

**ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL
STUDY SESSION
MINUTES
May 20, 2024**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Graham called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Mayor Graham and Councilors Hyatt, Dahle, Bloom, Hansen, DuQuenne and Kaplan were present.

II. PUBLIC FORUM

15 minutes – Public input or comment on City business not included on the agenda

III. PDMAC Report

1. PDMAC Report

Brandon Goldman, Director of Community Development, and April Lucas, Development Services Coordinator, provided a presentation of the Development Process Management Advisory Committee (DPMAC) meetings and its recommendations (see attached).

Goldman spoke of this temporary committee's purpose to examine how the development process was working and explore opportunities to improve, streamline, and potentially accelerate planning actions. Kaplan asked about means for public participation in the development process.

Goldman offered two generic project examples. Goldman's first example was annexation into the City. This entails a number of requirements that must be presented and met up front by the applicant. This provides an opportunity for it to be appealed by the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA), which adds time and can be a deterrent for developers. Goldman's second example was the tree removal permit process. After the City receives an application for tree removal, the City sends a notification to residents within 200 feet of the tree for an opportunity to comment within a 14-day waiting period. After the City approves the permit, there is another 10-day waiting period for residents to appeal that decision. These processes provide an opportunity for public input that doesn't exist in other cities.

Bloom asked if there are any penalties for frivolous appeals to LUBA.

Goldman explained with generic examples of reasonable appeals to LUBA and an example from years ago where an appeal to LUBA was found to be an abuse of process and the applicant was able to seek legal fees. This was codified recently into state law: in appeals to LUBA related to affordable or needed housing that are found to have no merit, the applicant can seek reimbursement for legal fees incurred.

Goldman continued his presentation reviewing fee comparisons for development in comparison to other municipalities. Bloom asked why Talent and Phoenix was not included in the fee comparison, and if it would be legal to lower the multi-family development fees and offset that cost with single family and commercial fees. Goldman

responded the City reached out to all the neighboring cities for comparison and was only able to include the information from those that provided it and remains open to new information if provided. Goldman spoke about the fee development methodology for System Development Charges (SDC fees) which includes consideration of system impacts for the related type of development, so SDC's are already less per unit for multi-family versus single family developments. Bloom inquired if the Council could change the fees to subsidize lower SDC's for multi-family units by offsetting cost with higher SDC's for single family units. Goldman responded that the question could be about how to subsidize that, but that SDC's are related to use and impacts.

Hansen asked what the *other fees* category includes and if the City could look at capturing enough revenue with its growth over the next few years to fund something. Goldman broke down some of the *other fees*: the community development fee is 1.1%, and the engineering services fee is 0.85% of the valuation of the building and are within the Council's discretion. The third significant *other fee* is the construction excise tax with the school board which has already been agreed upon. Hansen asked if the city wanted to increase revenue to fund a project, where could it insert fees to do so. Goldman responded that SDC fees are already prescribed from the State. He went on to describe one of the 15 identified housing production strategies was to impose an affordable housing construction excise tax, which would increase the *other fees* section. Hansen asked how other municipalities garnered fees to fund projects such as trails. Goldman explained the City's SDC's are for Water, Sewer, Parks, and Transportation. Goldman expected a trail project would fall under Parks and that Community Development has not explored that.

DuQuenne asked what fairly recently meant for this comparison, and Goldman responded it was the most recently available data which was December of 2022. DuQuenne asked where SDCs go and Goldman responded that the Water, Sewer, and Transportation SDC's go to Public Works for infrastructure. Goldman continued his presentation with *commercial development fees* where the same variations apply regarding costs. Goldman presented the community satisfaction survey distributed to all building permit or planning applicants between March 2018 and December 2022 with 1,200 recipients and 78 respondents using the same survey questions from the 2011 and 2016 surveys. Goldman spoke to his main concern was the turnaround time question and explained this covered the pandemic period where staffing was limited. Hyatt asked if planning could be seen as slow and unresponsive as a result. Hyatt asked if the City sets expectations up front with applicants of the realistic timeline on the various pieces of the process. Goldman spoke that staff is directed to respond within 24 hours, and that most questions are about how to fill out an application, many of which may not be submitted. Once a pre-application is submitted, the applicant is given a timeline with expectations. Goldman explained 95% of applications are approved which indicates staff has done a good job of helping applicants present a complete application that can be approved as opposed to the lengthy process that can result in applications that miss key details. Hyatt spoke of the guide documents to best prepare

applicants for timelines so they don't feel like the process takes longer than it needs to.

