

AGENDA

Coburg Planning Commission Regular Session

November 9th, 2005 at 7:00 p.m.

City of Coburg Municipal Court

32694 East Pearl Street

Coburg, OR 97408

1. 7:00 CALL MEETING TO ORDER PC Chair Engebretson
2. 7:02 ROLL CALL Petra Schuetz
3. 7:03 AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS PC Chair Engebretson
4. 7:05 PUBLIC TESTIMONY
Five minute limit each unless extended time approved prior to meeting.
5. 7:20 PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT Petra Schuetz
 - Gilbert/MBM Plat Vacation **Tab 1**
 - Coburg Bed & Breakfast Conditional Use Sign Permit **Tab 2**
6. 7:30 ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION REPORT Petra Schuetz
 - Myers, Lot Line Adjustment, Pearl **Tab 3**
 - Myers, Lot Line Adjustment, Delaney
 - Darnielle-Boyer/Degalman Lane County Decision for uninhibited use
7. 7:40 COMMISSION BUSINESS PC Chair Engebretson
 - Planning Commission Vacancy
 - Planning Commission Change of Monthly Meeting Date
8. 7:50 APPROVAL OF MINUTES PC Chair Engebretson
 - SEPTEMBER 20, 2005 **Tab 4**
 - OCTOBER 12, 2005 **Tab 5**
9. 7:55 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS PC Chair Engebretson
 - Residential Design Standards Progress
 - Aleska/Degalman/Myers Replat
 - Wilson variance for new construction/flag lot
10. 8:00 ADJOURNMENT
The next regular meeting of the Coburg Planning Commission is scheduled for December 14, 2005 at 7:00pm at the Coburg Municipal Court. The next Joint Session with City Council will be August 23, 2005 at 7:00pm at the Coburg Municipal Court. If you need a disability accommodation to participate in this event, please notify the City of Coburg at least 14 days in advance. Call Coburg City Hall at 682-7850 to request reasonable accommodation or for more information.

COBURG PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Cathy Engebretson, Chair

Katie Thiel, Vice Chair

Ken Donner

Dan Claycomb

Pat Greenwell

Patricia McConnell

Vacant

ATTACHMENT A

**FINAL ORDER of the
COBURG PLANNING COMMISSION**

SR-5-05: Bill McFadden, Coburg Bed & Breakfast Conditional Sign Permit

A. The Coburg Planning Commission finds the following:

1. Coburg Planning Staff has reviewed all material relevant to the Bill McFadden, Coburg Bed & Breakfast Conditional Sign Permit that has been submitted by the applicant and staff regarding this matter for tax lot 1700, assessor's map 16-03-33-23, including the criteria, findings, and conclusions within the proposed final order and attached staff report.
2. On November 9, 2005, the Coburg Planning Commission reviewed the conditional sign permit and site review application for Bill McFadden after giving the required notice as per O.R.S. 197.195(3) and Coburg Zoning Code Article X.B.

B. The request for approval of the Bill McFadden Conditional Sign Permit for the installation of a free standing sign in the residential zone, tax lot 1700, 16-03-33-23, is approved subject to the following condition:

1. **To ensure compliance with the Coburg Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance and Ordinance No. A-155, the height not exceed six feet nor two feet in width.**

C. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the Coburg Planning Commission approves the Bill McFadden Conditional Sign & Site Plan Review based on the following criteria and findings of fact:

The following are findings of fact and state whether or not the proposed application satisfies the required criteria (in *italics*) found in the Coburg, Oregon Sign Code, Ordinance No. A-155, Section 8, IL, Light Industrial zone, Section 35, Conditional Sign Permit and the Coburg Zoning Ordinance, Ordinance No. A-133, Article IX.B.4.

CONFORMANCE WITH COBURG SIGN ORDINANCE, NO. A-155, SECTION VII.E R, Residential zone:

[A-155 effective December 11, 1984]

SECTION 5. RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT:

- A. ***All signs within the residential areas shall be subject to the following provisions:***

1) No sign shall be illuminated with or by a flashing or intermittent light source. All light shall be directed away from and not reflected upon adjacent premises. No illumination of any sign shall be permitted after 10pm or before 7am. Freestanding signs shall not be internally illuminated nor be illuminated by neon tubing.

Finding: The proposed sign has no illumination.

2) One sign shall not exceed two square feet in area and bearing only property numbers, post box numbers, names of occupants, or occupations of residents only in event of home occupation shall be allowed each residential dwelling unit.

Finding: The proposed sign is a second sign; therefore it triggers a Conditional Use Permit. See Conditional Use Criteria. The sign is also a Home Occupation Sign, which has different area provisions. See SECTION 5.3.

3) Home Occupation Signs shall not exceed two square feet in area per side nor exceed six feet in height.

Finding: The proposed sign is a Home Occupation Sign, and is 24 inches wide and 29 inches high, well within the area limit.

CONFORMANCE WITH COBURG SIGN ORDINANCE, NO. A-155, SECTION 35), Conditional Sign Permit Criteria:

Criteria: A Conditional Sign Permit may be granted only if substantive and probative evidence establishing specific findings of fact have been made that said permit conforms to all of the following criteria:

1. Conformity with the Coburg Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Finding: The application meets this requirement. The sign being proposed is a free-standing. A second sign for a business on the fringe of the Central Business District is in no way inconsistent with the intent of the Coburg Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

2. Compliance with Special conditions established by the Planning Commission to carry out the purpose of the relevant section(s) of Ordinance No. A-155.

Finding: The application meets this criterion having paid for the Conditional Use Permit and asking for a second sign in an allowable use in the residential district and well within the dimensions of residential sign parameters.

**CONFORMANCE WITH COBURG ZONING ORDINANCE, NO. A-133,
ARTICLE IX.B.4. SITE PLAN REVIEW**

- a. *That the location, design, size, shape and arrangement of the uses and structures are in scale and are compatible with the surroundings.***

Finding: The applicant's proposal meets this criterion. The location of the proposed replacement sign is compatible with the surroundings and adjacent residential uses on the edge of the Central Business District. The proposed sign will replace an existing sign along Roberts Road and will provide for better identification of services.

- b. *That there is a desirable, efficient, and workable inter-relationship among buildings, parking, circulation, open space, landscaping, and related activities and uses, resulting in an attractive, healthful and pleasant environment for living, shopping and working.***

Finding: The applicant's proposal meets this criterion. The proposed sign will provide good visibility and name brand association with services provided by this Bed and Breakfast.

- c. *That there is no unnecessary destruction of existing healthy trees or other major vegetation, and that due consideration is given to the preservation of distinctive or natural features.***

Finding: This criterion does not apply. No trees or major vegetation is proposed to be removed.

- d. *That the quantity, location, height, and materials of walls, fences, hedges, screen planting and landscape areas are such that they serve their intended purpose and have no undue adverse effect on existing or contemplated abutting land use.***

Finding: This criterion does not apply. No walls, fences, hedges, screen planting or landscaping is proposed.

- e. *The suitable planting of ground cover or other surfacing is provided to prevent erosion and reduce dust.***

Finding: This criterion does not apply. No plantings are proposed.

- f. That the location, design and size of the uses are such that the residents or establishments to be accommodated will be adequately served by community facilities and service or by other facilities suitable for the intended uses, in conformity with the Coburg Comprehensive Plan.**

Finding: The applicant's proposal meets this criterion. The new sign will provide service information to patrons of the Bed and Breakfast.

- g. That, based on anticipated traffic generation, adequate additional right-of-way and road improvements must be provided by the development in order to promote traffic safety and reduce traffic congestion. Consideration shall be given to the need and feasibility of widening and improving abutting streets and also to the necessity for such additional requirements as lighting, sidewalks, and turn and deceleration/acceleration lanes.**

Finding: This criterion does not apply. No traffic will be generated as a result of sign installation.

- h. That there is a safe and efficient circulation pattern within the boundaries of the development. Consideration shall include the layout of the site with respect to the location and dimensions of vehicular and pedestrian entrances, exits, drives, walkways, buildings and other related facilities.**

Finding: This criterion does not apply. The subject sign does not affect vehicular traffic.

- i. That there are adequate off-street parking and loading-unloading facilities provided in a safe, efficient and pleasant manner. Consideration shall include the layout of the parking and loading-unloading facilities and their surfacing, lighting and landscaping.**

Finding: This criterion does not apply. No parking or loading areas are proposed to be developed.

- j. That the location, quantity, height and shape of areas of structures which define interior circulation and parking arrangements are suitable for their intended purpose.**

Finding: This criterion does not apply. No buildings are proposed to be constructed.

- k. That all signs and illuminations are in scale, and harmonious with the site and area.**

Finding: The applicant meets this criterion. The proposed sign will not be internally illuminated.

- l. That adequate methods are provided to ensure continued maintenance and necessary normal replacement of common facilities, uses, structures, landscaping, screening, ground cover, and similar items required to ensure compatibility with the surrounding areas and an attractive, healthful and pleasant environment within the development area.**

Finding: The applicant will be required to meet this criterion by keeping the sign in proper order.

