



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: David Landrum, Mark Phelps, Kay Bork, 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 for improvements to be made.

She introduced representatives of the CH3M 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

CH3M Consultant 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-quarter 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, 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 Meyers, 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.a.(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 delete 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 unanimously, 4:0.

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. **Delete Article VIII.J.4.h.(2).(a).**
- j. **Amend Article VIII.J.4.h.(2). (b) by changing the minimum to 4'-0".**
- k. **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.

l. Delete Article VIII.J.4.(2).(f).

m. 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

Yes: _____

No: _____

Abstained: _____

Passed: _____ Rejected: _____

Signed this _____ day of _____ 2005

Judith Volta, Mayor

Attest:

David Landrum, City Recorder