

Exhibit A



CITY OF SWEET HOME PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 19, 2024, 6:30 PM
Sweet Home City Hall, 3225 Main Street
Sweet Home, OR 97386

WiFi Passcode: guestwifi

PLEASE silence all cell phones – Anyone who wishes to speak, please sign in.

Meeting Information

The City of Sweet Home is streaming the meeting via the Microsoft Teams platform and asks the public to consider this option. There will be opportunity for public input via the live stream. To view the meeting live, online visit <http://live.sweethomeor.gov>. If you don't have access to the internet you can call in to 971-203-2871, choose option #1 and enter the meeting ID to be logged in to the call. Meeting ID: 265 017 664 000

Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM

Roll Call of Commissioners

PRESENT

Joe Graybill
Nancy White
Eva Journey (online)
Laura Wood

ABSENT

Jamie Melcher
Henry Wolthuis

STAFF

Blair Larsen, Community and Economic Development Director
Angela Clegg, Planning & Building Manager
Adam Leisinger, Special Projects Manager
Cecily Hope Pretty, Interim Assistant City Manager
Jason Ogden, Interim City Manager/Chief of Police

GUESTS

Colin McArthur, Cameron McCarthy, 106 E Broadway, Eugene, OR 97401
Elizabeth Auvil, Cameron McCarthy, 106 E Broadway, Eugene, OR 97401
Nancy Patton, 3041 Foothills Dr, Sweet Home, OR 97386
Brandell Braatz, 1530 Tamarack St #9, Sweet Home, OR 97386
Donna Brown, 1080 12th Ave, Sweet Home, OR 97386
Judy Goodenough, 1060 12th Ave, Sweet Home, OR 97386

Public Comment. This is an opportunity for members of the public to address the Planning Commission on topics that are not listed on the agenda.

None

The location of the meeting is accessible to the disabled. If you have a disability that requires accommodation, advanced notice is requested by notifying the City Manager's Office at 541-367-8969.

Exhibit A

Meeting Minutes:

- a) 2024-09-05 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the September 6, 2024 meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Graybill, seconded by Commissioner White

Yea: 4

Nay: 0

Absent: 2

Public Hearings

- a) Sweet Home Park System Plan

The Public Hearing was opened at 6:32 PM

Commissioner Wood read the application summary and asked of the Commission if there were any ex parte, conflicts of interest, or personal bias, there were none.

Director Larsen gave an introduction and introduced our consultants, Colin and Elizabeth, from Cameron McCarthy. The consultants gave a presentation to the planning commissioners.

Commissioner Graybill asked informed the consultants that there is a more updated waterways map. Graybill also asked if the consultants had considered the Foster Lake area. Colin explained that the Foster Lake area is owned by the Corp of Engineers, and the plan mentions partnerships, but focuses primarily on City limits properties. Director Larsen informed the Commissioners that staff have met with the Corp and discussed future partnerships and cooperation. Commissioner Wood asked if the cost estimates included staff maintenance. Colin stated that they did not explicitly include costs for operations and maintenance for each park that comes online, but it does include all the costs necessary to bring a project online including such things as planning, engineering, etc. Colin reminded the Commissioners that these are 10 to 20 year plans and operations and maintenance costs will change. Commissioner Journey asked about police surveillance and how that affect police staffing. She also stated that she is pleased to see the report. Director Larsen commented about park security. He stated that all future park plans will include security cameras. Commissioner White asked how likely the grants and improvement bonds will be to get and does the report prioritize based on funding. Colin stated that the priorities were based on what the community stated that they wanted and funding was considered based on community needs.

Testimony in Favor: Nancy Patton, a member of the Park & Tree Committee, testified in favor of the Park System Plan.

Testimony in Opposition: None

Neutral Testimony: None

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:06 PM

Commissioner White stated that she agrees with the information and direction in the plan, Commissioner Wood and Graybill agreed. Director Larsen stated for the record the the document is a planning and aspirational documents and reflects what the community wants. The list of projects and costs are not an obligation and all budget items will go through the budget community and City Council for approval. This document communicates to the Council, the community and future funders what the community wants. Commissioner Journey recommended they move it to the City Council.

A motion to recommend the Park System Plan to the City Council was made by Commissioner White, seconded by Commissioner Graybill.

Yea: 4

Exhibit A

Nay: 0
Absent: 2

b) Application CU24-01 Staff Report

The public hearing was opened at 7:11 PM

Commissioner Wood read the application summary and asked of the Commission if there were any ex parte, conflicts of interest, or personal bias, there were none.