- D. This approval of the Bill McFadden Conditional Sign Permit shall become final on the date this decision and supporting findings of fact are signed by the Chairperson of the Coburg Planning Commission. Anyone wishing to appeal a Planning Commission decision to the City Council must submit a written Notice of Appeal within 15 days of the decision. Unless appealed, the Planning Commission's decision becomes effective on the fifteenth (15) day after rendered.**

This approval shall be automatically revoked if any development for which a site review permit has been granted is not established within one year from the date of final approval.

Cathy Engebretson, Chair
Coburg Planning Commission

Date

COBURG PLANNING COMMISSION DEPARTMENT REPORT



TOPIC: ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION REPORT

Meeting Date: November 8, 2005
Staff Contact: Petra Schuetz
Contact Telephone Number: 682-7858

REPORT:

- 1. Myers Lot Line Adjustment. LLA-1-05**
- 2. Myers Lot Line Adjustment. LLA-2-05**
- 3. Darnielle-Boyer/Degalman Uninhibited Use Resolution to Lane County Board (Nov. 8)**

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Myers Lot Line Adjustment. LLA-1-05 Acceptance Letter**
- 2. Myers Lot Line Adjustment. LLA-2-05 Acceptance Letter**
- 3. Darnielle-Boyer/Degalman Uninhibited Use**



MINUTES

Coburg City Council Coburg Planning Commission

Joint Session

September 20, 2005 - 7:00 P.M.

Coburg Municipal Court
32694 East Pearl Street - Coburg

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Mayor Judy Volta; Bill Judd, Brian Pech, Michelle Sunia, John Thiel, Mike Watson

COUNCILORS ABSENT: Don Schuessler

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Katie Thiel, Chairperson; Dan Claycomb, Cathy Engebretson, Pat Greenwell

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Ken Donner, Patricia McConnell

STAFF PRESENT: Kay Bork, David Landrum, Mark Phelps, Scott Olson, Petra Schuetz

RECORDED BY: Dan Lindstrom

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Judy Volta called the meeting of the Coburg City Council to order at 6:05 p.m.

Minutes Recorder Dan Lindstrom called the roll, noted the absence of Councilors Don Schuessler and Michelle Sunia, and stated that a quorum was present.

Chairperson Katie Thiel called the meeting of the Coburg Planning Commission to order at 6:06 p.m.

Mr. Lindstrom called the roll, noted the absence of Ken Donner, Pat Greenwell, and Patricia McConnell, and stated that a quorum was not present.

Mayor Volta stated that items related to Water Storage Easement Acquisition and a Finance Department Report would be added to the Agenda of the Council Meeting.

Mayor Volta determined there were no requests to present public comment unrelated to the Periodic Review Public Hearing.

II. INTERCHANGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN

Planning Staff Petra Schuetz explained that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was preparing an Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) for the Coburg Interstate 5 (I-5) interchange. She said the plan was required before the reconstruction de-

sign could take place. She introduced representatives of the CH2M Consulting firm who were conducting the study, and noted that documents had been distributed, as follows:

- "City of Coburg IAMP Existing Conditions" (Draft)
- "I-5 Coburg Interchange Area Management Plan Traffic Methodology"
- "Vehicular Turning Movement " Packet
- "Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis" Packet
- "Coburg IAMP Study Area" Map
- "Comprehensive Plan Designations" Map
- "Functional Classification" Map
- "Pavement Condition" Map
- "Study Area Accesses" Map
- "Existing Conditions (2005) 30th Highest Hour Traffic Volumes" Map
- "Lane Transit District Bus Routes" Map
- "Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities" Map
- "Planning for Replacing the I-5 Coburg Interchange" Community Meeting Announcement

CH2M Consultant and Project Manager, Steve Perone, presented an overview of the IAMP purpose and process. He said the plan enabled better management of grade separated interchanges and adjacent land. He said ODOT would use the plan to work with Coburg and Lane County to develop improvements for the Coburg Interchange road network, right-of-way, access, and area land. He described the Coburg IAMP study area and the schedule for its completion. He reviewed work completed to date.

Mr. Greenwell joined the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Perone reviewed existing conditions described in the Coburg IAMP and identified additional issues to be addressed. He described Plan and policy review to be conducted and explained land use scenarios to be used in determining future impacts on the interchange and area transportation system. He announced a Public Open House regarding the Coburg IAMP to be held on September 27.

Mr. Perone described the next IAMP elements to be undertaken – modeling of land use alternatives, determining future travel demands and deficiencies, developing and evaluating alternatives, and preparing implementing ordinances. He introduced ODOT Project Manager Terri Harding and encouraged interested persons to contact her or Ms. Schuetz for further information.

Councilor Bill Judd asked if land use scenarios to be used in the IAMP would include the longer range projections being developed in the Region 2050 project. Mr. Perone replied that they would be included.

Councilor Judd asked when the current Coburg Interchange had been constructed. Mr. Perone replied that it had been completed in 1960, but that a Refinement Plan had been initiated in 1999.

Mayor Volta asked for an explanation of the term “failing intersection” used in the documents that were distributed. Mr. Perone replied that it described the level of delay involved in the use of an intersection.

Mayor Volta asked if issues related to the realignment of Roberts Road would be discussed in the Public Open House. Mr. Perone replied that he would ensure that options being initially discussed would be included.

Councilor Mike Watson asked if the influence of factors such as traffic from Harrisburg, use of the intersection by sand and gravel trucks, and the possible relocation of the Lane County Fairgrounds to the Coburg area were being considered in the IAMP. Mr. Perone explained that regional data was used in forecasting models and the influences of traffic generation from other areas were synthesized into the study.

Commissioner Dan Claycomb asked if there was any indication of what a reconstructed Coburg Interchange would look like. Mr. Perone replied that it was unlikely the basic “diamond configuration” of the current Interchange would change, but that access roads, and other area impacts would likely be altered, depending on the needs identified and finances available. He said much design treatment was possible within the footprint of the current interchange.

Ms. Harding explained that an environmental review of the project would identify impacts on all property within one-half mile of the interchange before work on any new design was started.

Commissioner Claycomb asked if Coburg would have any influence on the final design of the Interchange area. Mr. Perone replied that although the project was federally funded and managed by ODOT, care was taken to involve local jurisdictions in decisions affecting its area of influence.

Commissioner Claycomb said he was concerned that an expanded interchange would increase the detrimental penetration of freeway-related traffic into Coburg. He said he hoped guarantees could be created to prevent it from happening.

Ms. Harding stated that the purpose of the IAMP process was to find a mutually acceptable design that would meet the transportation needs of the interchange. She said ODOT was flexible in its planning to accommodate reasonable local concerns.

Mayor Volta asked how the IAMP process was funded. Mr. Perone replied that ODOT funded the IAMP and most other transportation planning in Coburg, with the City providing the assistance of planning staff.

Mayor Volta thanked Mr. Perone and Ms. Harding for their presentation and declared a five-minute recess.

Councilor Sunia joined the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

III. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

None.

IV. PERIODIC REVIEW – PUBLIC HEARINGS AND DELIBERATION

Mayor Volta expressed appreciation for the service of Katie Thiel as Planning Commission Chairperson. She said it had been mutually agreed that Councilor Watson would preside during consideration of matters related to the Coburg Periodic Review.

A. Comprehensive Plan Text and Map

Councilor Watson stated that the City Council and Planning Commission would conduct a Public Hearing on Ordinance A-199: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COBURG COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AND MAP AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Planning Staff Kay Bork stated that the hearing was the Second Reading of Ordinance A-199. She said its purpose was to repeal the current Comprehensive Plan and adopt, by amendment, the Plan developed during the recently completed Periodic Review process begun in July 2002. She said the proposed new Plan was built on existing policies, but was amended where new conditions in Coburg and Statewide Planning Goals showed changes were necessary.

Ms. Bork noted that copies of the document “City of Coburg Comprehensive Plan” and the map “City of Coburg Comprehensive Plan” had been distributed with the Agenda of the meeting. She referred to a document also distributed entitled “Findings in Support of the Adoption of Periodic Review Amendments to the Coburg Comprehensive Plan.” She noted it was analysis that showed the proposed amendments to be in compliance with applicable Statewide Planning Goals.

Councilor Watson opened the Public Hearing on Ordinance A-199.

Councilor Watson determined there was no one present wishing to present testimony and closed the Public Hearing. He invited comments from members of the Council and Commission.

In response to a request from Councilor John Thiel, Ms. Bork explained that a mobile home park and a private residence had been added to the area designated Central Business District on the Comprehensive Plan map on the requests of the property owners since the First Hearing. She said the properties had previously been considered part of the area and their inclusion created consistency in its boundary.

Mayor Volta asked if she should recuse herself from participating in discussion of the amendment because she and her husband owned the private residence identified. City Counsel Mark Phelps replied that it was appropriate for her to identify the fact, but that the adoption was a legislative not a land use zoning change matter with a potential financial impact.

