

AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

91136 N Willamette St, Coburg, OR

541-682-7852 | coburgoregon.org

Wednesday, July 17, 2024 at 6:00 PM

The public may attend this meeting at City Hall or via Zoom. To participate via Zoom, you must pre-register with the City by 3 PM the day of the meeting. Council meetings are recorded and live-streamed at www.coburgoregon.org (NO registration required). For questions, contact the City Recorder, Sammy Egbert, at sammy.egbert@ci.coburg.or.us or 541-682-7852.

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes for Approval: March 20, 2024; April 17th, 2024 & May 15th, 2024

AGENDA REVIEW

PUBLIC COMMENT

(Five minute limit unless extended time approved prior to meeting. Comments on Public Hearing items are done during the Hearing)

COMMISSION BUSINESS

2. DLCD Land Use & Master Planned Development Training

UPDATES & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

ADJOURNMENT

The City of Coburg will make reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities. Please notify City Recorder 72 hours in advance at 541-682-7852 or <u>sammy.egbert@ci.coburg.or.us</u>

All Council meetings are recorded and retained as required by ORS 166-200-0235.



MINUTES Planning Commission Meeting April 07, 2024 at 6:00pm Coburg City Hall 91136 N Willamette Street

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Bell; Chair, John Marshall, Jerry Behney, William Wood (via Zoom)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Seth Clark; Vice Chair, Jonathan Derby, Marissa Doyle,

STAFF/GUESTS PRESENT: Adam Hanks; City Administrator, John Lehmann; City Council Liaison

RECORDED BY: Madison Balcom; Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Jim Bell opened the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Chair Bell called roll. A quorum was present.

AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There were no requests to publicly speak and no written statements had been received.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

a. Willamette Forks Extension Request

Mr. Bell said they had some good discussion about this last meeting but had some questions from the requesting party, and some questions for the City regarding legal issues.

Mr. Hanks mentioned that the staff report included in the packet gives a brief summary of last meeting's discussion on this topic and also includes an updated exchange with the applicant in Attachment A with some more provided information from the applicant.

Mr. Bell explained that he had a conversation with Mr. Hanks about not needing legal counsel for this issue as long as they meet the criteria for extension. Mr. Bell said he felt they got a better reason for the delay in construction for the project.

Mr. Hanks summarized the four criteria for granting extensions and the extension timeframe.

Mr. Marshall asked if staff felt happy with the reason for extension that was provided. Mr. Hanks said yes overall, and the financing and contracting issues are pretty common, and believes the six month extension is enough time to give commission the ability to accommodate but doesn't stretch it out too far.

Mr. Lehmann asked if the change of use between the original and the extension request would count as a modification. Mr. Bell said no, it would not. Mr. Lehmann then asked if they would be allowed to get an OLCC license, and Mr. Hanks said they could if they needed or wanted.

Mr. Behney mentioned that it seemed like it would leave an opening for primary and accessory uses, and asked how they would make sure it is used how it was first intended. Mr. Hanks said they are only allowed to use it how it was intended in the original request. The wording listed in the extension request does not change or impact the original approval.

Mr. Lehmann asked if there was a completion date requirement. Mr. Hanks said that if they do not see any activity before September, the end of the extension, the applicant would have to start the whole application process over again. If they do initiate activity on the project, the building permit activity will continue to extend the timeframe as long as they're active.

Mr. Behney asked if there was any way they could advise the applicant to attend a Planning Commission meeting so they could ask more questions. Mr. Hanks said it might be helpful but they cannot base their decision off of whether they attended or not.

MOTION

Commissioner Marshall moved, seconded by Commissioner Wood to approve the Willamette Forks Extension Request.

Motion passed — 4:0.

