



**Coburg City Council Work Session**  
November 17, 2020  
Coburg City Hall  
Meeting held via webinar  
91136 North Willamette St., Coburg, Oregon

**Councilors Present:** Ray Smith, Mayor; Nancy Bell, Mark Alexander, John Lehmann, Patricia McConnell, John Fox.

**Councilor Absent:** Kyle Blain

**Staff Present:** Anne Heath, City Administrator; Sammy Egbert, City Recorder; Megan Winner, Economic Development Assistant; Tim Gaines, Finance Director; Brian Harmon, Public Works Director.

**Call the City Council Work Session Meeting to Order**

Mayor Smith opened the City Council Work Session at 6:34 p.m.

Zoe Anton had presented early numbers for the buildout scenarios to City Council in September. Today she would go over the final numbers and comments from the community.

First, Ms. Anton gave some information on the Coburg demographics from the 2018 US Census. The 2020 population estimate was 1,295. The median age of residents was 41.5, median housing value was \$288,400, median gross rent was \$869/month, and median income was \$55,208. She then talked about the population projections based off the 2019 PSU projection. The population in Coburg in 2044 was expected to be 1,678 (an increase of 383). To account for these additional residents the town would have to build an additional 142 units.

Ms. Anton went through the community vision statement that was adopted in July 2017. It talked a lot about maintaining parks and green spaces, having attractive ranges of housing options, and preserving buildings.

There was a total of eight settings for buildout. Settings 1, 2, 3, and 4 were residential or central business. Settings 5, 6, 7, and 8 were highway commercial and industrial. Ms. Anton shared that they got 208 responses to the survey, which accounted for 16% of the population. She shared that this was a great turn out for a city of Coburg's side. The highest scoring development scenarios were Setting 3, Scenario 2 and Setting 4, Scenario 2.

Setting 1 Scenario 1 averaged a score of 2.16. Comments on the scenario were worried it would not be affordable, that the lots would be too small, and that it would add traffic. Comments praised that there were some larger lots, they fit with the historic small-town feel, some of the houses matched existing development, and there would be minimal traffic impact.

Setting 1 Scenario 2 averaged a score of -4.54. Comments on the scenario did not like the townhomes and thought the area was too dense, that there would be too many people in the area, that it would mean losing their historic small town feel, and that it would add traffic. Comments praised that the townhomes were affordable and that it would add business and commercial space.

Setting 2 Scenario 1 would be commercial for box/convenience store build. There would be 56 commercial parking space and 150 district parking spaces. The scenario provided a low-density development alternative. The setting was dominated by surface parking and contains a commercial structure to the rear of the setting. The scenario produced minimal economic benefit in the developable area. It averaged a score of -4.54. Comments on the scenario did not like the lack of historic character, the added traffic, the big-box retail look, and the excessive amount of pavement/parking. Comments praised the added new businesses, a grocery store, and downtown retail which would reduce driving.

Setting 2 Scenario 2 would be mixed-use for food market, retail, and apartments above. There would be 36 residential units (12 single-family townhomes and 24 multi-family apartments). There would be 2 parking spaces per unit (72 total), 28 commercial parking spaces, and 80 district parking spaces. The scenario provided a higher density development alternative. Mixed-use development provided for residential units above and ground floor retail space along the city's main street. The scenario maximized benefit derived from a mixed-use structure that fronts the street, providing amenities to the downtown area with ample parking provided in back and to the side. Townhomes frame a treelined street with a small-town green along North Willamette Street. It averaged a score of 1.70. Comments did not like the urban feel of the scenario, the added traffic, or the townhomes. Comments praised the downtown retail, supporting local businesses, the mixed-use development, and more housing.

Setting 3 Scenario 1 averaged a score of -2.66. Comments thought it was a waste of space, had too much pavement, and no historic character. Comments praised more downtown parking and supporting downtown businesses and events.

Setting 3 Scenario 2 averaged a score of 2.42. Comments thought there was not enough parking, that there was no demand for more dining or commercial space, and that it added traffic. Comments praised the added mixed-use housing, focused of development downtown and around parks, maintained the small-town feel, the added amenities, and services, and spurred economic activity downtown.