Councilor Watson determined that no Councilor or Commissioner had a potential conflict of interest, or had engaged in *ex parte* discussion regarding the amendment.

Councilor Sunia asked if it would be appropriate to consider Measure 37 impacts in relation to the amendment proposal. Ms. Bork replied that such matters related to zoning matters, not the Comprehensive Plan.

Councilor Watson invited the Planning Commission to make a recommendation regarding the Comprehensive Plan and map.

Commissioner Cathy Engebretson moved, seconded by Councilor Greenwell, to recommend that the City Council adopt Ordinance 199-A, amending the Coburg Comprehensive Plan Text and Map. The motion was adopted unanimously, 4:0.

B. Zoning Ordinance

Councilor Watson stated that the City Council and Planning Commission would conduct a Public Hearing on Ordinance A-200: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COBURG ZONING ORDINANCE **ARTICLE VII** DISTRICT REGULATIONS: SECTION A, TRADITIONAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; SECTION B, TRADITIONAL MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; SECTION C, CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT; SECTION D, HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; SECTION E, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT; AND SECTION F, CAMPUS INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT; **ARTICLE XII** DEFINITIONS; AND **ARTICLE VIII** SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT REGULATIONS; AND REPEALING ARTICLE VII, DISTRICT REGULATIONS SECTION A THROUGH D, **ARTICLE VIII**, SUPPLEMENTARY DISTRICT REGULATIONS A THROUGH F, AND **ARTICLE XII** DEFINITIONS OF ORDINANCE A-133.

Mr. Watson opened the Public Hearing and asked for the staff report.

Ms. Bork noted that the hearing was the Second Reading of Ordinance A-200. She referred to her September 7 memorandum regarding public comment on proposed code amendments. She said the Council and Commission could address its concerns after the close of the Public Hearing.

Ms. Bork Referred to her September 13 memorandum regarding a Measure 37 analysis of proposed code amendments and an analysis data sheet identifying existing regulations, proposed amendments, and issues related to Measure 37 distributed with the Agenda of the meeting.

Ms. Bork said her analysis had shown there were no major potential Measure 37 claims in the amendment proposals. She pointed out that two concerns had been raised by members of the public – a new limitation of 50,000 square feet on floor area for permitted uses and structures in the Central Business District, and relegating truck stops to Special Exception Uses in the Highway Commercial District. She said, in addition, some new design elements might increase construction costs, but would also likely increase resultant property value.

Ms. Bork stated that the following documents distributed with the Agenda were unchanged from the First Reading:

- Findings in Support of Coty of Coburg Zoning Ordinance Amendments
- Article VII – District Regulations
- Article VIII – Supplementary District Regulations
- Article XII – Definitions

Councilor Watson invited testimony in the Public Hearing.

Chris Wilson, 91181 North Skinner, expressed appreciation for the work of the Planning Commission and City Council on the proposed zoning amendments. She said she believed it was important to continue the intention of maintaining the historic character of development in Coburg.

Ms. Wilson said the staff response to her comment in the First Reading regarding alley setback requirements in the Central Business District mistakenly identified existing alleys as 20 feet in width. She said most were only 10 feet in width and that she was concerned that the proposed setbacks would create unfair development restrictions.

Ms. Wilson said she was concerned that the proposed requirement for Special Exception Use permission to locate single family dwellings in the Central Business District could raise unidentified Measure 37 issues, since residential development was considered of higher value than commercial development.

Ms. Wilson said she was concerned that prohibiting the sharing of residential driveways could impact the value of some properties. She suggested that the provision be changed to allow sharing, if it were not forced.

Ms. Wilson said she believed off-street parking regulations proposed for the Central Business District should be made more flexible to recognize the inability of many small commercial enterprises to meet their requirements. She suggested they be modeled after the current regulations for Uses Not Specified.

Jim Anderson, 32910 East Pearl, Truck 'N Travel referred to his letter dated September 19 distributed at the beginning of the meeting. He said he believed design standards created for the Highway Commercial District were done with the best of intentions, but that they created concerns for businesses such as his Truck 'N Travel Center. He said the reference in Article VII.D.1 to "appropriately scaled commercial uses that fit the small town, historic character of the community" was an example of vagueness that created the possibility for a variety of interpretations.

Mr. Anderson said requiring truck stops to acquire Special Exception Use permission in the Highway Commercial District was illogical and punitive. He pointed out that service and gasoline stations were permitted principal uses, that trucks were major users of the Interstate Highway system, and that a major truck stop had been part of the Coburg interchange for over 30 years.

Mr. Anderson said he believed the 20-foot front yard setback requirement and maximum height standards unreasonably restricted development in the Highway Commercial District.

Mr. Anderson said he was concerned that the requirement for a 400 foot minimum distance between service station sites in the Highway Commercial District was unreasonable. He said, in addition, no provision was made for a property owner to develop more than one facility on a single parcel.

Mr. Anderson said I-5 and trucking related business benefited Coburg and that its regulation should be fair, reasonable, and not subject to interpretation.

Clay Myers, 32050 Coburg Bottom Lane, said he believed restrictions on multi-family residential development in the proposed regulations created serious potential for Measure 37 claims. He said he did not believe many existing homes met proposed residential design standards.

Mr. Meyers suggested that provisions be made for changing design standards without using the Zoning Ordinance amendment process. He also suggested that the effective date of the ordinance be delayed to allow for enforcement issues to be resolved.

In response to a question from Councilor Sunia, Mr. Meyers explained that the proposed Ordinance would not permit re-building of existing multi-family housing, in the event of its catastrophic destruction. He said triplex homes currently existed where only duplex homes were permitted.

Councilor Watson determined there were no other persons wishing to testify and closed the Public Hearing.

Councilor Watson determined that no members of the Council or Commission were required to declare *ex parte* contacts or conflicts of interest. He invited members to discuss the proposed Zoning Code amendments and public testimony.

Mayor Volta requested clarification regarding the staff report about alleys in the Central Business District. Ms. Bork explained that it was true that the staff report had assumed that all alleys were 20 feet in width, but that the setback requirement only applied to new development and no existing development was affected.

Mayor Volta asked why 20 foot width alleys were preferred. City Engineer Scott Olson replied that all potential fire access ways to buildings were required to be that wide.

Councilor Sunia asked why it was proposed to have truck stops be required to have Conditional Use Permits in the Highway Business District. Chairperson Thiel replied that the stipulation was created to ensure control of such development in the future, not impinge on current establishments.

Members engaged in extended discussion regarding replacement of currently existing non-conforming uses.

Mr. Phelps suggested that members determine a procedure for considering specific amendment proposals to facilitate Council action on the Ordinance.

Chairperson Thiel asked if postponing action on the Ordinance would require full public notice procedures. Mr. Phelps replied that action could be postponed, but that Periodic Review and other deadlines made doing so unadvisable.

Chairperson Thiel said she believed ample opportunity should be given to evaluate proposed changes in the light of potential Measure 37 claims.

Mayor Volta said she did not support postponement of action on the Ordinance because more than two years of effort and over \$200,000 had already been expended on the process. She said the purpose of its consideration in the current meeting was to give final approval, not to continue proposing minor fine tuning of its provisions.

Councilor Judd said he believed it was important to address issues raised in the Public Hearing and Staff Report and to postpone adoption of the Ordinance, if it was not possible to complete the process.

Councilor Thiel said he believed it was important to do what could be done in the time remaining.

Councilor Watson said the Council and Commission would initially focus attention on the September 7 memorandum of Ms. Bork regarding public comment on proposed Code amendments. He invited her to raise the issues sequentially.

1. General Comment

It is not clear if new regulations and standards apply to new development or new and existing development.

Staff Response: Article VI states that it is the intent of the Code to permit non-conforming uses to continue until they are removed, but not to encourage their survival. In addition, non-conforming uses are not permitted to be enlarged, expanded or extended, nor used as grounds for adding other structures of prohibited uses elsewhere in the same district.

No definitive change to the Staff Response was recommended in the discussion of members.

2. General Comment

What is the process for amending the zoning code when Periodic Review is completed?

Staff Response: Amending the zoning code is a Type II procedure described in Article X, Section F. The City Council or Planning Commission may initiate amendments. Public notice, State land use procedures, at least two work sessions, and public hearings are required.

No definitive change to the Staff Response was recommended in the discussion of members.

3. Traditional Residential District – Driveway Limitations

Limiting driveways to one per dwelling is too restrictive. The exception statement is vague and should be amended to say “A single driveway can be used to serve an approved accessory dwelling unit in addition to the primary dwelling.”

Staff Response: Narrow, side-by-side lots with minimum street frontage are required to each have a driveway. Development on flag lots without alley access is not permitted. The two restrictions could prohibit development on some lots large enough to be subdivided.

Chairperson Thiel attempted, but was unable to gain Planning Commission consensus to recommend the removal of restrictions on development on flag lots. Councilor Watson determined by a straw vote that only two of five Councilors favored elimination of Article VII.A.3.2, Driveway Limitations in the Traditional Residential District.