Planning & Building Manager Clegg presented the staff report and asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Graybill asked if the concerns from the Fire Chief will be addressed through the building permit process or through a condition of approval. Clegg stated that some of the concerns have already been addressed and she included those items in the staff report. Other items will be addressed in the permit process. Special Projects Manager Leisinger stated that he can speak to the Commissioners about the renovations after the meeting since it doesn't apply to the conditional use application. Commissioner Graybill asked if the use applies to the upper and lower levels of the building or just the upper level? Director Larsen stated that at this time it is only the upper floor.

Testimony in favor: None

Testimony in opposition: Judy Goodenough, Donna Brown, and Brandell Braatz testified on behalf of the Hope Center. They are all concerned about safety and security for their tenants. The Hope Center is a home for women and children who live their due to unsafe circumstances in their past. They heard that mental health services would be offered at the site. Staff assured them that they have not heard of any mental health facilities were being offered. The women have noticed more homeless activity around the subject building since Ridgeway Health started occupying it. They have had increased amounts of vandalism and have had to call law enforcement more in the last few months. Brandell is concerned that there will be a zoning change in the future that would allow drug and alcohol and mental health services. Director Larsen confirmed that there is not a zone change being proposed, just a change a use, and no mental health or substance abuse services will be permitted. If there were anything other than wellness center proposed, the applicant would have to come back to the Commissioners for approval.

Neutral Testimony: None

The public hearing was closed at 7:36 PM

Commissioner Wood stated that she is companionate about the Hope Center concerns, however she believes that having a tenant in the building will allow for safer conditions. Having tenants in the building strengthens the ability to remove unwanted individuals and will allow more eyes to keep watch on the property. Commissioner Graybill agreed with Commissioner Wood that having more tenants will help improve the safety of the property and discourage unwanted activities in the area. Commissioner Journey recognized that the Hope Center is housing vulnerable women and children. Journey stated that she recognizes that vandalism has occurred that the Commission has not control over, but she does think that having someone in the building will discourage unwanted activity. Commissioner Wood asked about the exterior improvements that the City will increase lighting and cameras around the building. Manager Clegg stated that the improvements will be included under a building permit, and not a part of the Conditional Use application. Director Larsen stated that he is willing to stay after the meeting and discuss the security concerns that are not a part of the application. Larsen stated that they would work closely with law enforcement to improve the conditions. Commissioner Wood asked who people would contact if they see concerns. Larsen stated that people can contact the City with concerns and they will either

Exhibit A

take care of the concern or contact the appropriate person to take care of the concerns. Commissioner Wood stated that she hopes the Ridgeway staff will assist with the security of the building.

A motion to approve Application CU24-03 was made by Commissioner Graybill, seconded by Commissioner White.

Yea: 4

Nay: 0

Absent: 2

Staff Updates:

Manager Clegg stated that there will be no meeting on October 3rd, but there are two conditional use applications being heard on October 17th and November 7th.

Manager Clegg reminded the Committee of the Harvest Festival on October 5th.

Director Larsen updated the Commission on the change of date for the combined Transportation System Plan workshop with the City Council. It will be held on Tuesday, October 8th at 5:00 PM in Council Chambers. The workshop has been difficult to schedule, so if they can't attend please let staff know. There needs to be a quorum of the Commission to move forward.

Round Table Discussions (Committee comments about topics not listed on the agenda)

None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 PM

Laura Wood, Chairperson
Sweet Home Planning Commission

Respectfully submitted by Angela Clegg, Planning and Building Manager

Exhibit A



City of Sweet Home
Community and Economic Development Department- Planning Program
3225 Main Street, Sweet Home, OR 97386 541-367-8113

City of Sweet Home 2024 Parks Master Plan Adoption Legislative Findings

INTRODUCTION

The 2024 Sweet Home Parks System Plan provides direction for current and long-range planning of the parks system. The Plan was prepared in collaboration with City staff, stakeholders, and community residents and documents the research, analysis, and community involvement process used to identify system assets and needs. The current 2014 Parks Master Plan was not added as a supporting document of the Sweet Home Comprehensive Plan, however, the previous 1983 Parks plan was. The intent with this plan is to add it as an amendment to and sub-element of the current Comprehensive Plan.