Setting 4 Scenario 1 averaged a score of -2.62. Comments did not like the added traffic, it not adding to the historic character of the town, commercial development outside downtown, that there was no demand for the offices, and a potential conflict with surrounding residents. Comments praised the access to a main road, the office spaces, and new businesses.

Setting 4 Scenario 2 averaged a score of 2.42. Comments did not like the added traffic, how big/tall the building was, and it not being consistent with surrounding development. Comments praised the mixed-use, new businesses and economic activity, opportunity for affordable housing, and rear parking.

Setting 5 Scenario 1 averaged a score of -2.37. Comments did not want fast food, that it removed space for truckers, that it did not add to the historic character of the city, and extra storage space was not needed. Some comments praised the new dining options and the extra storage.

Setting 5 Scenario 2 averaged a score of 0.39. Some comments did not think there was a demand for commercial/office space, the noise from manufacturing, and how it did not add to the City's historic character. Some comments praised the manufacturing space, the appropriate use for the site, and the extra jobs and economic opportunities.

Setting 6 Scenario 1 averaged a score of -0.94. Some comments did not like that it did not add to the historic character and removed farmland/greenspace. Some comments praised the extra lodging and spurred economic activity/tourism.

Setting 6 Scenario 2 averaged a score of 1.16. Some comments thought it was too close to the freeway for residential development and would attract out-of-towners. Some comments praised the added businesses, new amenities for the community, and that it encouraged biking and walking.

Setting 7 Scenario 1 averaged a score of -1.16. Some comments did not like supporting fast-food, how it took away from local businesses, and the unnecessary added truck stops. Some comments praised the appropriate use for this site, additional food and lodging for truckers/travelers, and kept 1-5 travelers outside of downtown.

Setting 7 Scenario 2 averaged a score of 1.92. Some comments thought the buildings were too big, that the area was not walkable, that they did not need or want hotels, and concerns around crime. Some comments praised the need for lodging, keeping traffic on the east side of 1-5, the added tax base and support of local economy, and the greenspace.

Setting 8 Scenario 1 averaged a score of -1.64. Some comments thought that there was no demand for this much industrial, it was too close to residents, it was an unsightly development, and meant they lost farmland. Some comments praised the extra jobs, focus on industrial growth outside of downtown, and appropriate use of the site.

Setting 8 Scenario 2 averaged a score of -1.08. Some comments thought there were too many buildings that were too big, that it was too close to residences, and the area was very dense. Some comments praised the access to the area from 1-5, the new jobs it would provide, and having industrial on the east side of the freeway.

Councilor Fox stated that since the community voted based off of the photos provided, they had to make sure any projects that came from this looked the same. Mayor Smith agreed. Ms. Anton said that this was one reason they put images on top of actual photos of Coburg. All the scenarios shown were within zoning and could be built just like shown. Mayor Smith stated that the City needed to learn what they did not want for Coburg and make zoning code changes to reflect that. Ms. Anton said that they could use the comments left by the community to help form the code changes. Many people were worried about Coburg's identity and wanted to see more mixed-use housing.

Councilor Alexander asked if they would have access to the buildout scenario information. Ms. Anton replied that all this information would be in a final report that the City had. They also had access to the raw data.

Ms. Anton gave some recommendations for next steps the City could take. She said that they should continue to engage residents as new developments occurred, consider simplifying the zoning code. They might want to consider developing a form-based code for the Central Business District and any other neighborhoods or main streets where next developments may occur. Ms. Anton also recommended they prioritize walkability and greenspaces in public area. She stated that there was no current need for Coburg to consider expanding the Urban Growth Boundary to achieve the development required for the projected population growth.

Councilor Fox asked for an explanation of form-based code. Ms. Anton replied that what was usually used was Euclidean code focused on uses of plots of land. This made sure that industrial zones were not right next to residential zones. A form-base code zoned by the way the buildings were formed instead of the use. That would allow for businesses to take up buildings that looked like houses. This could help their city look more uniform and historic to what they wanted to see. Ms. Anton added that this type of code was usually implemented in older towns.