4. Traditional Residential District – Minimum Lot Width

The term “Minimum Width” was re-labeled “Average Width,” without a definition, in Article VII.A.4.a and b.

Staff Response: Keep the Term “Average Width” and give it a definition such as “Average Lot Width is determined by measuring the width of a lot every 10 feet, for the entire depth of the lot, adding those measurements and dividing by the number of measurements.”

Discussion did not lead to apparent agreement or disagreement regarding the Staff Response.

5. Traditional Residential District – Side Yard Height Transition

Article VII.A.6.b.(2) references building height transition standards that have not been incorporated into the Code.

Staff Response: The Planning commission and City Council previously agreed to remove the transition standards from the proposed amendments. Article VII.A.6.b.(2) should be deleted.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council delete Article VII.A.6.b.(2).

6. Traditional Medium Residential District – Live-Work Buildings

Article VII.A.2.b.(4) references Live-Work Buildings that it had been agreed would be deleted during an August 23 Joint Work Session.

Staff Response: Delete the Section.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council delete Article VII.A.2.a.(4).

7. Central Business District – Alley Setbacks

The 10-foot alley setback requirement in Article VII.C.6.c.(3) is too restrictive and not consistent with existing buildings in the Central Business District.

Staff Response: If alleys are 20-feet in width, 10 feet from the centerline is a zero setback. If alleys are less than 20-feet in width, the setback is 10-feet minus half the width of the alley. The setback requirement should be maintained.

No change to the Staff Response was recommended in the discussion of members.

8. Highway Commercial District – Maximum Height Standards

The 35-foot maximum height standard in Article VII.D.5.a and b may not be sufficient to accommodate a three-story building in the Highway Commercial District.

Staff Response: A variance to allow a 45-foot building is permitted, if it does not abut a Residential District. The 35-foot height limit is common in other Oregon communities and counties.

No definitive change to the Staff Response was recommended in the discussion of members.

9. Light Industrial District – Buffer Zone

The required 25-foot buffer zone between development and an adjacent Residential District in Article VII.E,5.(d) is not adequate to protect residential areas from negative industrial use impacts.

Staff Response: The current code requires a 200-foot buffer zone, but it may be too restrictive and discretion should be allowed when establishing setbacks based on the type of industrial use. In addition, the proposed amendment does not make clear that the 25-foot buffer is required to screen industrial buildings. The following change to Article VII.E,5.(d) is recommended:

Where an industrial use abuts a residential district, a 25-foot setback is the minimum area that shall be required between any development and adjacent Residential District. Additional setback up to 200 feet may be required where the proposed activity would have a significant impact on adjacent residential property in the form of noise, dust, smoke, vibration or

other negative impact that is perceptible beyond the property boundaries. A 25-foot landscaped horizontal buffer zone shall be required between development and any adjacent Residential District. This buffer shall be included within the required yard setbacks. This area shall provide landscaping to screen buildings, parking, and service and delivery areas and walls without windows of entries. The buffer may contain pedestrian seating and pedestrian pathways, but shall not contain any off-street parking, or storage of equipment, materials, vehicles, etc. Landscaping shall be in accordance with Article VIII.H of this Code.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council amend Article VII.E.5.(d), as proposed by staff.

10. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

It is not common to have front porch beams and posts the same size, as proposed in the Design Standard in Article VIII.J.4.a.(2).(g). Most historic houses in Coburg do not meet this standard.

Staff Response: An interpretation may be in order.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council delete Article VIII.J.4.a.(2).(g).

Councilor Watson determined there was consensus to accept the recommendation.

11. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The proposed Design Guideline in Article VIII.J.4.a.(3).(a) would force a builder to use uncommon materials, increasing the cost of construction.

Staff Response: An interpretation may be in order.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council delete Article VIII.J.4.a.(3).(a).

Councilor Watson determined there was consensus to accept the recommendation.

12. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

Incorporating 2:1 ratio vertical-oriented windows as proposed in the Design Standard in Article VIII.J.4.c.(2).(a) is not practical when the building code requires a minimum egress of 3' x 5'.

Staff Response: None.

No definitive recommendation was developed in the discussion of the Planning Commission.

Councilor Watson determined there was agreement in the City Council to delete Article VIII.J.4.c.(2).(a).

13. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The Design Standard in Article VIII.J.4.c.(2).(b) needs to be clarified as to whether windows are required in the gable attics of a dwelling.

Staff Response: An interpretation may be in order, allowing more flexibility in window design while maintaining rectangle, vertically-oriented windows.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council delete Article VIII.J.4.c.(2).(b).

Councilor Watson determined there was consensus to accept the recommendation.

14. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The Design Standard proposed in Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(a) limits design options. The roof pitch standards are not consistent with existing architecture.

Staff Response: An interpretation may be in order. An opinion from another architect or builder could be helpful.

No definitive change to the Staff Response was recommended in the discussion of members.

Chairperson Thiel left the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

15. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The Design Standard proposed in Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(c) include requirements for dormer roof pitch that are not structurally possible. In some cases a dormer could be too low or even higher than the roof ridge line, if it had to meet the existing roof pitch.

Staff Response: An interpretation may be in order. An opinion from another architect or builder could be helpful.

Councilor Watson determined there was agreement among the City Council to delete Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(c).

16. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The Design Standard proposed in Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(e) raises the question if the original edifice is not compatible with the proposed guidelines, which takes precedence, the guidelines or original edifice?

Staff Response: An interpretation may be in order.

Councilor Watson determined there was agreement in the City Council to delete Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(e).

17. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The Design Standard proposed in Article VIII J.4.h.(2).(a) would result in garages that could not accommodate two cars and storage.

Staff Response : Consider deleting the text referring to a 24-foot maximum and keep 40 percent requirement.

Consensus was determined for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council keep Article VIII.J.4.h.(2).(a).

Councilor Watson determined there was consensus to accept the recommendation.

18. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

The Design Standard proposed in Article VIII J.4.h.(2).(b) could create problems, as typical construction is in increments of two feet.

Staff Response : Other communities require a garage setback of five-feet from the primary façade.

Councilor Watson determined there was agreement in the City Council to amend Article VIII.J.4.h.(2).(b) by changing the minimum to 4'-0".

Chairperson Thiel rejoined the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Ms. Bork reviewed her memorandum dated September 19 regarding comments receive via E-mail. She noted that concerns raised had been dealt with in consideration of her September 7 memorandum.

Ms. Bork referred to the September 19 letter from Jim Anderson distributed at the beginning of the meeting. She noted there were several concerns not yet considered.

19. Highway Commercial District – Yard Setbacks

The 20-foot front yard setback in the Highway Commercial District proposed in Article VII.D.4.a does not allow for parking, maneuvering and/or driveways and is overly restrictive.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus for the Planning Commission to recommend that the Council amend the second sentence of Article VII.D.4.a, as follows: No parking, ~~maneuvering~~, or loading areas ~~or driveways~~ shall be located within the front yard setback.

20. Highway Commercial District – Maximum Height Standards

The 35-foot maximum structural height in the Highway Commercial District proposed in Article VII.D.5.a does not allow for a four-story hotel/motel.

No agreement was reached to amend the provision.

There was agreement to consider an additional Design Standard

21. Supplementary District Regulation – Design Standards and Guidelines

Councilor Watson determined there was agreement to delete Article VIII.J.4.(2).(f), Design Standards for Porch and Deck Columns.

Mayor Volta stated that she would recommend that the City Council delay implementation of the Zoning Code Amendments until January 1, 2006.

Chairperson Thiel said she believed it was essential to include reference to the map entitled "City of Coburg Zoning Map" distributed with material for the Second Reading of Ordinance A-199 in its adoption.

Commissioner Claycomb moved, seconded by Commissioner Greenwell, to recommend to the City Council that it include adoption of the City of Coburg Zoning Map in its approval of Ordinance A-199. The motion was adopted unanimously, 4:0.

Commissioner Claycomb moved, seconded by Commissioner Engebretson, to recommend to the City Council that it adopt Ordinance A-200, with amendments as recommended. The motion was adopted, 3:1.

The meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

V. PERIODIC REVIEW - ADOPTION

Councilor Pech moved, seconded by Councilor Thiel, to adopt Ordinance A-199, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COBURG COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AND MAP, DECLARING AN EMERGENCY, AND AMENDING THE ORDINANCE TO INCLUDE ADOPTION OF THE COBURG ZONING MAP. The motion was adopted unanimously, 5:0.

Councilor Watson moved, seconded by Councilor Judd, to adopt Ordinance A-200, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE COBURG ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLE VII DISTRICT REGULATIONS: SECTION A, TRADITIONAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; SECTION B, TRADITIONAL MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; SECTION C, CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT; SECTION D, HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; SECTION E, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT; AND SECTION F, CAMPUS INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT; ARTICLE XII DEFINITIONS; AND ARTICLE VIII SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT REGULATIONS; AND REPEALING ARTICLE VII, DISTRICT REGULATIONS SECTION A THROUGH D, ARTICLE VIII, SUPPLEMENTARY DISTRICT REGULATIONS A THROUGH F, AND ARTICLE XII DEFINITIONS OF ORDINANCE A-133.