Bloom asked about the responses of applicants feeling they were treated differently. Goldman responded this is an opinion survey with no metric to examine if those opinions are valid. Bloom spoke of noticing a more negative perception in 2016. Goldman responded that the 2016 survey included applicants after 2011 up until 2016 which was after the recession when delays were occurring. In 2015 a study was initiated to explore how to have more clarity and responsiveness, and one of the outcomes was a total renewing of the land use code. Goldman spoke this was not in effect during the 2016 survey, and so the gains of positive perception reflected in the 2022 survey could largely be attributed to the work done in 2015.

Dahle thanked staff for their work, and asked for staff's perception on if the public concerns around long timelines for development were due to a lack of understanding of timelines and incomplete applications, or if they were simply too long even with a perfect application. Goldman responded that basic planning applications are approved within weeks. Type I Applications are typically approved within sixty days which includes sending out notices which requires a 30-day wait period. Type II applications are larger commercial developments with a 90–120-day timeline. The Type III applications take longer due to any necessary legislative changes/actions, Commission review, or City Council review due to scheduling challenges involved for those procedures with public meetings. Dahle asked how these timelines stack up against other municipalities, and Goldman said it was comparable.

Kaplan asked if there were metrics in place to measure staff responsiveness. Goldman responded that there are not metrics on initial staff responsiveness to questions, but after applications are received, they are date stamped and entered into the system. Then each step can be tracked for how long it takes from intake until deemed complete, or the time from deemed complete until date issued, etc. The planning software has been an internal means to check responsiveness and requires a phone call from an involved party to the department to check on status. Goldman hopes the new software that went live in February with the new website will prove helpful to the community to check on the permitting status directly. Goldman also explained that after approval there is still the actual building that takes its own time, often years. Graham asked if it was possible to capture small surveys along each step of the timeline rather than asking about the whole process after completion. Graham also asked if the surveys captured the types of responders in order to differentiate the frustration from first-time applicants newly adjusting to the complex permitting process verses the more experienced responders that could indicate more systemic issues. Goldman responded that was certainly worth including.

DuQuenne spoke about the written responses from a changing demographic and asked what the next steps are to the written comments to help streamline the permitting process. Goldman responded that the goal of the group was to meet a certain number of times and report back to the City Manager and did not delve into demographic considerations or suggest next steps for attracting younger families with children. DuQuenne asked if there is going to be follow up for the group to explore meeting those needs. Goldman responded the group that met to address the housing production strategy was intended to address those considerations. DuQuenne spoke of

concern around affordability of fees and of builders and developers encouraged to go to Medford and asked how to address the fees so people want to live here. Graham spoke of multiple groups considering these issues, such as the housing production strategy group, and spoke that the specific charter of this group is to find recommended improvements of the permitting process.

Lucas spoke about the new online permitting tool, the Citizen Self Service Portal and highlighted the program. The portal is live and provides operational transparency to applicants, property owners, and citizens. It offers 24/7 access to permitting, review status, inspections scheduling, and project information. It streamlines permitting, plan review, and record requests. Lucas provided a tour of the online tool which launched February 20, 2024 and has issued over 200 online permits. The department saw a drop with over-the counter permit applications with a majority of users providing positive feedback and preferring the online features. Recommended next steps include expanding the online permitting options to include new single-family homes and ADU's, (Additional Dwelling Units) new multi-family buildings, new commercial buildings, and commercial tenant improvements. Other recommendations include online payment and fee estimate features.

Goldman spoke about the DPMAC recommendations which included enhancing the online process such as explained by Lucas and creating better handouts and guides. Recommendations that require administrative action included creating clear guides in response to changing building occupation limits and the City's traveler's accommodations requirements. Recommendations requiring legislative actions were noted and included increase in density in multi-family zoning, employment opportunities analysis, climate friendly areas, and a manufactured park development zone (see packet). Graham asked Hyatt, as the staff liaison to the Planning Commission, if she wanted to pass along the request for recommendations moving forward. Hyatt spoke the Council as a body would set the direction and if the Council wants input from the Planning Commission that would be reasonable. Graham asked the Council if there were any concerns with bringing those three recommendations that require legislative action back before Council for further review. Cotta reminded Council about the current workplan and the need to keep in mind these can be goals for the 2025-27 biennium. Hyatt spoke of three previous items the Council already asked of the Community Development department: Manufactured housing zoning which is first on the housing production strategy; set plans for Additional Dwelling Units, and Economic Opportunities Analysis with input from the Planning Commission. Goldman spoke of work in progress on Climate Friendly Areas also. Graham asked if staff needed direction with priorities. Goldman clarified the presentation was to inform the Council of the findings and recommendations of the DPMAC and would seek specific staff direction from Council as those items come before Council. Goldman wanted to remind Council that items that require legislative changes will need considerable public involvement. Graham asked if Goldman's staff needed a priority list, and Goldman responded some of these changes would be made concurrently so would be brought to Council at appropriate time.