The 2010 Sweet Home Comprehensive Plan includes goals for parks and open space in Sweet Home, incorporating Statewide Planning Goals 5 (Natural Resources) and 8 (Recreational Needs). The Plan also adds community goals to balance the development needs of the community with responsible stewardship of its natural environment and to establish and maintain a city-wide park system that provides a variety of recreational opportunities to the citizens of Sweet Home. This Parks System Plan is compatible with these goals and further details recommendations and improvement projects to align with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

The 2024 Parks System Plan is proposed for adoption as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and a contextual document within the plan that replaces the 2014 and 1983 Parks System Plans. This document includes criteria of approval and findings of compliance that support a Type IV Legislative Procedure for plan adoption.

CRITERIA OF APPROVAL

Sweet Home Municipal Code Chapter 17.116 sets out the decision-making criteria for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code. The decision criteria are listed in bold text with findings in plain text.

17.116.030 DECISION CRITERIA

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or Development Code test shall be approved if the evidence can substantiate the following:

A. The proposed amendment will not adversely impact the following:

1. Traffic generation and circulation patterns;

The 2024 Parks System Plan does not include any changes in traffic patterns or transportation infrastructure. All additional parks infrastructure is proposed to fit within existing transportation

Exhibit A

infrastructure that is sufficient for the additions, or are designed to include additional transportation infrastructure, such as sidewalks and parking. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

2. Demand for public facilities and services;

The proposed plan does not include any improvements that will increase demand for public services—all proposed improvements are intended to satisfy existing demand, and future demand resulting from population growth. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

3. Level of park and recreation facilities;

The proposed plan does not adversely impact the level of park and recreation facilities because no reduction in facilities is proposed in the plan. The plan only proposes improvements to the existing park system. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

B. A demonstrated need exists for the proposed amendment.

The current Comprehensive Plan includes the goal to “establish and maintain a city-wide park system that provides a variety of recreational opportunities to the citizens of Sweet Home.” The last parks plan that was mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan was completed in 1983. The City of Sweet Home has grown substantially since that time, which necessitates an updated plan that will provide recreational opportunities for the current and future population of the City. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

C. The proposed amendment complies with all applicable Statewide Planning Goals and administrative rule requirements. In addition, amendments to the Development Code shall conform with applicable City Comprehensive Plan policies.

Goal 1 Citizen Involvement: To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

The Parks System Plan is a guiding document for long-range parks planning in Sweet Home and anticipates park and recreation needs for all residents and visitors. Development of the Plan relied heavily on citizen involvement and utilized an outreach and involvement process to verify and inventory uses, identify park interests and desires, and prioritize park and recreation needs. The outreach and involvement process began in July, 2023 and extended through October, 2024. Outreach methods included two public events, and seven stakeholder interviews. Public events were held at the Sweet Home Library summer reading event on August 11, 2023, and at the Sweet Home Harvest Festival on October 6, 2023. Both events were held at Sankey Park. The seven stakeholder interviews were completed by phone in July, August, and September of 2023. Stakeholders represented small businesses, recreation groups, City committees, and City officials.

The process for approval of the Sweet Home Parks Master Plan is detailed in 17.128.020. The adoption process requires public hearings and notifications as outlined in 17.128.020(D) and (F): two hearings are required, one Planning Commission hearing and one City Council hearing, for application approval. The Planning Commission public hearing date is set for September 19, 2024. The City Council public hearing is scheduled for October 12, 2024. The City provided noticing in accordance with 17.128.020(E) and (F), which details the required public hearing notification process. In compliance with these sections, the City met the required notice timelines and published the notices in the local newspaper. Additionally, the Department of Land Conservation and Development was notified in writing by the City. Based on the preceding findings, the process for adoption of the amendment complies with Goal 1 and meets the requirements of the State's citizen involvement provisions.

Exhibit A

Goal 2 Land Use Planning: To establish a land use planning process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions and actions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.

The Sweet Home Comprehensive Plan is the planning and policy framework tool for decisions and actions related to use of land in the Sisters Urban Area. The plan was last updated in 2010. The Parks System Plan complies with and is consistent with the goals and policies set in the Comprehensive Plan.

The project management team for the Parks System Plan was comprised of City staff and consultants from Cameron McCarthy. In addition, the project team met in workshops with the City Park and Tree Committee four times during the planning process on November 15, 2023 and February 21, May 15, and July 17, 2024. The project team also met with City Council on May 28, 2024.