Councilor Pech moved, seconded by Councilor Judd, to amend the motion, as follows:

- a. **Delete Article VII.A.6.b.(2).**
- b. **Delete Article VII.A.2.a.(4).**
- c. **Amend Article VII.E.5.(d), as follows:**

Where an industrial use abuts a residential district, a 25-foot setback is the minimum area that shall be required between any development and adjacent Residential District. Additional setback up to 200 feet may be required where the proposed activity would have a significant impact on adjacent residential property in the form of noise, dust, smoke, vibration or other negative impact that is perceptible beyond the property boundaries. A 25-foot landscaped horizontal buffer zone shall be required between development and any adjacent Residential District. This buffer shall be included within the required yard setbacks. This area shall provide landscaping to screen buildings, parking, and service and delivery areas and walls without windows of entries. The buffer may contain pedestrian seating and pedestrian pathways, but shall not contain any off-street parking, or storage of equipment, materials, vehicles, etc. Landscaping shall be in accordance with Article VIII.H of this Code.

- c. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.a.(2).(g).**
- d. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.a.(3).(a).**
- e. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.c.(2).(a).**
- f. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.c.(2).(b).**
- g. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(c).**
- h. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.e.(2).(e).**
- i. **Amend Article VIII.J.4.h.(2). (b) by changing the minimum to 4'-0".**
- j. **Amend the second sentence of Article VII.D.4.a, as follows:** No parking, ~~maneuvering~~, or loading areas ~~or driveways~~ shall be located within the front yard setback.
- k. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.(2).(f).**

I. Declare that the Ordinance shall take affect ninety days after its adoption.

The motion to amend was adopted unanimously, 5:0

The motion to adopt Ordinance A-200, as amended, was adopted unanimously, 5:0.

VI. CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Mayor Volta reported the results of interviews with applicants for the position of Coburg City Administrator. She described the process followed and stated that the committee unanimously recommended that Don Schuessler be appointed half-time City Administrator effective September 22. She said it was recommended that the position be considered an employee, that no Public Employee Retirement System or Health Benefits be provided, that personnel policy vacation and sick leave provisions apply, and that the annual salary be \$25,000.

Councilor Judd moved, seconded by Councilor Watson, to accept the recommendations of the committee, with a contract, including probationary period, to be agreed upon within thirty day. The motion was adopted unanimously, 5:0.

VII. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Mr. Olson referred to the Public Works Department Report regarding restructuring an existing loan with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for the design and construction of the Coburg Wastewater Treatment System. He explained that Resolution No. 2005-21 authorized the Mayor to sign the necessary documents to accomplish the restructuring.

Councilor Pech moved, seconded by Councilor Thiel, to adopt Resolution No. 2005-21: A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE INTENTIONS OF THE COUNCIL AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO SIGN THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS FOR A LOAN FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY. The motion was adopted unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. Olson referred to the Public Works Department Report regarding water storage easement acquisition. He noted that it presented progress on the development of a water reservoir site east of I-5 and property easements to provide access to it. He said the total easement value for five parcels involved was under \$50,000 and reminded Councilors that the water project was funded by loan agreements with the DEQ.

Councilor Judd moved, seconded by Councilor Pech, to accept the report and authorize proceeding with negotiations regarding securing of water storage easements. The motion was adopted unanimously, 5:0.

VIII. FINANCE REPORT

Finance Director David Landrum referred to his Monthly Report. He reviewed bills submitted for approval and explained that the large payment for Liability Insurance was the total annual bill. He noted that the Urban Renewal Agency had been invoiced for expenses incurred by the City in the first quarter. He said he would be able to present summaries and budget comparisons of fund and department expenses by the November Council meeting.

He estimated that July and August exceeded budget expectations, but that a balanced report would be made at the mid-year review.

Councilor Thiel moved, seconded by Councilor Judd, to approve the Accounts Payable dated September 20. The motion was adopted unanimously, 5:0.

Mayor Volta determined there was consensus to add payments to the Editor of the City Newsletter to pre-authorized Bills to be Paid.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

ACCEPTANCE

City Council

Yes: _____

No: _____

Abstained: _____

Passed: _____ Rejected: _____

Signed this _____ day of _____ 2005

Judith Volta, Mayor

Planning Commission

Yes: ___ 6 _____

No: ___ 0 _____

Abstained: ___ 0 _____

Passed: ___ Yes, as amended _____ Rejected: _____

Signed this _____ day of _____ 2005

Cathy Engebretson, Planning Commission Chair

Attest:

David Landrum, City Recorder



MINUTES

Coburg Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Coburg Municipal Courthouse – 32694 Pearl Street
Coburg, Oregon 97408
October 12, 2005 – 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Katie Thiel, Chair; Dan Claycomb, Ken Donner, Cathy Engebretson, Pat Greenwell, Patricia McConnell, members; Petra Schuetz, staff.

ABSENT: Mike Watson, City Council Liaison.

GUESTS: Nick H. Amo

Chairperson Katie Thiel called the Regular Meeting of the Coburg Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m. Planning Staff Petra Schuetz called the roll of members and noted that a quorum was present.

1. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Chairperson Thiel said consideration of a change of use request by Family Video would be added to the agenda. She suggested that a time for Comments from Commissioners also be added, immediately preceding adjournment.

2. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

None.

3. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT

Ms. Schuetz referred to Agenda Support Material regarding the status of the Coburg Periodic Review. She noted that it reported (1) the Comprehensive Plan had been approved by the City Council, would be presented to the Lane County Planning Commission for its approval in January 2006 after a 21-day period following the Lane County Planning Commission potential adoption December 12, and would become effective after Board approval; and (2) The Zoning Code had been approved by the City Council and would become effective December 19. She added that a schedule for completion of unfinished work on several additional elements would be developed following a budget review of staff time.

Ms. Schuetz referred to Agenda Support Material regarding proposed amendments to the Conditional Sign Permit. She reviewed information it contained about an application to post a Bed and Breakfast advertising sign on an establishment in the Residential District. She said the proposed sign exceeded the current two square feet size limitation, requiring a conditional sign permit application to be submitted for consideration by the Planning Commission. She said the application required a fee of \$1,720.

Ms. Schuetz noted that the Support Material reported that the Commission had requested staff to review sign permit procedures and recommend improvements. She said the material included an analysis of the issues involved and alternatives available to the Commission.

Chairperson Thiel suggested that since the applicant qualified as a neighborhood commercial use in the soon to become effective Zoning code, adopting new sign code criteria would be appropriate. Ms. Schuetz noted that the suggestion was incorporated Recommended Action No. 2 - Direct staff to develop new sign regulations for certain uses in the R1 District (TR and TMR Districts, as of 12/19/05).

In response to a question from Chairperson Thiel, Ms. Schuetz said the Planning Commission had the authority to implement Recommended Action No. 1 – Keep sign regulations as they are and create a separate application and fee for a Conditional Sign Permit. She said she suggested \$250 as an appropriate fee for a Conditional Sign Permit.

Members discussed various criteria for a Conditional Sign Permit. There appeared to be agreement to incorporate criteria included in the code of the City of Ashland:

1. The total size of the sign is limited to six square feet.
2. The maximum height of any ground sign is to be three feet above ground.
3. The sign must be constructed of wood and cannot be internally illuminated.

Commissioner Greenwell suggested that the criteria should (1) establish the sign height limitation to be no higher than the maximum allowed for front yard fencing, and (2) not allow signs to be placed in street rights of way.

Ms. Schuetz pointed out that a conditional use permit implied that it was revocable. She said there were examples of signs that were currently within a street right-of-way for which permission could be removed.

Commissioner McConnell said she would favor establishing criteria that would require signs to reflect the vision of Coburg as an historic location.

Commissioner Greenwell suggested that recommendations for conditional sign permit criteria and fees be presented to the Planning Commission at the time an application was received.

Commissioner McConnell moved, seconded by Commissioner Greenwell to establish six square feet as the maximum size sign allowed in the Residential Zones and that an application fee of \$250.00 be established for a conditional use sign. The motion was adopted unanimously, 6:0.

Ms. Schuetz referred to Agenda Support Material regarding Sign Permit Application SR-4-05 for Paradise RV submitted by Metro Western Sign and Awning. She said the application had been submitted after the deadline for its consideration at the current Planning Commission meeting, but that all referrals to public agencies and notices to property owners had been completed as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairperson Thiel determined there was consensus to consider the application.