UPDATES & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. City Administration Report | Information Only

- The City Administrator Report covers precise event details and data on department statistics for the Police, Municipal, Planning and Building and Public Works.
- Updates have been provided on City Projects, Grants, Programs, Franchise Agreements and the League of Oregon Cities (LOC).
- Upcoming Events
- Priority Projects and Task Lists

Mr. Bell asked how the City is doing with the water system projects. Mr. Hanks said a Council work session was held in September on the topic and an upcoming work session is scheduled for July for an update on the Water System. Hanks noted that progress continues on the well #3 project. With the well piping and pump in place, work has begun on the well house, the SDADA electronic control systems, the treatment housing and equipment and the transmission line to connect the well to the City's distribution system.

The loan that funds these projects has roughly \$2 million left and the completion of the well #3 systems will deplete much of those funds. Staff is hopeful that two additional projects will be able to be completed with the remainder of the loan funds and will have a better sense of the remaining funds once the transmission line project is put out to bid in the fall.

There was also discussion about the potential need for a longer-term water supply solution since well #3 didn't result in producing as much water as hoped/expected. Hanks noted that staff will be discussing that at the July work session and will include the concept of re-visiting a regional water connection as one of the long term options for future water supply to serve both the newly annexed light industrial property on the east side of I-5 as well as the incremental residential growth that is expected over the next 10-20 + years.

AD	00	RNMENT	
Ch	air∣	ell adjourned the Planning Commission Regular Meeting at 6:49 p.m.	
AP 20		VED by the Planning Commission of the City of Coburg on this day of	_

Jim Bell, Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder



MINUTES Planning Commission Meeting March 20, 2024 at 6:00pm Coburg City Hall 91136 N Willamette Street

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Bell; Chair, Seth Clark; Vice Chair, John Marshall, Jonathan Derby, Marissa Doyle, Jerry Behney

MEMBERS ABSENT: William Wood

STAFF/GUESTS PRESENT: Megan Winner; Planning Director, John Lehmann; City Council Liaison

RECORDED BY: Madison Balcom; Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER Chair, Jim Bell opened the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL Chair Bell called roll. A quorum was present.

AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There were no requests to publicly speak and no written statements had been received.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM:

a. December 20, 2023

MOTION

Commissioner Clark moved, seconded by Commissioner Derby to approve the December 20, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting minutes as presented.

Motion passed — 5:0.

b. February 21, 2024

MOTION

Commissioner Marshall moved, seconded by Commissioner Behney to approve the February 21, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting minutes as presented.

Motion passed -5:0.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

a. Extension Request: Willamette Forks Site Review (SR 01-22)

Ms. Winner reported that this approval was for a Restaurant and Brewery at 91032 South Willamette Street. This was a site review application that was approved concurrently with a conditional use permit in February 2023, which was approved by the Planning Commission. The official final date for approval was March 10th, after the appeal period ended. Site review approvals are good for 1 year, meaning that approval expired on March 10, 2024. The Planning commission received a letter from the applicant requesting an extension, following the procedures outlined in the development code for seeking an extension for a site review.

Ms. Winner informed the Planning Commission of the criteria used in an extension request;

- 1. No changes are made to the original site design review plan
- 2. Applicant can show intent to initiate construction on the site within the 6 month extension period
- 3. There have been no changes to the applicable code prevision on which the approval was based
- 4. Applicant demonstrates that failure to obtain building permits and substantially begin construction within 1 year of site design approval was beyond the applicants control

Ms. Winner said that the applicant submitted a response in the letter included in the packet.

Mr. Marshall explained that he would like to see more evidence and detail as to why the circumstances were beyond the applicant's control.

Mr. Marshall also wondered if the change from "Restaurant & Brewery" to "Bakery, General Store & Restaurant" would be considered a change in the original approved site design plan.

Mr. Bell wondered what past practice has been for granting these kinds of extensions. He would like to get a legal consult from LCOG on the practices and ramifications of granting extensions in Lane County and other cities.

Mr. Bell asked if the property is a National Registered Historic Place. Ms. Winner said it is considered a contributing property to the National Historic District, but she's wasn't sure if it is individually listed.

Ms. Doyle asked if the applicant had submitted for building permits. Ms. Winner said no.