DuQuenne asked Lucas if the online system was better and Lucas affirmed. Hansen asked if other permits such as event permits could be added to the online portal. Lucas

responded that existing permits such as special event permits already in the EnerGov system can easily be added to the online portal. Dahle asked how far back the records searches go. Lucas respond it goes back to 2018 when the current permitting system was launched. Bloom asked if there were any indications of changes at the state level of Oregon Land Use Law to ease restrictions. Goldman said he only knew of the legislative update he gave earlier. Hyatt asked how best to direct citizens in utilizing the online portal. Lucas affirmed that for general inquires they can use the portal and can still ask questions directly of the department. Goldman added that if people want to comment on a planning action, they should still contact the department for consideration by the Planning Commission.

Public Comment

Craig Anderson/Ashland - spoke he held high regard for the planning department and has worked with planners and staff for many of the 25 years he has lived here. He spoke about a developer who didn't want to build in Ashland due to affordable housing restrictions. He spoke of his concern about the transportation situation around the Grand Terra Project and the Rogue Advocates appeal to Land Use Board of Appeals.

IV. New Website Review

1. New Website Review

Interim City Manager Sabrina Cotta began with the project history on August 15th, 2023, when the Council approved the contract for the Civic Plus website development team. Cotta spoke of the website transformation, Civic Clerk, and See-Click-Fix aspects of the project. The goals of the new website were to update the site, improve navigation for citizens and staff, and transfer records retention from the website to a better platform.

Dorinda Cottle, Communications Officer for the City, spoke of results from the recent communications survey and pointed to the City's website as the number one communications tool with 70% of residents using the site to garner information. Civic Plus was introduced as the vendor that specializes in websites for municipalities, from whom the City purchased three modules that work together: Civic Engage is the main website, Civic Clerk is the public meeting module, and See-Fix-Click is the non-emergency reporting module. The new URL will be ashlandoregon.gov and goes live May 22, 2024. Work on the site began last December by surveying other sites and looking at the analytics of the existing site. Goals for the new site included ease of navigation for users: residents, tourists, and businesses. Cottle provided a sample of site navigation that illustrated how various items can be found in various ways through planned redundancies. Cottle highlighted the Spotlights and City News sections that cover current news and events, the footer with Quicklinks, and the emergency banner at the top that will be used for emergency alerts. Cottle reviewed various ways to find popular searched pages and information including wildfire risk reduction, parks and recreation, and utility billing. Cottle spoke of a recent focus group that included seven residents. Mayor Graham, and Councilors Kaplan and Bloom who provided feedback. The production link was also sent to 60 residents who expressed interest in providing input.

DuQuenne asked if there were links to maps for public art. Cottle spoke to the links on the site where one can find that information and described the public art self-guided

tour in the mapping hub with more self-guided tours coming soon. Bloom spoke about being able to make changes to the site in real-time moving forward for updates and corrections. Hansen asked how the process of implementation went and Cottle responded that it was a big project with about 1500 pages to pare down and was easy to use after learning the platform. Cotta spoke that a website is not simply built and launched, but will be continually changing and how important it is to manage what is added and what is removed.

Graham identified one of the problems with the old site was the search function and asked about its functionality for finding relevant up-to-date information. Cottle responded that the new search feature will work with the agenda and minutes module to pull up information in a chronological order. Graham asked about the Utility Billing module being the same one as used before. Cotta spoke that the finance department is looking for new software in recognition of the difficulty current customers are experiencing. The goal is to integrate new software with the new system when available.

