



MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting

March 20, 2024 at 6:00pm

Coburg City Hall

91136 N Willamette Street

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: William Wood

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

RECORDED BY: Madison Balcom; Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Chair Bell called roll. A quorum was present.

AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM:

a. December 20, 2023

MOTION

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

Motion passed — 5:0.

b. February 21, 2024

MOTION

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

Motion passed —5:0.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION

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

Motion passed — 5:0.

b. Comprehensive Plan Review: Goals 3 & 4

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

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

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

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

Ms. Winner explains Goal 4: Forest Lands and provides further detail.

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

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

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

UPDATES & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

a. March City Administration Report | *Information Only*

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

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Jim Bell, Commission Chair

ATTEST: _____
Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder

DRAFT