



## MINUTES

### Code Review

#### Ad-Hoc Committee

September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021 5:30 P.M.

Virtual Meeting - Coburg City Hall

91136 N Willamette Street

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair John Fox, Cathy Engebretson, City Councilor; Marissa Doyle, Planning Commissioner; Alan Wells, Business Owner.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:** Patty McConnell, City Councilor; Paul Thompson, Planning Commission Chair; Jerry Behney, Citizen At-large.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Megan Winner, Planning and Economic Development.

**RECORDED BY:** Jayson Hayden, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG).

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Fox called the meeting to order at 5:35 P.M.

#### 2. ROLL CALL

Ms. Winner took roll and a quorum was present.

#### 3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- **Finish Subdivision Code Comments**

Chair Fox recapped that at the last meeting they had went over Ms. Engebretson's comments and that he agreed with them about clearing up passive language and changing words from partitions to subdivisions. He noted that they had not sent this off to the lady who would review it and Ms. Winner shared that they just confirmed they would move forward with that contract.

Ms. Engebretson noted that they had left off with replacing words throughout the entire code. Chair Fox noted that the word "shall" gives you the option and "must" means you had to go through the planning committee and Ms. Engebretson agreed that this left less room for interpretation.

Ms. Engebretson suggested removing the phrase “as far as is practical” as it left too much room for potential applicants who would fight and weren’t willing to meet the community halfway. Chair Fox agreed.

Ms. Engebretson mentioned there had been discussion around “abuts” or “adjacent” and shared that there had been a truck stop travel center wanting to come in that was able to find a loophole or technicality in the code. Chair Fox suggested adding the appropriate term to help avoid loopholes.

Chair Fox shared that someone had bought the property on the other side of the highway and initially wanted to put in a truck stop which would be great revenue for the town but was not what they had envisioned for the other side of the highway. Ms. Engebretson said that the public did not want truck stops anywhere near residential because it created a lot of noise, dust, and light in the middle of the night.

Mr. Wells asked if there were instances where they wouldn’t mind a commercial use of a certain type being across the street from residential and asked how they would do this. He thought that the language and definitions of words used could become subjective. Chair Fox thought this was a good point and noted that most of Oregon administrative rules began with definitions of words before going into the rule itself. Chair Fox said that they currently had commercial that abutted residential areas such as the current truck stop. Ms. Engebretson said when it came to these specific words there was a standard legal definition used but thought it wouldn’t hurt to include these definitions in their code too. She noted that there was not a lot of this throughout the code and that it had arisen due to a few specific situations in the past that they had learned from. She added that this one was not as cut and try as replacing shall with must and maybe this warranted the Planning Commission look through it. Mr. Wells suggested defaulting to the most restrictive code and having people come to bargain from there and Chair Fox agreed.

Ms. Engebretson said with design standards there was an attempt to take design standards that were embedded within the relevant section of code. She said that the headings of the section appeared organized but had trouble finding the design standards for a specific zone and thought that they should go back to a former version of the code and have someone put more time into making it clear. Chair Fox asked if this would go hand in hand with the design standard stuff he had taken from Fort Angeles in Washington and Ms. Engebretson said that this would go for any kind of design standard. Ms. Engebretson said it was difficult to read through with the way the code had been edited and thought there were standards that could be missed if they didn’t clean that section up. Chair Fox asked if there was an earlier version that had more concrete or better design standards which had been removed over time but Ms. Engebretson thought that the content had not changed but it had been cut and pasted in a way that made it unclear as to which zone the design standard applied to.

Chair Fox asked if the design standards were what the Governor retained all being great writing group for and Ms. Winner said yes, for the highway commercial. Chair Fox said whatever was in

the other design standards shouldn't conflict or confuse that and asked if Ms. Engebretson was suggesting they also needed one for the residential and downtown areas. Ms. Engebretson said they had a few design standards for residential noted that design standards were just part of the development code that talked about the design of the built environment whereas the other types of development code talked about the types of uses allowed. Chair Fox asked if the design standard would limit the use of modular homes and Ms. Engebretson said you could use a design standard to try to discourage a certain type of development or look. She explained that design standards dealt more with the look or appearance of the development rather than the use.

Mr. Wells asked if they had specific design standards for residential zones and Ms. Engebretson said yes they had about 5 and that they used to be listed in the residential zone code but were now placed all together with the rest of the design standards. Ms. Doyle noted that there was a difference between design standards and design guidelines and Ms. Engebretson suggested putting the guidelines along with the standards and thought someone should go through the old code to reference.

Ms. Doyle said she would love to have a table containing the requirements to help when quickly reviewing design code and thought other architects would love this too and would make it much simpler. Chair Fox suggested that Zoe could help implement this but noted it would be expensive as it is laid out now and hoped to find the original format.

Mr. Wells suggested having Zoe look at what she's doing and then edit it afterwards but Ms. Engebretson said it would be hard for her to know what they intend with the code as the layout and format currently stood. Chair Fox asked Ms. Winner to look for the older code that had the more consolidated design based standards.

Ms. Engebretson thought that the section on adding the minimum height requirement for screening spoke for itself as she noticed there were obvious specifics that were missing. Mr. Wells agreed that 6' sounded reasonable.

Ms. Engebretson shared that when the design standard for garage setbacks was put into code they decided 5' was the standard but after that several decisions were made to allow applicants of single resident homes to use a 4' setback rather than 5' as it worked better with the building materials. She said it still fulfilled the point of the standard which was to make Coburg more appealing to most people by having more porch and front door focused houses rather than having prominent garages.

Chair Fox asked Ms. Winner to note the 6' height standard that Mr. Wells suggested.

Ms. Doyle explained that the 4' length was determined by the standard size of a sheet of plywood and having to cut a second sheet to reach the 5' basically wasted a sheet.

Ms. Engebretson noted a missing word where it read that buildings within 40 feet of a front line shall have their primary orientation toward the street and thought that it should read 40 feet of street frontage instead.

Mr. Wells asked if they had decided on the street facing façade in the last meeting and noted that 100 feet was a lot of space. He suggested requiring the articulation instead of offering the choice of and/or articulation. Mr. Wells having a conversation to clarify what exactly articulation meant.

Ms. Engebretson said she was sure that as Zoe worked through the central business district design standards they would be able to utilize similar standards for other uses.

- **Review and Approve CBD Input**

Ms. Winner shared that these were comments they had requested to review one more time before handing off to Zoe. She noted that Zoe would be having a kickoff meeting with this committee so they would have direct interaction before she got started.

In response to inquiry from Chair Fox, Ms. Doyle explained her notes about a main entrance having at least 3 architectural features.

Mr. Wells said he liked Ms. Doyle's comments as she probably had more experience than anyone else there.

Chair Fox thought that a definition of articulation would be very helpful. He suggested shortening some of the maximum allowed building sizes as they didn't have any buildings 300' long.

#### **4. FUTURE MEETINGS | DATES TO REMEMBER**

- **Next Code Review Ad-Hoc Committee Meeting: September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2021**

#### **5. ADJOURNMENT**

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Fox adjourned the meeting at 6:37 P.M.

**APPROVED** by the Development Code Review Ad-Hoc Committee of Coburg this \_\_\_\_ day of xx 2021.

---

Chair, John Fox

ATTEST:

---

Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder

DRAFT