Bloom spoke of how to find archived records in Laserfiche which is searchable, and Cotta explained how Laserfiche is our records retention tool and that information available in the Agenda's and Minutes Module will be searchable moving forward. Alissa Kolodzinski, City Recorder, demonstrated various avenues to access Agendas and Minutes and related materials such as agenda packets. These will be available May 22 moving forward with past information stored in Laserfiche. Graham asked what happens to the archived videos of meetings. Kolodzinski spoke that the City's contract with Rogue Valley Television (RVTV) is for them to hold those for a year. Historically, RVTV has held them for about a year and a half to two years after which the videos are deleted. Graham asked how the City can hold those for as far back as possible for records retention purposes. Kolodzinski responded that options include contracting with RVTV for storage and asking for input from the City's Information and Technology (IT) department. Kaplan asked if a YouTube channel would work for that and Kolodzinski spoke that was also an option. Dahle spoke that the issue is about who owns the data and advocated for the City considering how to retain that ownership. Cotta spoke that by State statute the official records of all meetings are the minutes. Graham spoke that videos were not historically available, but since we have them now and they catch the flavor of the conversation it is worth looking into how to hold on to them. DuQuenne asked if social media would include news about the new website and Cottle affirmed.


Jason Wegner, Director of Innovation and Technology, reviewed the See-Click-Fix reporting tool for non-emergencies and gave an example of how to report a pothole. Staff will be notified immediately, and it will integrate with staff workflow. Kaplan asked if there is a list of submissions that people can see if an issue has already been reported and Wegner affirmed this was under the City's control to include that. Hyatt asked if wildlife sightings could be included in that application, whereas now it can be found under the Maps page to file a report. Wegner spoke this was reasonable and could look into how to implement that. The planned roll out of options includes potholes first to see how it goes, then adding streetlight outages, graffiti, and other code compliance concerns one at a time. Kaplan commented that finding the report button was unclear and asked about integrating Near Miss Data. Cotta affirmed all aspects of the website will be monitored and adjusted as necessary as a living document and

thanked all the staff that made it happen. Wegner commented on the move to a .gov domain which recognizes the City as a government entity. Dahle asked if this would mean e-mail addresses would change which Wegner confirmed adding that the old addresses would still send to the new ones during the transition. Graham reiterated the importance of the public being able to efficiently find information on its City's website, and thanked staff for moving this forward.

V. ADJOURNMENT


Meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:



City Recorder Alissa Kolodzinski

Attest:



Mayor Tonya Graham



Development Process Management Advisory Committee (DPMAC) Report

City Council
May 20, 2024

Introduction to the DPMAC

Committee Overview:

- Temporary committee appointed by the City Manager of Ashland.

Composition:

- Includes planners, architects, developers, and real estate professionals.

Primary Objectives:

- Streamline the development process.
- Ensure compliance with Oregon State Law and local participation goals.

Operational Focus:

- Evaluate and recommend ways to accelerate administrative and Type I/II planning actions.
- Identify and modify cumbersome or conflicting development codes.



Committee Composition

Members appointed by the City Manager

- Christopher Brown - Architect
- Brian Druhet - Catherine Rowe Real Estate Team
- Dan Jovick - Builder
- Kerry KenCairn - Planning Commission and Landscape Architect/Planner
- Ray Kistler - Architect
- Jim McNamara - SOU
- Matt Small - Architect
- Ben Treiger- Builder

Staff participants:

- Brandon Goldman, Community Development Director
- April Lucas, Development Services Coordinator
- Steven Matiaco, Building Official
- Derek Severson, Planning Manager



DPMAC Meetings

October 18, 2023

- Discussion of committee objectives.
- Consideration of demographic shifts in Ashland.
- Examination of 2022 Community Development Customer Satisfaction Survey findings.

November 29, 2023

- Review of building permit fee comparisons across various jurisdictions.
- Presentation and beta testing feedback on the Permit Self Service portal.
- Discussion on Types of Land Use Actions and their efficiency.

March 6, 2024

- Updates on the city's planning and development processes.
- Further discussions on streamlining development processes through digital tools.
- Recommendations on simplifying planning actions and administrative processes.

April 24, 2024

- Review and finalize the committee's recommendations.
- Final discussions on the impact of the Citizen Self Service portal and other improvements.
- Preparation of report to the City Manager.



Key Challenges in Ashland's Development Process

- Perception of Ashland in the development community
- High applicant legal costs
- Neighborhood opposition leading to delays
- Need for clearer and more predictable processes



Fee Comparisons

- Comparison of Ashland's fees with other jurisdictions
- City development fees were not seen as a substantial deterrent to new development.



NEW SINGLE FAMILY
2,000 sq. ft. house w/ 500 sq. ft. garage
\$269,070 Valuation

- Building Permit
- SDCs
- Other Fees



Fee Comparisons – Single Family

7

NEW MULTI-FAMILY
10 units, 8000 sq. ft.
\$868,880 Valuation

- Building Permit
- SDCs
- Other Fees




Fee Comparisons – Multi Family

8

NEW COMMERCIAL OFFICE

30,000 sq. ft.

\$3,639,600 Valuation



Fee Comparisons - Commercial

9

Community Satisfaction Survey

(DPMAC reviewed survey results)




- Recipients included all individuals applying for a Building Permit or Planning Action between Mach 2018 and December 2022.
- 1,200 Recipients / 78 respondents
- Same Survey Questions from 2011 & 2016
- Highlights key areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among respondents
- Written responses provide direct feedback from respondents



10

(1) When making an application, I have generally found the Community Development staff to be responsive and helpful.

(2) In general, the staff has dealt with me in a professional and positive manner, providing options where available, and attempting to help me navigate through the process.





Community Satisfaction Survey Results

11



(3) Ashland is just as fair, consistent, and practical in its application of regulations as other neighboring cities or counties

(4) Application review turnaround time is acceptable. I did not have to wait an excessive amount of time to get back plans or find out about problems that needed to be corrected.



Community Satisfaction Survey Results

12




(12) I found the handouts supplied by the City to be useful and informative in explaining the requirements I must meet for approval



Community Satisfaction Survey Results

13



Was your application ultimately approved?



Community Satisfaction Survey Results

14

Survey Insights

Survey Highlights:

- Improvements in staff responsiveness, professionalism, and process quality.
- Positive trends observed from 2016 to 2022.

Improvement Strategies:

- Maintain high standards and ethics in staff conduct.
- Enhance clarity and response times in permit processing.
- Improve departmental communication with coordinated reviews.
- Create user guides for clearer application processes.



Community Satisfaction Survey Results

15

Enhancements to Online Permitting

- Introduction of the Citizen Self Service portal
- Online permitting now live
- Plans for future enhancements



16



Program Highlights

Provides operational transparency to applicants, property owners, and citizens.

Improves customer experience by offering 24/7 access to permitting, review status, inspection scheduling, and project information.

Streamlines permitting, plan review, and record requests by providing users quick, intuitive, self-service access for achieving their needs.

Enhancements to Online Permitting

17



Program Highlights

APPLICANT/CONTRACTOR FEATURES

- Apply for Permits/Plans
- Monitor Review Status
- Review fees prior to payment collection
- Submit revisions or Resubmit documents with corrections
- Request inspections
- Real-time access to inspection results

Enhancements to Online Permitting

18



Program Highlights

ONLINE BUILDING APPLICATIONS

- Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Structural Permits
- Renewable Energy Systems
- Residential Remodels, Additions, and Decks
- Grading & Excavation Permits
- Fire Alarm, Fire Sprinkler, and Fire Suppression Systems

Enhancements to Online Permitting

19



Program Highlights

ONLINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- Sign Permits
- Fence Permits
- New Addresses
- Pre-Application Conferences
- Zoning Permits (sheds, lot line adjustments, land use approval extensions, administrative actions)

Enhancements to Online Permitting

20



Program Highlights

ONLINE PUBLIC WORKS APPLICATIONS

- Right-of-Way Closures
- Street & Alley Excavations
- Miscellaneous Concrete Permits

Enhancements to Online Permitting

21



Citizen Self Service
Planning & Building Permits
Community Development Department

Good Afternoon, Guest •

Home Apply Today's Inspections Map Fee Estimator Search Q Calendar

Welcome to Self Service

Search Public Records This tool can be used to search for existing permits, plans, and inspections.	Apply This tool can be used to apply for a building permit or planning permit.	Login or Register Login to an existing or create a new account. You can also find help if you forgot your login information.	Estimate Fees Use this tool to quickly estimate the required fees for a permit or plan. "SDCs not included in estimate"
Map Search parcels and tax lots.	Calendar Click here to find out about certain events like holidays and public hearings.	Application Forms Download and complete required application forms.	Request Inspection Click here to request an inspection on an existing record.