Ms. Schuetz reviewed the staff Report regarding the background, public notices, and issues related to the application. She noted the possible actions of the Planning Commission and noted that the staff recommended approval of the sign permit, with conditions contained in the proposed Final Order:

1. Obtain building and electrical permits prior to installation of the signs.
2. Lighting may not include “outline” illumination to accentuate the sign.
3. Palm Trees on the sign need to be safely and securely built or attached to the sign structure and comply with all requirements of Section 28 of the Sign Ordinance.
4. If sign was to be placed in line of vision, the supporting sign poles may not exceed a combined total width of 12 inches and no portion of the sign may be located within the vision clearance of 7 feet above grade.
5. The installed sign shall be maintained in a clean, sanitary, and inoffensive condition, free and clear of obnoxious substances, rubbish, and weeds.

[The applicant agreed to and submitted a revised site plan illustrating a 15 foot setback from the street, negating condition 4 above].

Members discussed the application.

Commissioner Greenwell moved, seconded by Commissioner McConnell, to approve Proposed Final Order SR-4-05: MBM Property Management/Paradise RV, adding to the conditions therein that a modified site plan showing more accurate sign location shall be submitted. The motion was adopted unanimously, 6:0.

Chairperson Thiel stated that it was her belief that the existing sign on the Paradise RV property was in violation of the Zoning Code. She determined there was agreement to ask staff to investigate and discuss the matter with the owner.

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION REPORT

Ms. Schuetz stated that, in compliance with a request of the Commissions, she was reporting that Planning Staff had presented a letter of completeness for the Myers Lot Line Adjustment at 32818 Delaney Street. She said applications for two other lot line adjustments, a re-plat, and a vacation in the Light Industrial Zone were in process and would be presented at the November 9 meeting.

Ms. Schuetz circulated a copy of the latest budget/expenditure report for Planning Department activities. She also referred to a document entitled “Coburg Planning Assistance Contract” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She said the City Council had previously given authori-

zation to proceed with Staff work related to Periodic Review. She said a review of anticipated activities would be conducted to determine how staff time should be allocated for the remainder of the year.

Chairperson Thiel determined that there was agreement to hold a Planning Commission Work Session without Staff at 6:00pm on November 9, to create a prioritization of planning projects.

5. COMMISSION BUSINESS

In response to a question from Chairperson Thiel, Commissioner Greenwell said he was willing to be nominated for re-appointment to the Planning Commission for a new term.

Commissioner Claycomb nominated Pat Greenwell to serve a 2-year term as a member of the Coburg Planning Commission.

Chairperson Thiel determined there were no further nominations and that there was unanimous support for the re-appointment of Mr. Greenwell.

Chairperson Thiel said she was not willing to continue as chairperson of the Planning Commission, but that she had asked Commissioner Engebretson to serve if intertested.

Chairperson Thiel nominated Cathy Engebretson to serve as Chairperson of the Coburg Planning Commission.

Chairperson Thiel determined there were no further nominations and that there was unanimous support to elect Commissioner Engebretson.

Chairperson Thiel said she was willing to be elected vice chairperson of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Engebretson nominated Katie Thiel to serve as Vice Chairperson of the Coburg Planning Commission.

Chairperson Thiel determined there were no further nominations and that there was unanimous support to elect Commissioner Thiel.

Chairperson Engebretson determined there were no applicants for appointment to the vacant position on the Planning Commission. She determined there was agreement to request that Staff publicize the vacancy through all appropriate means and set November 1, 2005 as the deadline for applications for appointment to be submitted.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Greenwell requested that Sentence 1 of Paragraph 3 on Page 1 of the minutes of the August 10 meeting be changed, as follows:

Chairperson Thiel nominated Commissioner Ken Donner as Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission for the remainder of the term ending September 2005.

Chairperson Engebretson determined there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

Chairperson Engebretson requested that the address of Chris Wilson on Page 1 of the minutes of the August 10 meeting be corrected to 91181 North Skinner.

Chairperson Engebretson determined there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

Commissioner McConnell moved, seconded by Commissioner Greenwell, to accept the minutes of the August 10, 2005, meeting, as amended. The motion was adopted unanimously, 5:0:1, with Commissioner Thiel abstaining from voting.

Commissioner Thiel requested that the “unidentified member of the public” referred to in Paragraph 6 on Page 1, and in Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 on Page 3 of the minutes of the August 23 joint meeting with the City Council be changed to Clay Myers.

Chairperson Engebretson determined there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

Chairperson Engebretson requested that the reference to the “TA District” in Paragraph 10 on Page 2 of the minutes of the August 23 meeting be changed to the “TR District.”

Chairperson Engebretson determined there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

Commissioner Greenwell moved, seconded by Commissioner Thiel, to accept the minutes of the August 23, 2005, Joint Meeting with the City Council, as amended, with the comments and questions from the recorder eliminated. The motion was adopted unanimously, 6:0.

Chairperson Engebretson requested that Paragraphs 14 and 15 on Page 11 of the Minutes of the September 20 joint meeting with the City Council be deleted.

Commissioner Greenwell said he was not willing to accept the requested amendment.

Chairperson Engebretson requested that the reference to Article VII.A.2.a.(4) on Page 9 of the minutes of the August 23 meeting be changed to Article VII.B.2.a.(4).

Chairperson Engebretson determined there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

Commissioner Thiel moved, seconded by Commissioner Claycomb, to accept the minutes of the September 20, 2005, Joint Meeting with the City Council, as amended, and further amended by the elimination of Paragraphs 14 and 15 on Page 11 and elimination of the words “Delete Article VIII.J.4.h.(2).(e)” from the amendment to the second motion on Page 13, changing the alpha-enumeration of sections that follow. The motion was adopted, by rule of the Chair, 3:1:2, with Commissioner Greenwell voting no, and Commissioners Donner and McConnell abstaining from voting.

7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Schuetz noted that Residential Design Standards and Residential Sign Standards in the Traditional Residential District were scheduled to be considered on the agenda of future meetings.

Ms. Schuetz reported that no action had been taken at the September 11 meeting of the area Joint Elected Officials regarding the Coburg request to have sewage treatment services through the Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment facility. She said the results of votes of approval regarding the proposal from the Eugene and Springfield City Councils and Lane Board of County Commissioners were scheduled to be completed by December 5. She said she believed eight strongly committed members of the group were committed to seek its approval of moving forward with the opportunity to hook Coburg to MWMC in the future.

Ms. Schuetz reported that unofficial notice had been received that federal grant applications to support construction of the Coburg Sewer project would be turned down because previously available funds had been reallocated to Hurricane Katrina disaster relief.

8. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner McConnell said she was concerned that follow-through on the Paradise RV sign application be facilitated. Ms. Schuetz agreed to write a code enforcement letter to the owner.

9. NEXT MEETING

Chairperson Engebretson announced that the next Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was scheduled for 7:00 p.m. on November 9 and that a Work Session was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. on the same evening.

Commissioner Thiel requested that a complete list of unfinished Periodic Review tasks be prepared in advance of the Work Session.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

**COBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

**Plat Vacation
Damien Gilbert P.E./Coburg Investors, LLC**

I. BASIC DATA

File number: VAC-1-05

Applicant : Damien Gilbert P.E.
Branch Engineering
310 5th Street
Springfield, Oregon 97477

Property Owners: Coburg Investors, LLC
2133 Kimberly Circle
Eugene, OR 97405
(16-03-33-40 TL 900 & 1300)

CJ/MBM, LLC
4725 Village Plaza Loop, Suite 201
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(17-03-04-12 TL 100)

Request: Vacant lot on the northwest corner of Roberts Court and Roberts Road Lot 5, Block 1 Roberts Industrial Center; Tax Lot 100 of Assessor's Map 17-03-04-12.

Property Location: Vacate parcel of land on the southwest corner of Roberts Court and Roberts Road, Lot 6, Block 1, Roberts Industrial Center.

**Assessor's map
& tax lot:** 17-03-04-12, Tax Lot 100

Zoning Designation: LI, Light Industrial

**Comprehensive
Plan Designation:** Light Industrial

Applicable Criteria: Coburg Zoning Ordinance, No. A-133A, Article VII, Section D, Light Industrial District, Article X, Section B, Land Development Procedures, Article X, Section H, Vacation Procedures and Criteria, ORS 271.080 Vacation in Incorporated Cities.

Report Date: November 1, 2005

**City Council
Public Hearing Date:** November 8, 2005

II. REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval to vacate a subdivision plat boundary line for Lot 5, Block 1 Roberts Industrial Center in a Light Industrial zone to allow future lot line adjustment for better efficiency of the lot for RV sales.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that City Council approve with conditions to ensure that it complies with the criteria in the Coburg Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends the City Council forward the findings and conclusions in the attached Proposed Findings and Recommendation with the following condition:

- A certified copy of the ordinance vacating the plat and map shall be filed with the county clerk. The petitioner shall bear the cost of recording, preparing, and filing the certified copy.