The City of Sweet Home established planning and policy framework, including but not limited to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code, has been acknowledged to be consistent with state law and provide adequate factual basis for decisions and actions. As adopted as a contextual document to this framework, the amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 2.

Goal 3 - Agricultural Land: To preserve and maintain agricultural lands.

Goal 3 is not applicable as the Parks Master Plan does not affect any agricultural plan designations or uses.

Goal 4 - Forest Land: To conserve forest lands.

Recommendations and development projects in the Parks System Plan primarily address properties within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and do not occur on land designated as Forest Land. Therefore, the proposed amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 4.

Goal 5 - Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources: To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.

OAR 660-015-0000(5) requires local governments to protect significant riparian corridors, upland wildlife habitat, and wetlands to conserve these resources and the biological systems they contain and support. The City of Sweet Home details protection and conservation efforts in the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code (Title 17 of the Sweet Home Municipal Code).

The Parks System Plan identifies multiple projects that comply with Goal 5. Recommended projects create targeted water access points along the South Santiam River to enhance recreation access and protect adjacent habitat and natural resources (Project P3, P7 and P12). The recommended trail system plan (T1) will also improve access to the South Santiam as well as protect and conserve land within its riparian corridor.

The cumulative effect of the planned projects in the Parks Master Plan projects will protect and conserve existing natural resources and improve open spaces in Sweet Home. The amendment does not change or functionally alter any previously established protection or conservation measures. Therefore, the amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 5.

Goal 6 - Air, Water and Land Resources Quality: To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water, and land resources of the state.

Numerous projects in the Parks Systems Plan support enhanced air, water, and land resource quality. Projects P3, P7 and P12 propose improved water access to, and protection of, the South Santiam River. Improving water access to the river at targeted locations will protect habitat and water quality

Exhibit A

from degraded vegetation and erosion caused by human activity. Project P6 continues the protection of the Hobart Natural Area, which helps maintain our air and land resources. The Parks System Plan recommendations thoroughly promote the improvement of air, water and land resource quality and therefore the amendment is in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 6.

Goal 7 - Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards: To protect life and property from natural disasters and hazards.

This amendment does not directly address potential natural disasters and hazards. These hazards are addressed in other planning processes. Therefore, this amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 7.

Goal 8 - Recreational Needs: To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

The City of Sweet Home has an established park system with a network of existing parks, open space, and trails. The system has 27.14 acres of developed park land and 59.59 acres of open space. Additionally, there are 233.46 acres of undeveloped park land. The Parks Master Plan recommendations propose park development projects at existing parks to further enhance current facilities (Projects P1-P5 and P7), improvements at undeveloped open space sites (Projects P6 and P8-P12), and identify park acquisition and development areas (Projects A1 and A2).

The Plan's recommendations collectively address Goal 8 by responding to current recreational needs of citizens and visitors as well as identifying future needs and desires. The planned park projects were heavily informed by local residents and organizations, and implementation of these projects will satisfy the recreational goals and needs of the Sweet Home community. Therefore, this amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 8.

Goal 9 - Economic Development: To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon's citizens.

This amendment does not directly impact or inhibit economic activities or propose any zoning designation changes. Therefore, this amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 9.

Goal 10 - Housing: To provide for the housing needs of the citizens of the state.

The provisions of this amendment do not address the planning or development of housing. Therefore, this amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 11.

Goal 11 - Public Facilities and Services: To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

The provisions of this amendment do not affect the planning or development of future public facilities or services. Therefore, this amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 11.

Goal 12- Transportation: To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

Goal 12 is implemented through the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012-0060) states that land use changes that significantly affect a transportation facility shall require mitigation measures to address the anticipated impacts. The rule states that:

Exhibit A

- (1) If an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (including a zoning map) would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, then the local government must put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule, unless the amendment is allowed under section (3), (9) or (10) of this rule. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:
 - (a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);
 - (b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or
 - (c) Result in any of the effects listed in paragraphs (A) through (C) of this subsection based on projected conditions measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP. As part of evaluating projected conditions, the amount of traffic projected to be generated within the area of the amendment may be reduced if the amendment includes an enforceable, ongoing requirement that would demonstrably limit traffic generation, including, but not limited to, transportation demand management. This reduction may diminish or completely eliminate the significant effect of the amendment.
 - (A) Types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
 - (B) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility such that it would not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or
 - (C) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.
- (2) If a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, then the local government must ensure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards of the facility measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP through one or a combination of the remedies listed in (a) through (e) below, unless the amendment meets the balancing test in subsection (2)(e) of this section or qualifies for partial mitigation in section (11) of this rule. A local government using subsection (2)(e), section (3), section (10) or section (11) to approve an amendment recognizes that additional motor vehicle traffic congestion may result and that other facility providers would not be expected to provide additional capacity for motor vehicles in response to this congestion.
 - (a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.
 - (b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.