Councilor McConnell wanted to know how quickly they could move to get new code written. Ms. Anton told her that Coburg's code had a lot of good things going for it. Mayor Smith thought that getting a new code done in six months seemed fast. He wanted to make sure that they got thorough feedback from the community and staff.

Ms. Brandy was curious about the walkability of Coburg with these changes. They already had a lot of traffic and wanted to know how they could reduce it. Ms. Anton voiced that she had not seen the traffic count for the main roads. She understood that the issue was on a County road. She recommended they reach out to Lane County for help. They could help the City fundraise some money to increase walkability. They could narrow the streets, which would make drivers

slow down, add more cross walks, and widen the sidewalks. Mayor Smith mentioned that the issue was that the traffic was not created in Coburg. He was working with the County to fix the issue. Councilor Alexander inquired into if they should hear back from the County before making their zoning changes. Ms. Anton said that they should not wait for someone else to do it. They should go to the County with issues and changes as they needed. She was happy to hear that they were being proactive about it.

Mayor Smith said that they had an issue with legacy housing in Coburg. When people get older and want to downsize there are no homes in Coburg that fit what they needed. He wanted this to be addressed in the future since it would bring younger families to the area.

Mayor Smith was glad to see the response to the parking lot next to Pavilion Park. Those comments would help them figure out what Coburg did not want. He noted that the community wanted to keep public green spaces open. Mayor Smith wanted to look at public hearings and see what they could do moving forward. Councilor McConnell did not want to see this issue taking up unnecessary time. She wanted them to have a timeline for it and stick to it. Councilor Fox thought having a draft within six months would be good. They could always push the time frame back if needed.

Councilor Lehmann asked if they could do anything in the meantime to keep building that went against the changes, they would implement from being built. Mayor Smith stated that they had to stick to whatever was in the zoning code, even if they did not agree with it. They could not just say no or put up a block.

Councilor Lehmann inquired into how much of the existing code would need to be changed to reach their goals. Mayor Smith felt that there were a lot of small points that they needed to change and if they decided to do a form-based code they would need to change more. Mr. Darnielle advised them to be careful with form-based zoning changes. They could end up creating huge learning curves for developers that they did not want in Coburg.

Councilor Lehmann knew that physical structures were a big issue but felt like the type of business was most of the issue. Mayor Smith thought that was on the right track. He mentioned the Sisters had a limit on the amount of national chains allowed in the City. Ms. Anton noted that big chains could conform to what they specified in the zoning code. She did not think type of business was an issue, but the look. Councilor McConnell stated that she wanted local businesses in Coburg and even if larger corporations conformed, they still might not want them.

Ms. Heath said that they could do small code changes soon and do bigger ones in the future. They could put out the most important stuff first and then they do not have to spend years making changes. Councilor Lehmann thought that they all seemed on the same page and just needed to flush out the details. Mayor Smith agreed and added that they needed to get the right people on the job. Ms. Anton recommended focusing on their central district and adding the minimum amount to their code while getting their desired outcomes.

Mayor Smith asked what types of people should be in the Committee. Councilor McConnell said that it should be a Planning Commissioner, a City Councilor, some staff, community members, and the Mayor. Ms. Anton recommended having one resident and one business owner.

Mayor Smith asked if any Councilors were interested in the Committee. Councilor McConnell and Councilor Fox both volunteered. Mayor Smith asked if there was any staff present who wanted to be on the Committee. Ms. Winner volunteered. Ms. Heath said that Henry Hearley could unofficially give advice if needed. Mayor Smith said that he would reach out to some business owners in town. Ms. Egbert recommended they talk to Seth Clark on the Planning Commission since he was a business owner. Ms. Winner recommended Marissa Doyle because she was on the Planning Commission, the Heritage Committee, and was an architect.

Ms. Heath said that they would work on getting all the remaining members of the Committee and come back to City Council for approval in December.

#### **1. Adjournment**

Mayor Smith adjourned the work session at 8:01 p.m.

*(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)*

**APPROVED** by the Mayor and Council of the City of Coburg this 12<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021.

---

Ray Smith, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder