



## City Council & Planning Commission

Joint Work Session

February 22, 2022

Coburg City Hall

91069 North Willamette Street

Virtual via Zoom

**COUNCILORS PRESENT:** Ray Smith, Mayor; Mark Alexander, Kyle Blain, Nancy Bell, Patricia McConnell, John Fox.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Paul Thompson, Seth Clark, John Marshall.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Gary Darnielle, Sammy Egbert, Damien Gilbert, Brian Harmon, Anne Heath, Fire Chief Chad Minster.

### 1. Call Work Session to Order

Mayor Smith opened the Joint City Council and Planning Commission work session at 6:00 p.m.

### 2. Transportation Information

Mr. Darnielle reminded everyone that at the last meeting there were a lot of questions about Light Industrial zoning versus Campus zoning. Staff had put together a presentation in order to inform both the Council and Commission on what their development code dictated for those zonings. The presentation would utilize a fake scenario that staff put together.

Mr. Darnielle said that the developer had to provide a concept plan to the City. The concept plan was made up of a few parts. First was a statement describing the character of the proposed development and reasons behind choices made by the applicant. Second was a development schedule with approximate dates of construction of the development and phases. Third was a narrative report documenting modifications of standards (compliance with approval criteria). The developer must make the City aware of any modifications as soon as they can. Fourth were special studies of qualified professionals required by planning staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council (i.e. traffic, geologic, noise, environmental, natural resource, etc.). Fifth was an existing conditions map. Sixth was a conceptual plan showing building envelopes, circulation, open space, and utility connections. Seventh was a grading plan where extensive grading was anticipated. Eighth was a landscape concept, which showed retention of existing vegetation and general planting areas. Ninth was an architectural concept (describe architectural style, building heights, and general materials).

For the concept plan to be approved it had to meet the following standards. First was it had to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Second, it had to comply with land division standards. Third, it had to meet development and design standards of Articles VII and VIII (except where modified). Fourth, it had to meet the open space requirement of 20%.

Mr. Darnielle noted that a development would need to go in front of the City Council at least twice. The Planning Commission would be involved in the process as well.

Mayor Smith asked what level of involvement the community (this included the Planning Commission) had in the subjectivity and objectivity of the development code. Mr. Darnielle responded that there was a lot of flexibility. The City Council had to make the developer aware of the standards that they had to meet.

Councilor Fox wanted them to tighten up their code to make sure developments the community did not want were not built. He was personally passionate about eliminating the amount of light pollution in Coburg. Mr. Darnielle responded that there were standards (noise, traffic, etc.) that the developer had to meet. He suggested that if there were standards that the City Council did not agree with that, they change them quickly. Once a development application was sent it had to be processed under the rules that existed when it was submitted.

Commissioner Marshall asked when they should enter negotiation on code standards when a developer was asking for an exception. Mr. Darnielle replied that the City had final approval on whether they wanted to give the developer an exception. He said that the type of exemption determined the course of action as well.

Councilor McConnell brought up a citizen concern that was brought up at the last City Council meeting. They asked whether a beverage distribution company could use City water resources to package and redistribute water and what impact that would have on resident's water usage. Mr. Darnielle replied that any development had to conform to the master water plan. The City was aware of the limitations of their water system and would not put a company's water needs above the community. Mr. Harmon was concerned with beverage manufactures coming into the area. He would be against those types of developments entering the City.

Commissioner Clark remembered a few years back when a development was denied based on water usage. There was not enough infrastructure for companies to bottle the water in Coburg and resell it. Mayor Smith added that the development was not denied. They were in negotiations to find out if the City was able to provide the water necessary. In those situations, if more water is needed, than the developer must pay for that development. Through those conversations the developer decided to back out. Ms. Heath stated that when there was interest in a property by a manufacturer, they sent them a questionnaire. The questionnaire asked how much power, water, sewage, etc. They would need. City staff was very involved in figuring out if they had the capacity to give the business. She said there had been times in the past when they had to deny businesses based on that criterion.

Councilor Alexander inquired into who would pay for the infrastructure that was being brought over from across the freeway. Mayor Smith replied that the System Development Charges (SDC) and water fees were utilized. Mr. Harmon clarified that they did not solely take the water under the freeway for development. A reservoir would be put in place on that side of the freeway in the future.

Councilor McConnell had some concerns with traffic studies based on the one that was done during the Hayden Home application process. Mr. Gilbert responded that traffic studies were complex. It looked at future capacity and condition of the roads. The study helped make decisions like if a stop sign or a traffic light would be better to put in. Mayor Smith had found that engineering standards and other standards differed. Mr. Gilbert mentioned that the Planning Commission could change the standard for their traffic study. Commissioner Marshall stated that while they could do that, those changes could not be applied to County roads.

Councilor Alexander asked if a traffic study considered how much traffic would reroute because of not wanting to use the freeway, the other entrances and exits near the fire station, and rerouting because of bridge traffic. Fire Chief Minster responded that the intent of a traffic study was not to get into every detail. Rather if a traffic signal was needed, or if another lane should be added for a turn.

Ms. Heath mentioned that the code did not specify which utilities to include, and it was the charge of the staff to determine. Mr. Harmon said that was correct, but he was not sure if that applied to private development. Mr. Gilbert concurred.

### **3. Adjournment**

Mayor Smith adjourned the work session at 7:31 p.m.

*(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)*

**APPROVED** by the City Council of the City of Coburg on this \_\_ day of March 2022.

---

Ray Smith, Mayor of Coburg

ATTEST:

---

Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder

**APPROVED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Coburg on this \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_ 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Thompson, Chair

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder

DRAFT