Exhibit A

- (c) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.
- (d) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including, but not limited to, transportation system management measures or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall, as part of the amendment, specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.
- (e) Providing improvements that would benefit modes other than the significantly affected mode, improvements to facilities other than the significantly affected facility, or improvements at other locations, if:
 - (A) The provider of the significantly affected facility provides a written statement that the system-wide benefits are sufficient to balance the significant effect, even though the improvements would not result in consistency for all performance standards;
 - (B) The providers of facilities being improved at other locations provide written statements of approval; and
 - (C) The local jurisdictions where facilities are being improved provide written statements of approval.

This amendment will not change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility, nor will it change standards implementing a functional classification system. Further, it will not allow types or levels of land uses which would result in levels of travel or access which are inconsistent with the functional classification of a transportation facility or reduce the performance standards of any facility. Therefore, Statewide Planning Goal 12 is not implicated by this amendment.

Goal 13 - Energy Conservation: To conserve energy.

The amendment does not concern energy conservation. Therefore, Statewide Planning Goal 13 does not apply.

Goal 14 - Urbanization: To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.

The proposed projects in the Parks Master Plan are all located within the Urban Growth Boundary, and do not impact the transition from rural to urban land use. Therefore, the proposed amendment is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 14.

Goal 15 - Willamette River Greenway: To protect, conserve, enhance and maintain the natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, economic and recreational qualities of lands along the Willamette River as the Willamette River Greenway.

Goal 15 is not applicable to the Sweet Home UGB and the amendment does not interfere with compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 15.

Goal 16 through 19 (Estuarine Resources, Coastal Shorelands, Beaches and Dunes. and Ocean Resources):

Exhibit A

There are no coastal, ocean, estuarine, or beach and dune resources within the Sweet Home UGB. Therefore, these goals are not relevant, and the amendment will not affect compliance with Statewide Planning Goals 16 through 19.

Conforming with Applicable City Comprehensive Plan Policies

The 2000 Sweet Home Comprehensive Plan (updated in 2010) includes parks, recreation, and open space goals outlined in Chapter 3. The goals are:

- Balance the development needs of the community with responsible stewardship of its natural environment.
- Establish and maintain a city-wide park system that provides a variety of recreational opportunities to the citizens of Sweet Home.

Development of the 2024 Parks System Plan included a community outreach and involvement process that involved the collection of feedback from a variety of community members that informed recommendations regarding the development needs of the community, and responsible stewardship of the City's natural environment. The identified park acquisition and development areas in the Plan do not infringe on environmentally sensitive areas. Recommended projects are intended to provide a variety of recreational opportunities that meet the needs of both the current and projected population of Sweet Home.

As stated previously, the 2024 Park System Plan is designed to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan goals and further implements the goals through recommendations and projects in the Plan. The proposed amendment does not affect any other goals in the Comprehensive Plan nor create any inconsistency within the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

D. The amendment is appropriate as measured by at least one of the following criteria:

1. It corrects identified error(s) in the provisions of the plan.

As mentioned previously, the 2014 Parks System Plan was never added as a supporting document to the Sweet Home Comprehensive Plan. In fact, Staff are unable to find any evidence that the 2014 Plan was officially adopted. The adoption of this plan and inclusion of this plan in the Comprehensive Plan correct these errors. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

2. It represents a logical implementation of the plan.

Because the Comprehensive Plan includes the goal that the City "establish and maintain a city-wide park system that provides a variety of recreational opportunities," this Plan represents a logical implementation of the current Sweet Home Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

3. It is mandated by changes in federal, state, or local law.

Staff are not aware of any changes in federal, state, or local law that mandate that a parks plan be added as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, this criterion is not satisfied.

4. It is otherwise deemed by the City Council to be desirable, appropriate, and proper.

On April 26, 2022, the City of Sweet Home City Council passed Resolution No. 13 for 2022, which expressed support for an updated Parks System Plan. In addition, the 2024 Parks System Plan will be brought before the City Council for adoption, which will further show that the amendment is deemed by the Council to be desirable, appropriate, and proper. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.