

FARM, FOREST AND RURAL ECONOMY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
ROOM 126, MULTNOMAH BUILDING
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD. PORTLAND, OR
MAY 27, 2015 3:00-5:00 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

In attendance:

<u>Subcommittee members</u>	<u>Project Team</u>
Aaron Blake	Rich Faith
George Sowder	Rithy Khut
Paula Sauvageau	Kevin Cook
Linden Burk	Matt Hastie

Public: Carol Chesarek, Don Jenkins, Charlie Swindell

II. Home Occupation Policy

A question was posed as to whether this policy should include language that guides the code to say that home occupations shall not have an adverse impact on adjacent uses? After some discussion it was agreed to revise the policy to include language that speaks to no adverse impacts.

Action Item: It was moved and seconded to approve the home occupation policy with the following change (underlined) as the subcommittee's recommendation to the CAC:

Recommendation:

New Policy: Allow for home occupations wherever dwellings are permitted in order to assist in developing new business opportunities and to increase convenience to residents, while considering and minimizing impacts on adjacent land uses.

Approved unanimously.

III. Farm Dwellings Policy

There was discussion about incorporating some of the language from original policy option A3 into the new proposed policy 1 to strengthen it. Including language about limiting new non-agricultural uses and expansion of existing non agricultural uses should be an major element of the County's farm protection program.

Other recommended changes were to delete the words “continued” and “incidental” from the third policy because they are not really needed. Inserting a comma after “prohibit parcelization” in the third policy would clarify that prohibiting parcelization is meant to apply broadly and is not restricted just to situations which detracts from agricultural practices and protection of open spaces.

Action Item: It was moved and seconded to approve the farm dwellings policies with the following changes as the subcommittee’s recommendation to the CAC.

Recommendation:

Policy 1: Insert “Limit new non-agricultural uses, and expansion of existing uses” after the first sentence.

Policy 3: Change as follows: Prohibit parcelization, which detracts from continued agricultural practices and incidental from protection of open spaces and rural community values.

Approved unanimously.

Another comment on this topic was that policy three mentions rural community values and this should be defined. There was much effort as part of the recent Sauvie Island rural area plan process to do that. Rural community values are something that the different communities and areas of the county may want to define differently. This is not necessarily a policy question, but it should be addressed somewhere in the comprehensive plan narrative.

Parking lot item: Defining what rural values are within the comprehensive plan narrative.

IV. Farm Stands Policy

The subcommittee reviewed the policies on farm stands being proposed as part of the Suave Island/Multnomah Channel (SIMC) Rural Area Plan. The policies have not yet been adopted but as now proposed by the Planning Commission, they can serve as the model for the rest of the county.

Major Discussion Points:

- Policy 1.8(b) – Inserting the words “events, such as” after “fee-based” in the second line would clarify that fee-based is not just in reference to weddings, but to all of the event types identified in this policy.
- Where did the promotional activities listed in policy 1.8(a) come from and are there other activities that should be added?
- Where did the “shall not exceed five percent or five acres” in policy 1.3(a)(2) come from?

- What does “may require consideration of alternative site plans” in policy 1.3(a)(5) mean? Does this refer to other properties or just another location on the same property? That should be clarified in the policy.
- If this subcommittee wants to modify the policies from what is proposed in the SIMC plan, how will that be factored in and applied countywide?

Action Item: It was moved and seconded to approve the farm stand policies from the proposed SIMC Plan with the following revisions:

Recommendation:

Policy 1.3(a)(5): Multnomah County may require consideration of alternative site plans for the property that use less agricultural land or interfere less with agricultural operations on adjacent lands.

Policy 1.8(b): Unless authorized at farm stands by statute, administrative rule or an appellate land use decision, fee-based events, such as weddings, corporate retreats, family reunions, anniversary gatherings, concerts, and amusement park rides, and other activities for which the primary focus is on the underlying cause for the gathering or activity rather than the farm operation, are prohibited.

Approved unanimously

V. Forest Dwellings Policy

The discussion mostly centered around whether the policy on forest dwellings should include the same or similar language in the farm dwellings policy. For example, should policy A3 say, as does the farm dwelling policy, that it will result in a protection program that is more restrictive than what state statutes and rules require? Another example is the farm dwelling policy about prohibiting parcelization; shouldn't this also be included for forest dwellings?

If prohibiting parcelization is included as part of the policy, how does that affect the existing policy that allows disaggregation in the East of Sandy area? They contradict one another.

This led to discussion about disaggregation and one of the comprehensive plan update objectives of consolidate multiple zones, such as the five CFU zones, into one if possible. The idea of consolidating zones was the reasoning behind striking CFU-2 in policy B3 so that it becomes a generic policy applicable to any and all CFU zones.

Consolidating all five CFU zones may not be possible because of the differences among them and the reasons behind those differences. Much more discussion is needed if the CFU zones are going to be consolidated into one. It may be necessary to have more than one.

Rich Faith pointed out that in today's meeting packet there is written testimony on the topic of forest dwellings and that the author of that testimony, Charlie Swindell on behalf of his clients, is here. He then asked Mr. Swindell if he wanted to say anything to the subcommittee. He responded that he was here to answer questions if there are any. There were none.

Action Item: A final decision was not reached on how the forest dwellings policy should be changed, but staff agreed to include language in A3 similar to the farm dwellings policy about exceeding state requirements and to include a similar policy about prohibiting parcelization. Staff will also rework policies B2 and B3 to combine them and to reflect other points that were discussed.

VI. Other Farm and Forest Land Policies

Existing Policy Language Related to Farm Lands

The subcommittee discussed these policies with most of the discussion centered on F1, F2 and F3. What do they mean and how are they different? After considerable discussion the committee decided that both F1 and F2 should be retained, making F3 unnecessary.

Action Item: It was moved and seconded to approved the existing policies related to farm lands with the following changes:

- Introduction: Strike the word "essential" from the last line of the first sentence.
- Policy A. Replace the word "permitted" use with "allowed" use to be consistent with how uses are labeled in the development code.
- Policy D. This policy can be deleted because it is already included as a policy under farm dwellings.
- Policy E. Delete the words "any" and "comprehensive".
- Policy F3. Delete.

Approved unanimously.

The committee was not able to complete its discussion of the other existing policies and decided that another meeting was needed to do so. Everyone agreed to set the next meeting for June 24 at 3:00p.m., which is the same day as the next CAC meeting and there is no other subcommittee scheduled for that time.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:15 pm.