Mr. Bell clarified that the applicants request was submitted before the March 10th, 2024 deadline. Ms. Winner said it was submitted before then. Mr. Bell asked how long they have to address this. Ms. Winner said she is not sure which type of Land Use Action this would fall under, but if it were the same as the Type 3 Site Review Application, it would be 120 days.

Mr. Clark hoped the applicant would be at the meeting so they could ask questions, and also agrees with possibly getting a legal consult on these situations.

Mr. Derby adds on by saying that he believes, by the title and use provided on the extension request, that the original approval has changed and it would require a new permit application.

Mr. Marshall asked if they grant the extension, would they be able to make additional conditions. Ms. Winner said she does not think so. Winner mentioned that this extension is a maximum of 6 months, and no further extensions would be allowed after that time is up.

The commissioners agree that they need more clarification regarding Criteria D, and the discrepancy in the property's use, from the applicant in writing or in person at a meeting.

MOTION

Commissioner Marshall moved, seconded by Commissioner Derby to request further explanation, evidence and testimony from the applicant and to request a legal consult on what kind of precedence they are setting by approving these extensions.

Motion passed — 5:0.

b. Comprehensive Plan Review: Goals 3 & 4

Ms. Winner presented a report of goals 3 & 4, and provides further detail on Goal 3: Agricultural Lands.

Mr. Bell mentioned that EFU has its own set of categories; high vs. low value, and the only way that is settled is in court. He gives some examples on what is often considered high & low value.

In the packet, under Goal 3, there is the LCDC statewide goal; "to preserve and maintain agricultural lands...", along with the Coburg objective; "to retain the agricultural use of land in those areas where the SCS's Soil Suitability Classification indicates that it is the highest and best use", and a variety of policies that support the agricultural land surrounding the community.

Mr. Bell asked how a town could grow if it were completely surrounded on all four sides by EFU. Ms. Winner explained that there is an Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Analysis Process that considers alternate locations of where the expansion takes place, considering the soil and its use, and looks at where it makes most sense for the City to grow. Ms. Winner explains Goal 4: Forest Lands and provides further detail.

In the packet, under Goal 4, there is the LCDC statewide goal; "to conserve forest land for forest use", along with the Coburg objective; "to conserve forest lands existing within the City and its area of influence as shown on map 6".

Mr. Behney asked what the "area of influence" is. Ms. Winner said she would have to do more research to understand exactly how the parameter was decided.

Mr. Bell asked if Lane County Planning has any routine meetings or discussions with Coburg Planning. Ms. Winner said not unless there something happening that would impact the other jurisdiction.

UPDATES & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. March City Administration Report | Information Only

- The City Administrator Report covers precise event details and data on department statistics for the Police, Municipal, Planning and Building and Public Works.
- Updates have been provided on City Projects, Grants, Programs, Franchise Agreements and the League of Oregon Cities (LOC).
- Upcoming Events
- Priority Projects and Task Lists

Mr. Bell asked if the Transportation Safety Ad-Hoc Committee was still meeting. Megan said March 28th will be their third meeting.

Mr. Marshall said the committee has had lots of discussion about the Van Duyn & Willamette St intersection to try to come up with possible solutions to improve that intersection, along with some parking issues. They will soon get into speed limits, stop signs and crosswalks as well.

Mr. Derby asked about the process and previsions if the school wanted to update and fix their sign, without changing any dimensions or placement. Ms. Winner said the sign is a legal nonconforming sign, and is currently grandfathered in. Once it is replace or fixed, it will have to come into compliance with the new sign requirements. There could be a pathway for the school to demonstrate why the traditional residential standards should not be applied because the school has a different hardship.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bell adjourned the Planning Commission Regular Meeting at 6:54 p.m.

APPROVED by the Park Tree Citizen Advisory Committee of the City of Coburg on this _____ day of _____ 2024.

Jim Bell, Commission Chair

ATTEST: ______ Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder





MINUTES Planning Commission Meeting May 15, 2024 at 6:00pm Coburg City Hall 91136 N Willamette Street

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Bell; Chair, Seth Clark; Vice Chair, William Wood (via Zoom), Marissa Doyle

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Marshall, Jerry Behney, Jonathan Derby

STAFF/GUESTS PRESENT: Megan Winner; Planning Director

RECORDED BY: Madison Balcom; Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Jim Bell opened the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Planning Director, Megan Winner called roll. A quorum was present.

AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There were no requests to publicly speak and no written statements had been received.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

a. Comprehensive Plan Review: Goals 5 & 6

Ms. Winner said they have been slowly reviewing the comprehensive plan and statewide planning goals, and tonight they will look at goals 5 and 6.

Ms. Winner provides a report on each of these goals, along with some of the processes that happen to reach these goals and objectives.

In the packet, under Goal 5, the LCDC statewide goal is; "to conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources", along with the Coburg objective; "to protect, restore and enhance open space, scenic and historic areas, and to promote a healthy and visually attractive environment in harmony with the natural landscape", and a variety of policies that support it.

Mr. Bell asked if LCDC ever considered protecting an open space for future resource development like wind or solar farms. Ms. Winner said that the state considers it in similar ways to the other planning goals. The development may mean that some of the goals are in conflict, and becomes a conflict of which gets priority and makes the most sense. Winner stated that possibly looking at agricultural lands that may be able to produce energy in a way that supports the states clean energy goals, might be something the state might be open to.

Mr. Bell asked if the City ever discovered Native American sites in the urban growth boundary, is there any requirement to protect those sites. Ms. Winner said yes, the appropriate state authorities would come perform an assessment and determine an appropriate level of securing and preserving the site.

Ms. Winner explains Goal 6: Air, Water and Land Resource Quality and provides further detail.

In the packet, under Goal 6, the LCDC statewide goal is; "to maintain and improve the quality of the air, water and land resources of the state", along with the Coburg objective; "to insure the continued quality of air, water and land resources within the City and its area of influence".

Mr. Bell asked if Coburg's comprehensive plan was any more specific that what Ms. Winner is reading. Ms. Winner said that what she is presenting is the Coburg Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Bell asked how Coburg maintains and meets this goal as a city. Ms. Winner said that it can be challenging, they work with their partners, like LRAPA, who are responsible for monitoring the air quality in the region, and handle the complaints that are received regarding it.

Mr. Clark asked if the City complies with regional air quality regulations or do they set their own regulations regarding air quality pollution. Ms. Winner said they follow the state DEQ standards, and she is not aware of any local regulations.

Mr. Clark then asked if there was any reason why they could not create their own standards that are more stringent. Ms. Winner said she is not familiar with any restrictions regarding that, but it can be hard to enforce and monitor. Mr. Bell mentioned that it causes the City extra time and money to defend it as well.

Mr. Clark asked where he could find the city regulations on noise pollution. Ms. Winner said that she will look into it and get him that information.

UPDATES & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. May City Administration Report | Information Only

- Oregon Dept of Energy Grant Update
- Equipment Surplus Sales Complete
- Business Oregon Grant Update
- RARE Grant Update
- Wastewater Treatment Plan Instrumentation Theft
- Engineering Services RFP Update
- Current Projects & Contracts
- Department Activity & Stats

b. July 17th, 2024 Training with DLCD Representative Patrick Wingard

Ms. Winner said that staff has established bi-weekly meetings with their DLCD representative to look at scoping out long range planning activities for the city. They set up a meeting with 4j to think about what their capacity is going to look like, because in order for the city to pursue a UGB amendment they have to show that there is capacity at the school for the new population. Staff was also asked to participate on the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities Walkability Model Code being developed, to help represent small cities on the committee. They are also currently working on their own CFEC implementation work as well, as an update on the regional transportation plan and congestion management plan.

Mr. Bell asked if the Transportation Safety Ad-Hoc Committee is still meeting. Ms. Winner said they are not meeting in May, but they will meet in June for their last meeting to finalize their recommendations to council, which should go to them in August.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bell adjourned the Planning Commission Regular Meeting at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVED by the Planning Commission Committee of the City of Coburg on this _____ day of _____ 2024.

Jim Bell, Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder