



**Coburg Parks | Tree Committee
Work Session**

May 13, 2021 – 5:00 P.M.
Virtual Meeting – Coburg City Hall
91136 North Willamette St.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Mary Mosier, Chair; Lonna Meston, Coleen Marshall, Joe Morneau, Claire Smith, Karen Coury, Tom Beatty.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Brian Harmon, Public Works; Megan Winner, Planning and Economic Planning Assistant; Anne Heath, City Administrator; Sammy Egbert, City Recorder; Gary Darnielle, City Attorney.

GUESTS: Ramon Fisher; Todd Favreau, Property Owner

1. Call Meeting to Order

Ms. Mosier called the Park and Tree Committee to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Mr. Harmon took roll and a quorum was present.

3. Annexation Property Open Space

Ms. Heath began by explaining that this meeting came about because of the discussions about the open space of this property. Because this type of property has a different requirement than what the Park and Tree Committee might be used to, Ms. Heath thought it was important to take the time to outline the developer requirements and allow the developer talk about the property and their plans for providing open space on the property.

Ms. Heath invited Mr. Darnielle to outline the requirements for this property.

Mr. Darnielle explained the need to differentiate between the standards that apply in the light industrial district from a normal residential subdivision land use. In a light industrial district there were certain open space requirements that require a certain percentage of the property

to be landscaped. Mr. Darnielle said that there was no mechanism for dedicating money to supporting parks. Much of the 20% of open space will be in a conservation easement, in part to provide a buffer between light industrial uses and residential uses to the east. This development agreement differs from other agreements in that the developer won't be actually performing the development but will be selling the parcels to different parties who will develop different sections to be annexed.

Mr. Darnielle asked the committee for any questions.

Ms. Coury asked if the 20% of the property designated to open space would look different from a central park. Mr. Darnielle responded that the code allows developers to create private parks which serve the interest of employees but are not accessible to the public depending on the location of the open space and what the best use of the space will be.

Mr. Mosier asked to define the term easement, Mr. Darnielle explained that an easement was a legal right to use someone else's property. In this case, the easement is over what is now the applicant's property but will eventually be under different ownership and will go with the land when it's sold. Mr. Darnielle explained the need to determine who will manage the easement. He said this easement was an encumbrance on the property that prevents it from being developed and would specify the allowed uses within it. He said that the property owner would retain ownership but the easement would burden the ownership right.

Ms. Mosier suggested that the property owner be responsible for maintenance of the easement and Mr. Darnielle agreed. Ms. Heath added that they weren't completely sure what it would look like but hoped that Mr. Fisher would share his thoughts.

Mr. Fisher gave some background on the property, explaining that they had owned it for 10-12 years and that the property was not suited for farmland. He noted that Lane county was lacking in large lot industrial parcels. Mr. Fisher shared that they were successful in attaining light industrial zoning last year and were now working on the annexation agreement. The challenge was that they did not know who the end user would be and whether it would be someone who would purchase the whole thing. Mr. Fisher said there was a prospective buyer in place, and that the property would likely be either split into 4 smaller parcels or 2 small parcels in front with one large in the back, bisected by an entrance road. He met with the Diamond Ridge residents who desired to keep a natural buffer of trees on the east side of the property. Mr. Fisher proposed leaving as much buffer as possible, between 15-17 acres. This area could be used by customer's employees for recreation or left wooded as it is. He noted early concern was what happened when the companies went home at night, and that the Diamond Ridge residents did not want an area where people would be loitering at night.

Mr. Favreau added that the buffer and/or the park lands would be in the sloped area on the east side of property. Ms. Heath noted that this was an important wooded area because it protects homes and retains timber on the back of the property.

Ms. Mosier inquired about the width of the property and Mr. Favreau answered that there was a 330' width and a vertical elevation ranging from 415' to 475'.

Mr. Beatty asked if the landscape would remain the same when driving east out of Coburg, Mr. Fisher answered yes it would be mostly the same. Mr. Beatty added that there would be very little human footprint in the area.

Ms. Mosier asked where the entrance to the area would be, Mr. Fisher said there would be an access road running north-south through the center of property, with the people on the east side having direct access to the buffer area.

Ms. Coury asked if all of the 20% buffer would be on the east side of property, Mr. Fisher answered that the contract stipulated 20% of the property to be open space, and that the west side especially would have to be landscaped. He added that the prospective buyer wanted the northeast quadrant property which would be in the buffer zone. Mr. Fisher considered allocating the rest of the buffer area to each of the other properties so the people on the west side didn't have to include 20% of landscaping area.

Ms. Coury asked about the creek on the west side of property and if a perimeter trail were possible. Mr. Fisher said that one problem was that the city services may not want to patrol there at night. He said to think of the property as 4 separate businesses and that a path running through it would not produce the end result desired. Ms. Coury asked if this was city property and who was responsible for determining what the open space looked like, Mr. Darnielle answered that the city will review the development against code regulations including open space and setback regulations and that it is not the city's property but is its jurisdiction. Ms. Heath added there was a requirement to create open space for the employees of the businesses rather than a public park.

Ms. Smith asked about policing concerns and if a security gate were possible at the north entrance. Mr. Fisher answered that because it would be a city street when completed, ODOT would have jurisdiction but that there may be gated entrances off of the new street.

Mr. Beatty asked if this property could be accessed now and Mr. Fisher replied yes.

Ms. Coury asked how big the lot sizes would be, Mr. Fisher answered generally 25-50 acres. Ms. Coury added that the responsibility of the parks committee was to have a long term plan including trees to help reduce heating and cooling bills and mitigate pollution, and hoped that people were investing in the future livability of the whole area. Mr. Fisher agreed, adding that he had been approached by people who wanted a medium industrial use but that the city did not want that.

Mr. Morneau asked if the residences to the west would be given the same consideration as the ones to the east. Mr. Fisher responded that the western property owners would need to do a lot more landscaping to create a buffer. Mr. Favreau added that there was a natural buffer on the east side but that the code requires a buffer on the west too.

Ms. Mosier asked how much of the area was soggy during winter months, Mr. Fisher said there was about 14 acres of wetlands, with about 8 acres being in the middle of the field and some in the buffer area. He said the plan was to buy credits in the wetlands bank to allow customers to build in those areas but that there may be some protected easements that are not buildable. Ms. Mosier hoped to maintain at least some wetlands.

Ms. Coury asked where the western property owners would get oversight from when developing the properties, Mr. Fisher answered that the annexation agreement included a list of requirements from the city and that they are hoping to start as soon as the property is annexed. He also mentioned making sure they honor any existing easements.

Ms. Heath said it was important to point out that any time a parcel is sold the development required a master plan and that the city wanted to plan upfront for what the open space looked like for the whole area instead of planning 4 different areas separately. She wished to add this to the annex agreement.

Ms. Marshall asked if the park committee would review the master plan once it was finished. Ms. Heath asked if the master plan agreement would be for the whole property or just the piece that was sold, Mr. Fisher said he believed the entire property would be done, depending on who is interested in buying. Ms. Heath said the master plan could be shared with the park committee once completed and added that they tried to engage the park committee in these types of developments.

Mr. Fisher commended the committee on their hard work and commitment.

Mr. Beatty asked if the intersection with I-5 was suited for the expected traffic this development might produce. Mr. Fisher answered that a traffic study was being performed and that ODOT would need access to the Country Squire area and the trailer park but would only need to notify the owners for access. He said there should be a process in place for working with ODOT when the overpass work started. Mr. Fisher did not anticipate this work would overlap with the land development. Ms. Heath added that there was funding available for the design of the bridge and that ODOT showed a preliminary design for rebuilding the bridge. She hoped there would be funding to build in the future but said that currently it is funded for design only. Mr. Fisher added that any improvement there would also help sell the property.

Ms. Coury asked about the entranceway being built and whose property it was on, Mr. Fisher answered that it was not city property. Mr. Morneau added that this was private property.

Ms. Mosier asked about the north side of Van Duyn and Mr. Fisher said that ODOT may take a small sliver of that property. Ms. Mosier expressed concern about maintaining wetlands and remarked on the possibility of owners putting in a sports park.

Ms. Heath noted that one positive of this was receiving SDC funds which will pay for future parks in other areas of the community.

Ms. Mosier was sad to see Coburg expanding and losing farm and pastureland but expressed appreciation for the committee's work.

4. Adjournment

Ms. Mosier adjourned the meeting at 5:43 p.m.

APPROVED by Park | Tree Committee on this xx day of xx 2021.

ATTEST:

Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder

Mary Mosier, Chair

(Minutes recorded by Jayson Hayden)