development Code updates can document the history of the configuration and clarify how land outside the UGB is regulated.

6. Upcoming

Commissioners request that minimum residential lot size be added to the next Work Session agenda and coordinated with the upcoming review of major and minor partition standards and serial partitioning.

7. Next Meeting Date and Adjournment

The next Planning Commission Meeting is September 22, 2026 at 6:00 pm.

CM White adjourns the meeting at 6:39 pm.

For questions regarding this meeting, please contact City Hall at 541-562-5197.

City of Union, Oregon



PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course

Signature

Date

DRAFT

City of Union, Oregon



PO Box 529
342 S. Main Street
Union, OR 97883

Phone: 541-562-5197
Fax: 541-562-5196
www.cityofunion.com

Home to the Buffalo Peak Golf Course