Need Help? Call the Community Development Department at (541) 488-5305 or TTY at (800) 735-2900

Enhancements to Online Permitting

22



Apply for Permit - Building: Commercial Electrical *REQUIRED

1 Locations 2 Type 3 Contacts 4 Materials 5 Attachments 6 Review and Submit

LOCATIONS
Provide the location where the project will take place.

Location

Add Location

+

REQUIRED

SEARCH

51 WINBURN WY

Select All

51 WINBURN WY
Parcel: 391E09BB14800

51 WINBURN WY
Parcel: 391E09BB14800
Zoom to + Add

Enhancements to Online Permitting

23



1 Locations 2 Type 3 Contacts

PERMIT DETAILS
Describe the basics of your project.

* Permit Type: Building: Commercial Electrical

* Description

Back Create Template

1 Locations 2 Type 3 Contacts

CONTACTS
Property Owner and Applicant are required.

Applicant

City of Ashland
April Lucas (You)
51 Winburn Way, Ashland, OR
. 97520

Select Type

Add Contact

+

Enhancements to Online Permitting

24



✓

Locations

✓

Type

✓

Contacts

4

More Info

5

Attachments

6

Review and Submit

MORE INFO

Please answer these key questions about your project.

General Info [Next Section | Top | Main Menu](#)

Description

Electrical [Previous Section | Top | Main Menu](#)

Temporary Pole ☐

Branch Circuits with Service

Branch Circuits without Service

Enhancements to Online Permitting

25



✓

Locations

✓

Type

✓

Contacts

✓

More Info

5

Attachments

6

Review and Submit

Attachments

Attach supporting documentation (if applicable)

Select Type

Add Attachment

+

Supported: pdf, jpg, png, jpeg, doc, docx, xls, xlsx

✓

Locations

✓

Type

✓

Contacts

✓

More Info

✓

Attachments

6

Review and Submit

Submit

Locations

Location 51 WINBURN WY Ashland Oregon 97520

Parcel Number 391E09B814800

Basic Info

Type Building: Commercial Electrical

Description Test

Applied Date 11/27/2023

Contacts

Enhancements to Online Permitting

26



Dashboard Home Apply My Work Today's Inspections Map Fee Estimator Search Q Calendar

My Permits

Attention	Pending	Active	Recent	Draft
2	1	4	2	0
Building Permits	Building Permits	Building Permits	Building Permits	
Building Permits		Building Permits	Building Permits	

[View My Permits](#)

My Plans

Attention	Pending	Active	Recent	Draft
0	1	1	0	0
	Planning App Permits	Plan Reviews		

[View My Plans](#)

My Inspections

Requested	Scheduled	Closed
0	0	2
Building Permits		Building Permits
Building Permits		Building Permits

[View My Inspections](#)

My Invoices

Current	0	\$0.00
Past Due	0	\$0.00
Total	0	\$0.00

[View My Invoices](#)

Enhancements to Online Permitting

27



Citizen Self Service
Planning & Building Permits
Community Development Department

Good Afternoon, **City of Ashland** •

Dashboard Home Apply **My Work** Today's Inspections Map Fee Estimator Search Q Calendar

My Work

MY INVOICES **MY PERMITS** MY PLANS MY EXISTING INSPECTIONS REQUEST INSPECTIONS

Search... [Export to Excel](#)

Display All Records Updated In Last 120 Days

Permit Number	Project	Address	Permit Type	Status	State
ELEC-2023-01194		51 WINBURN WY Ashland, ...	Building: Residential Electrical	Issued	Active, Recent
PLUMB-2023-00874		51 WINBURN WY Ashland, ...	Building: Residential Plumbing	Issued	Active, Recent

Enhancements to Online Permitting

28











Citizen Self Service
Planning & Building Permits
Community Development Department

Good Afternoon, Guest

Home Apply Today's Inspections Map Fee Estimator Search Calendar

Welcome to Self Service



Need Help? Call the Community Development Department at (541) 488-5305 or TTY at (800) 735-2900

Enhancements to Online Permitting

29



Citizen Self Service
Planning & Building Permits
Community Development Department

Good Afternoon, Guest

Home Apply Today's Inspections Map Fee Estimator Search Calendar

Public Information

Search: All for Exact Phrase

Need Help? Call the Community Development Department at (541) 488-5305 or TTY at (800) 735-2900

Enhancements to Online Permitting

30



Citizen Self Service
Planning & Building Permits
Community Development Department

Good Afternoon, Guest •

Home Apply Today's Inspections Map Fee Estimator Search Q Calendar

Welcome to Self Service



Search Public Records

This tool can be used to search for existing permits, plans, and inspections.



Apply

This tool can be used to apply for a building permit or planning permit.



Login or Register

Login to an existing or create a new account. You can also find help if you forgot your login information.



Estimate Fees

Use this tool to quickly estimate the required fees for a permit or plan. *SDCs not included in estimate



Map

Search parcels and tax lots.



Calendar

Click here to find out about certain events like holidays and public hearings.



Application Forms

Download and complete required application forms.




Request Inspection

Click here to request an inspection on an existing record.

Need Help? Call the Community Development Department at (541) 486-5305 or TTY at (800) 735-2900

Enhancements to Online Permitting

31



Enhancements to Online Permitting

32



Home Dashboard View Apply My Work Today's Inspections Calendar Map

Address & Parcel Search

Results: 530 Locations

[View Records](#)

Locations

Records

☐ Select All

☐ 391E09AA1600	Parcel: 391E09AA1600
☐ 391E09AA1605	Parcel: 391E09AA1605
☐ 391E09AA1613	Parcel: 391E09AA1613
☐ 391E09AA2218	Parcel: 391E09AA2218
☐ 391E09AA2600	Parcel: 391E09AA2600
☐ 391E09AA9000	Parcel: 391E09AA9000
☐ 391E09AA8700	Parcel: 391E09AA8700
☐ 391E09AA9000	Parcel: 391E09AA9000

Case Number
BD-NR-2022-00179

Apply Date
2/11/2022

Case Type
Building (Non-Residential) - New

Status
Void

Case Number
BD-NR-2022-00206

Apply Date
5/11/2022

Case Type
Building (Non-Residential) - Tenant Improvement

Status
Finalized

Enhancements to Online Permitting

33



Permit Number: BD-NR-2020-00087

[Permit Details](#) | [Tab Elements](#) | [Main Menu](#)

Type:	Building (Non-Residential) - Tenant Improvement	Status:	Finalized
Applied Date:	04/15/2020	Issue Date:	06/10/2020
District:		Expire Date:	03/17/2021
Square Feet:	0.00	Valuation:	\$174,000.00
Description:		Finalized Date:	09/18/2020

[Summary](#) | [Locations](#) | [Fees](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Inspections](#) | [Attachments](#) | [Contacts](#) | [Sub-Records](#) | [More Info](#)

Progress



Fees

Workflow

- Confirm application complete - Passed: 04/15/2020
- Department Reviews - Passed: 04/17/2020
- Fee collection - Passed: 06/10/2020
- Issue Permit - Passed: 06/10/2020
- Certificate of Occupancy

Available Actions


No Actions

Enhancements to Online Permitting

34



- Portal Launch Date: February 20, 2024
- 10 "Beta" Testers to 130 Active Users
- Over-the-Counter permit applications have dropped with majority preferring to use online features
- Issued 200+ online permits
- Overwhelmingly positive response from users




Enhancements to Online Permitting

35



Online Permitting Next Steps

- Expand Online Permitting Options
 - New Single-Family Homes & ARU's
 - New Multi-Family Buildings
 - New Commercial Buildings
 - Commercial Tenant Improvements
- Activate Online Payment Features
- Activate Fee Estimate Feature



Enhancements to Online Permitting

36

DPMAC Recommendations Streamlining

- Enhancing online access
- Better handouts /guides
 - Accessory Dwelling Units
 - Change in commercial occupancy
 - Traveler Accommodations

Administrative Actions Underway

- Online Permitting Enhancements
- ADU guide and plan availability
- Commercial Occupancy Guide and Building Permit guides.



Next Steps

Future Legislative Actions

(* to be considered through annual PC and Council goal setting for 2025-2027 Biennium)

- Density Increases in Multifamily Zones
 - *Housing Production Strategy Action 2027-2028*
- Planning Application approval extensions (*2025)
- Subdivision thresholds for Outline and Final Plan (*2025)
- Solar access standards within subdivisions(*2025)
- Fence Permit requirement amendments
- Tree Permit Requirements
- Maximum Permitted Floor Area in Historic Districts
- Hillside Lands evaluation of man-made grades.

* Land Use changes require Planning Commission or City Council initiation , Public Hearings, and Ordinance review and approval



QUESTIONS?