IV. BACKGROUND

The parcel is located in the Light Industrial Zone (LI). The vacation is being requested to allow future lot line adjustments of the east line of lot 5, Block 1 to the west line of said lot of the Roberts Industrial Center. The site well exceeds the minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and lot width dimension of 100 square feet. The lot is part of the Roberts Industrial Center subdivision that was platted in 1980 in the City of Coburg. The applicant submitted a Land Use Application, supporting documentation and maps. A title report, submitted by the applicant shows that Lot 5 currently contains easements for Muddy Creek Irrigation District on the easterly 66 feet of Lot 5, a public utility easement on the northerly 10 feet of Lot 5 and a grant of record to various property owners the right of use for septic drainfield purposes. The lot is also within the City of Coburg's Urban Renewal District. There are no wetlands located on the site.

In 2004 two Boundary Line Adjustment Applications through applicant Al Couper were submitted (VAC-1-04) adjusting the property lines after the vacation has been completed. Conditions of approval for VAC-1-04 included

- Dedication of right-of-way for Roberts Court. Based on the findings in the Proposed Final Order of VAC-1-04, right-of-way for Roberts Court was dedicated, ensuring that properties on Roberts Court had legal access to Roberts Road. This shored-up the right-of-way issue that was overlooked

when the original subdivision plat and subsequent transfer of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way to private ownership occurred.

- Signed approval by all parties for the relocation of the reserve drainfields to the Proposed Lot 1.

The property is surrounded by industrially zoned property within the Roberts Industrial Center on Roberts Court and along Roberts Road. Some of the parcels are developed and other parcels are vacant. Roberts Road and Roberts Court are both improved with 22 foot paving and curbs. Roberts Court is a designated local street and Roberts Road is a designated collector by the Coburg Transportation System Plan.

The applicant's vacation application (application VAC-1-05) includes the existing plat boundaries before vacation.

V. AGENCY REFERRALS

Referrals were sent to:

- Coburg Public Works Supervisor
- Lane County Environmental Health
- Lane County Surveyors Office
- Branch Engineering

No comments were received at the time of preparation of this staff report.

VI. PROPERTY OWNER NOTICES

Notices of a public hearing were sent to all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property, exceeding the legal requirement. This is a Type II land use development under the requirements of the Coburg Zoning Ordinance notice requirements and ORS 271 for notice of Vacation within City limits. In addition, a notice was posted at three prominent City locations and published two times in the Register Guard for the public hearing.

No comments were received at the time of preparation of this staff report.

VII. STAFF DISCUSSION/ISSUES

Upon vacation of Lot 5, the applicant is requesting that the application for boundary line adjustment between said Lot 5 and Tracts I and II from County Survey File number 39296 that lie contiguous with and east of said lot be approved. These applications have yet to be submitted.

VIII. POSSIBLE ACTIONS BY CITY COUNCIL

The City Council may:

- 1. Recommend approval of the Vacation Application to City Council with conditions based on the findings of fact in the Proposed Findings and Recommendation.**
- 2. Move to continue the meeting to a certain date to provide the opportunity for the applicant to submit additional information and/or to allow for more deliberation.**
- 3. Move to continue the meeting to a certain date to provide the opportunity for Planning Commission to offer a formal recommendation to City Council for approval. This is not legally necessary. (The Staff Report, Final Order, and Draft Ordinance were submitted to Planning Commission for their November 9, 2005 meeting).**
- 4. Recommend Denial of the Vacation Permit Application. If the Planning Commission recommends denial of the request, they must develop adequate findings of fact to support this action.**

IX. ATTACHMENTS

- A: Proposed Findings and Recommendations
- B: Draft Ordinance

IX. EXHIBITS

- A. Damien Gilbert Vacation Petition and map, submitted September 27, 2005.

ATTACHMENT A

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION for the COBURG CITY COUNCIL

VAC-1-05: Gilbert/Coburg Investors, LLC Plat Vacation

A. The Coburg Planning Staff finds the following:

1. The Coburg Planning Commission has not reviewed all material relevant to the Vacation application that has been submitted by the applicant and staff regarding this matter for tax lot 100, assessor's map 17-03-04-12, including the criteria, findings, and conclusions within the proposed findings and recommendation and staff report.
2. On November 8, 2005, the Coburg City Council held a public hearing and reviewed the vacation application for Gilbert/Coburg Investors, LLC after giving the required notice as per O.R.S. 271.080 and Coburg Zoning Ordinance No. 133-A, Article X.B.

B. Planning Staff recommends approval of vacation of Lot 5, Roberts Industrial Center, tax lot 100, assessor's map 17-03-04-12, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall provide a certified copy of the ordinance vacating the plat and map shall be filed with the county clerk. The petitioner shall bear the cost of recording, preparing, and filing the certified copy.
2. Any new drainfield areas for the property shall be first approved by Lane County Environmental Health. Copies of all permits shall be submitted to the Coburg Planning Department.
3. Any future building on the site will comply with the most current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) standards and regulations as FEMA Flood Insurance Map Number 41039C0643F with effective date June 2, 1999 shows a Zone A (area within the 100-year floodplain) crossing lot 5 Tract I and Tract II approximately, but not entirely within the Muddy Creek Irrigation Channel Easement.

C. Coburg Planning Staff recommends approval of the vacation of the property line for Lot 5 Roberts Industrial Center based on the following criteria and findings of fact:

The following are findings of fact and state whether or not the proposed application satisfies the required criteria (in *italics*) found in the Coburg, Oregon

CONFORMANCE WITH COBURG ZONING ORDINANCE, NO. A-133, SECTION H, Vacation Procedures and Criteria

1. Vacation Procedures

A proposal to vacate an easement, right-of-way, or plat may be initiated by the City Council or by petition of adjoining and area owners in accordance with ORS 271.080. Type II procedures as outlined in ARTICLE X.B.13. shall be used as supplemented by the provisions of ORS Chapter 271.080 Petitions for vacations shall be submitted on a form prescribed by the City and shall be accompanied by the required application fee.

Finding: The applicant meets this requirement. An application was submitted to the City and fee paid. A Type II procedure requires a public hearing, notices were sent to property owners within 400 feet of the property, exceeding the legal requirement, notices posted in three prominent City public locations and sent to the Register Guard, as required in the Coburg Zoning Ordinance, No. 133-A and ORS 271.080. The property owner, Coburg Investors, LLC, is sole owner of the subject property for the vacation.

2. Vacation Criteria.

The Council shall give consideration to the following criteria in reaching a decision on a vacation request:

a. *Conformance to applicable Comprehensive Plan policies and maps.*

Finding: The applicant meets this criterion. The proposal is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- P. 25: Goals 2 & 14: Land Use and Urbanization: Policy 1
The city shall preserve urbanizable land and provide for orderly, efficiency development by controlling densities through provision of the Zoning and Subdivision ordinances, thereby preventing the need for overly extensive public services and restricting urbanization to that commensurate with the carrying capacity of the land.
- P. 27: Commercial and Industrial Land Use: Policy 6
Commercial and industrial properties shall have adequate sewage disposal systems as determined by DEQ and other applicable federal, state and local agencies.

The policies in the Coburg Comprehensive Plan encourage efficient and orderly development within the City of Coburg. The proposal to vacate the plat boundary line and adjust the property boundary will allow the most efficient use of the land for a future building site due to topographic barriers currently existing on the proposed lot for parking- a primary use of the facility for recreational vehicle sale. Approval of this vacation request and the proposed boundary line adjustments will allow for the most efficient use of the property.

The vacation and future boundary line adjustments will not affect the existing subsurface sewage disposal drainfield systems; however, locations for the any new drainfield areas will need to be approved by Lane County Environmental Health Department prior to final approval. This will be a condition of approval.

b. Potential conflict with any minor or major street plan.

Finding: The applicant's proposal meets this criterion. Existing access to Roberts Court from Roberts Road will be maintained. Both Roberts Court and Roberts Road are city streets and improved to city standards. No conflicts are anticipated by the vacation of this plat line.

c. Consistent with the City of Coburg Transportation System Plan, consider the potential to establish or maintain accessways, paths, or trails, prior to vacation of any public easement or right-of-way, in addition to effect on access, traffic circulation, and emergency service protection.

Finding: The applicant's proposal meets this requirement. The proposed subdivision plat boundary vacation will not affect any transportation systems and is consistent with Coburg's Transportation System Plan.

d. Need for access to existing properties or potential lots, which would otherwise be without access to a public way.

Finding: The applicant's proposal meets this requirement. The proposed plat vacation will not affect access to either Roberts Road or Roberts Court. In the future, when city sewers are available and the septic systems are abandoned, the lot may take access from either Roberts Court or Roberts Road, subject to site plan review, boundary line adjustments or land partitioning review.

CONFORMANCE WITH ORS 271.120 Hearing; determination.

At the time fixed by the governing body for hearing the petition and any objections filed thereto or at any postponement or continuance of such matter, the governing body shall hear the petition and objections and shall determine whether the consent of the owners of the requisite area has been obtained, whether notice has been duly given and whether the public interest will be prejudiced by the vacation of such plat or street or parts thereof. If such matters are determined in favor of the petition the governing body shall by ordinance make such determination a matter of record and vacate such plat or street; otherwise it shall deny the petition. The governing body may, upon hearing, grant the petition in part and deny it in part, and make such reservations, or either, as appear to be for the public interest.

Finding: The applicant meets the requirements of ORS 271.120. The consent of owner has been obtained, and notice of the public hearing provided as required. This notice included mailed notice to property owners within 400 feet, exceeding the legal requirement, notices posted in three prominent City public locations and published in the Register Guard two times. The public interest will be served by allowing the plat vacation which will allow for efficient use of existing industrially zoned property.

D. Based on the findings stated above, the Coburg City Council finds that the applicant meets the requirements for a vacation of a subdivision plat line for Lot 5, Roberts Industrial Center. This recommendation of approval of the Couper/MBM Vacation shall be forwarded to the Coburg City Council for public hearing and final decision.

Judy Volta, Mayor
Coburg City Council

Date

11/8/05

ATTACHMENT B

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE VACATING PART OF A PLAT DESCRIBED AS LOT 5, ROBERTS INDUSTRIAL CENTER WITHIN THE CITY OF COBURG.

WHEREAS, the purpose of this ordinance is to grant approval by the City of Coburg, an Oregon Municipal corporation for the vacation of a part of a plat described as Lot 7, Roberts Industrial Center from the recorded plat, such that this parcel shall hereafter be a separate lot from that plat; and,

WHEREAS, this vacation petition was initiated by MBM Group in accordance with O.R.S. 271.080 (2) and Coburg Zoning Ordinance, No. 133-A, and after notification pursuant to O.R.S. 271.110 and Coburg Zoning Ordinance, No 133-A, Article X, Section B, and hearing before the City of Coburg Planning Commission, was found by the Planning Commission, based upon the required legal criteria and adopted findings, to not prejudice the public interest and to have the consent of the affected property owners; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council recommended approval of this petition for vacation; and,

WHEREAS, the owners of a majority of the area affected have not objected to the vacation; and,

WHEREAS, the Coburg City Council now specifically finds that the city recorder has filed a certificate that all city liens and taxes on the subject property have been paid, and that all applicable criteria for this vacation petition, notice, hearing, property owner consent, lack of substantial effects on the market value of affected property owners and the public interest pursuant to O.R.S 271.080-271.150 and Ordinance NO. A-133-A have been satisfied and favor granting this petition;

THE CITY OF COBURG ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Coburg Planning Staff report and criteria, findings and conclusions are hereby approved and adopted by the Coburg City Council.
2. The Coburg City Council concludes that there are no reasonably foreseeable public need for the subject lot of this vacation petition to remain a part of the Roberts Industrial Center recorded plat, that the public interest will not be prejudiced by granting this vacation, that the required property owner consent to this vacation have been obtained and that the long-term public interests will be best served by vacating this lot from the plat, such that this lot shall hereafter be a legal parcel of land separate from the Roberts Industrial Center plat.
3. The real property specifically described as Lot 5, Roberts Industrial Center within the City of Coburg, Lane County, Oregon, is hereby vacated as part of the Roberts Industrial Center plat from the effective date of this ordinance, and shall hereafter exist as a legal parcel of land separate from the Roberts Industrial Center plat.
4. In accordance with O.R.S 271.150, a certified copy of this ordinance will be filed with the Lane County Record's Office, the Lane County Surveyor's Office and the Lane County Assessor's Office.
5. In the event any provision of this ordinance is finally adjudged to be legally unenforceable, then the remaining provisions not so adjudged shall remain in full force and effect.
6. This ordinance shall take effect thirty days after adoption by the City Council and approval by the Mayor.

After public notice, hearing and council deliberations, and having been read twice by title, no councilor present having requested a full reading of this ordinance, this ordinance was put to a vote by councilor motion and second, the results of which were:

YES: _____

NO: _____

ABSTAIN: _____

PASSED: _____

REJECTED: _____

SIGNED AND APPROVED THIS ____ day of _____, 2004.

Judy Volta, Mayor
City of Coburg

ATTEST:

David Landrum, City Recorder

STATE OF OREGON)

)ss

County of Lane)

On _____, personally appeared before me the above-named Judy Volta, Mayor City of Coburg known to me to be the same person who executed the foregoing instrument on behalf of the City of Coburg, an Oregon municipal corporation, and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his voluntary act and deed.

Notary Public for Oregon
My Commission Expires: _____

**COBURG PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

Bill McFadden, Coburg Bed & Breakfast Conditional Sign Permit

I. BASIC DATA

File number: SR-5-05

Applicant: Bill McFadden
32712 E. McKenzie
Coburg, Oregon 97408

Property Owner: Bill and Patsy McFadden
32712 E. McKenzie
Coburg, Oregon 97408

Agent: Bill McFadden
32712 E. McKenzie
Coburg, Oregon 97408

Request: A site plan review application to allow an additional free-standing sign in a residential district in conjunction with a permitted use Bed and Breakfast

Property Location: 32712 E. McKenzie on the SE corner of McKenzie and Diamond Sts.

Assessor's map & tax lot: 16-03-33-23, tax lot 1700, lot 6

Zoning Designation: None (located in public right-of-way)

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Residential - R

Applicable Criteria: Coburg Sign Ordinance, No, A-155, Section 8, IL, Light Industrial zone & Section 35, Conditional Sign Permit, Coburg Zoning Ordinance, No. A-133, Article IX, Section B, Site Plan Review Permit, Article X, Section B, Land Development Procedures.

Report Date: November 1, 2005

Planning Commission

Meeting Date: November 9, 2005

II. REQUEST

The applicant is requesting a conditional sign permit allowing the Coburg Bed and Breakfast a freestanding sign on the said property. The sign dimension is 24" wide and 29" tall.

III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Conditional Sign Permit application be approved considering Planning Staff findings and conclusions in the attached Proposed Final Order. The Conditional Sign Permit applicant should incur an alternative fee of \$250 instead of \$1,720 as a result of the October 12, 2005 Planning Commission action as follows:

Commissioner McConnell moved, seconded by Commissioner Greenwell to establish six square feet as the maximum size sign allowed in the Residential Zones and that an application fee of \$250.00 be established for a conditional use sign. The motion was adopted unanimously, 6:0.

IV. BACKGROUND

In July 2005, Planning Commissioner Thiel brought to Commission attention the installation of a free-standing sign in a residential district. This was a nonconforming use of signage in the current Residential District zone. The owner, Bill McFadden, was informed that he must apply for a Conditional Sign Permit. As the code is written, the property owner may choose to submit a conditional sign permit which would allow the Planning Commission to review a sign proposal that would ordinarily not be permitted by the sign ordinance. However, processing a conditional sign permit may not be a feasible option given the application fee for a conditional use permit is \$1,720

The Planning Commission requested staff to review the Conditional Sign permit review procedure and offer recommendations to improve the processes if necessary.

After deliberation at the October 12, Planning Commission Meeting the Planning Commission took the following action:

Commissioner McConnell moved, seconded by Commissioner Greenwell to establish six square feet as the maximum size sign allowed in the Residential Zones and that an application fee of \$250.00 be established for a conditional use sign. The motion was adopted unanimously, 6:0

V. REFERRALS

Referrals were sent to:

- Coburg Public Works on October 20, 2005

Coburg Public Works stated that this application would not impact the Public Works Department.

VI. PROPERTY OWNER NOTICES

Notices were sent to all property owners within 100 feet of the subject property on October 28, 2005. This is a limited land use decision under the requirements of the Coburg Zoning Ordinance notice requirements and ORS 197.195 for notice of Limited Land Use Decisions.

No comments were received at the time of preparation of this staff report.

VII. ISSUES/DISCUSSION

Conditional Sign permits are reviewed under the same criteria as a development proposal. The Conditional Use Permit process is intended to be used for certain types of development when special considerations prior to their being permitted in a particular district. The same review process is required for signs that are not permitted in a zoning district. The criteria of approval for Conditional Use and a Conditional Sign Permit are the same. However, the review procedure and applicable criteria is much more involved for a proposed land use than for a proposed sign.

Since the level of review for a Conditional Sign permit and a Conditional Use is significantly different, the fee for a Conditional Sign permit was reasonable. The methodology included consideration that if a sign permit cost \$175 and is processed as a Type I application and a Conditional Sign permit costs \$1,720 and is processed as a Type II application requiring public notice, the Conditional Sign permit fee of \$250 to cover staff review time and public notice costs. However, adjusting the fee does not alleviate the fact that the Conditional sign permits will still be reviewed using the Conditional Use criteria. The attached Final Order presents all of the proper criteria and findings for Conditional Use.

VIII. POSSIBLE ACTIONS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission may:

- 1. Approve Conditional Sign Permit with adjusted development fee**

2. **Do not approve Conditional Sign Permit and provide findings of fact that illustrate applicant's nonconformity with existing Conditional Use Permit Criteria**

IX. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Proposed Final Order

X. EXHIBITS

- A. Coburg Bed & Breakfast Conditional Sign Permit application and materials.