Topic: Accessory Dwellings

What’s the issue?

- There is a growing interest among NSA residents in renting out accessory buildings or rooms in existing residences as short-term or vacation rentals as a means of supplemental income generation.

- There is some concern that allowing accessory dwellings in the NSA would have negative impacts to resources in the gorge.

- The standards for Bed and Breakfast Inns in the Management Plan can be restrictive to landowners who wish to rent rooms in their residence on a daily or weekly basis.

What the Management Plan currently says:

- The Management Plan does not permit occupancy in accessory buildings. The Plan does not allow accessory dwelling units (attached or detached). Dwelling units are defined in the Plan as: “A single unit designed for occupancy by one family and having not more than one cooking area or kitchen.”

- The Plan typically allows only one single family dwelling per parcel, except for unique circumstances including hardship dwellings, life estates, a dwelling for farm operator’s relative, agricultural labor housing, or duplexes in Rural Center land use designations.

- The Plan does not allow short-term rentals but does allow Bed and Breakfast Inns in Rural Center and Commercial land use designations, in 5-acre Residential and 10-acre Residential designations, and in historic dwellings in other areas.

Input we’ve received:

- Allowing short-term, vacation rentals in the NSA would allow landowners to have a means of supplemental income without having to satisfy the requirements of a Bed and Breakfast.

- Vacation rentals, aside from bed and breakfasts, should not be allowed in the NSA.

- The Plan should explicitly allow or deny accessory dwelling units.

- Accessory dwelling units, if allowed, should only be permitted in the Rural Center land use designation.

Questions we’re considering based on input:

1. Are the policies and standards for Bed and Breakfast Inns still relevant and protecting resources?

2. Should accessory dwelling units be allowed as a means of income generation in the NSA if they comply with resource protection guidelines? (Accessory buildings are limited in size, so the consideration is to change use rather than allow for additional development on any one parcel.)
What’s the issue?

• Interest and popularity of hosting commercial activities on agricultural land has increased.

• There is a desire to expand the allowed review uses on agricultural land to include a wider variety of commercial facilities and events.

• There is concern that commercial uses on agricultural land is changing the character of agricultural lands in the National Scenic Area.

What the Management Plan currently says:

• The Management Plan allows commercial events a review use on most agricultural lands in the GMA in conjunction with a lawful winery, wine sales/tasting room, bed and breakfast inn, existing commercial use, or historic dwelling. The Plan does not regulate noise and traffic.

• Fruit and produce stands may be allowed in certain land use designations, upon a showing that sales will be limited to agricultural products raised on the subject farm and other farms in the local region.

Input we’ve received:

• Expand the allowed review uses on agricultural lands to include uses such as cideries, distilleries, concerts, food sales, farm dinners, and bike tours.

• Allowing for more and different value-added uses on agricultural lands supports economic development by allowing landowners alternative income generation from their land.

• Agricultural lands should be used strictly for agricultural activities, not for commercial use.

• Restrict size and parking allowances for farm stands.

• Address cumulative impacts on resources and communities and neighbors of all the new vineyards, wineries and commercial events allowed in the NSA.

Questions we’re considering based on input:

1. Should we allow and regulate cideries and distilleries in a manner similar to wineries?

2. Are the current standards for commercial events and uses on agricultural land sufficient to support agri-tourism?

3. How can the allowances for fruit and produce stands be expanded to include other farm-raised and value-added products produced on the subject farm and other farms in the local region?

4. Are the current standards for commercial events adequate for resource protections?
What’s the issue?

- The Gorge Commission wants to support renewable energy production, recognizing the need to consider climate change in the National Scenic Area today and in the future.

- Solar panels and some wind turbines are currently allowed as review uses in the National Scenic Area, but the Management Plan does not explicitly address solar and wind power structures and generation.

What the Management Plan currently says:

- The Management Plan does not address wind and solar energy production. However, solar arrays and wind turbines of some form have been allowed in all counties in the National Scenic Area as “structures” if stand-alone, and as “additions” if attached to a structure.

Input we’ve received:

- Many people are in favor of allowing solar in some capacity for both residential and agricultural uses, if it is demonstrated that:
  
  - The project meets all Scenic, Natural, Cultural and Recreational resource protection guidelines.
  
  - The project is only generating the power necessary for the primary use (residential or agriculture)

Questions we’re considering based on input:

1. How can we incorporate clear standards in the Plan that to allow solar and wind energy systems as an accessory use, if they:
   
   - Only produce energy necessary for the primary use (residential or agricultural), and
   
   - Adhere to resource protection guidelines (Scenic, Natural, Cultural, Recreational)?
What’s the issue?

- The Management Plan allows wineries in certain land use designations in conjunction with onsite viticulture, upon a showing that processing of wine is from grapes grown on the subject farm or in the local region.

- There is some concern that the current rules make it too easy to establish a winery and tasting room, and that the term “local region” is too vague.

- There are also concerns about the environmental impacts of an increasing popularity of vineyard development in the National Scenic Area.

What the Management Plan currently says:

- The Management Plan allows wineries in certain land use designations in conjunction with onsite viticulture, upon a showing that processing of wine is from grapes grown on the subject farm or in the local region.

- Wine sales/Tasting rooms are allowed as review uses in conjunction with an on-site vineyard.

Input we’ve received:

- There is general concern about the cumulative effects of wineries and tasting rooms across the National Scenic Area on scenic and natural resources.

- The Management Plan needs to strengthen rules regarding local appellation and the amount of on-site or local grapes used for production.

Define what is meant by “local region” in the Management Plan’s allowance of wineries: “in conjunction with onsite viticulture, upon a showing that processing of wine is from grapes grown on the subject farm or in the local region.”

- Explicitly address natural and scenic impacts of vineyards- what’s the vision for them in the NSA?

Questions we’re considering based on input:

1. Should there be additional size and location limits or standards for vineyards and wineries in the Gorge?

2. What voluntary programs and technical assistance for landowners should the Commission support?

3. How could “local region” be better defined to ensure that local wineries are only producing wine made with grapes grown in the area? What is “local” enough?”