

Minutes of the Veneta Planning Commission August 6, 2013

Present: James Eagle Eye, Kevin Conlin, Calvin Kenney, Len Goodwin, and Lily Rees

Others: Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; Ric Ingham, City Administrator; and Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder

I. Review Agenda

James Eagle Eye called the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Len Goodwin made a motion to approve the June 4, 2013 minutes. Kevin Conlin seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 5-0.

IV. Residential Buildable Land Inventory

Bork said the main purpose for tonight's meeting is to review the preliminary results of the Buildable Land Inventory (BLI), the GIS analysis and to agree on some of the assumptions so staff can finalize the tables for the BLI and to address any issues for agreeing on the methodology. She reviewed the general steps for the preliminary results and said the analysis is for the Veneta Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) as it exists today and focuses on the residential plan designations. Staff determined the total residential BLI by subtracting the unbuildable land, a certain amount of constrained acres, and land for public facilities from the total vacant acres. The sum of that equation will be our total buildable residential acres for the next 20 years. She said re-developable and infill acreage will be added back into the inventory. She's not sure if we will get to that tonight but if so, she will need direction on this.

She said the most time consuming step was classifying the land in the UGB as vacant, partially vacant, or developed. Staff reviewed the maps on a lot by lot basis to verify. She said Table 1 is the base acreage of all of Veneta UGB by plan designation. This data was received from Lane County Assessment and Taxation. Garbett provided some analysis because the information straight from Lane County, needed to be recalibrated to meet our needs. Table 1 shows all plan designations excluding all of the right-of-way. She said the Veneta UGB is about 1300 acres. The next step was looking at residential plan designations which are rural residential, low density residential, medium density residential, and commercial residential, total about 1042 acres. The next step was to categorize these lands as vacant, partially vacant or developed. Table 2 and Map 3 show the residential acres by classifications.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said staff's goal is to complete the final BLI tables to show the amount of land by classification (vacant, partially vacant, and development) and plan designation.

She said most of the land in the UGB is vacant or partially vacant and about 28% of the total acres is developed. This is just for residential plan designations. She referred to map 3 which is the visual representation of Table 2. Bork said the two parcels on Bolton Hill, in the southwest corner, could be categorized as partially vacant because they meet the definition (greater than a half-acre and include a house). She said the parcels are not included in the Bolton Hill Ranch subdivisions. She would like to

change the designation back to partially vacant and the Planning Commission could assign a density to the parcels.

James Eagle Eye said it would depend on the location of the existing development, access and if you think there is potential for development.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said we cannot tell from the data if the dwelling is habitable but based on the definition of developed it would be considered partially vacant if it was over a half acre and even if the dwelling wasn't habitable.

In response to questions from James Eagle Eye, Bork said the intent of the rural residential zone is to always change to a higher density zoning if it was ever developed.

James Eagle Eye said he was curious if that's how we're looking forward and does this give us the best realistic number.

Len Goodwin said we could leave it "as is" and as we complete the BLI and move on to the urbanization of the Comprehensive Plan, we could determine whether or not we need to consider expansion and look back at those parcels and incorporate certain measures to increase or decrease the availability of that land.

Bork said this first step is to not get too detailed and just find out what we have.

James Eagle Eye just wants to make sure that we are okay making those assumptions, that the figures are accurate, and match with the zone designations at the time.

Len Goodwin suggested using alternative zoning schemes to make those lands more developable.

Bork suggested we may find that we don't need to create such an aggressive infill strategy. She said until we know the number of housing units we need, we can come back to these particular parcels and look at how they would be divided up by plan designation.

James Eagle Eye said at some point we need some clarification.

Kevin Conlin suggested not making more work for staff. He said if we don't need it now and we know we'll look at it later, he suggested leaving things the way they are and wait until we move further into the process and spend more time on this.

Bork confirmed if the Planning Commission agrees, staff will use the methodology, consolidate the vacant and partially vacant land to 672 acres and developed to 369 acres with the intent of looking at the infill options at a later date.

Review Preliminary Results

Bork said the next methodology we need to review are unbuildable and constraints assumptions. She said for unbuildable inventory staff is suggesting slopes over 25%, parcels too small to be developed but there's nothing that fell into that category, and public facilities that will never be developed because it's a storm retention pond or swale. Staff is recommending those be removed from the inventory as unbuildable. She said this will all be done by plan designation in the final tables. Bork said this removes about 29 acres from the inventory.

The Planning Commission had no questions.

She said the next option is the constraints which aren't removed from the inventory. She said we need to determine how much of the constraint is or isn't developable. The constraints identified are the wetlands and the greenway, slopes between 14% and 25% and flood hazard area (the 100-year flood plain). She said greenways actually sit on top of the wetlands.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Bork said the greenway captures and overlays the wetlands. When we calculate the shape of the greenway it captures the wetland in it. She said currently there are 109 acres of wetland and 230 acres of greenway in Veneta.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said we have an actual shape file or a zoning district and a map was created that buffered the wetlands but we don't have a greenway inventory.

Len Goodwin said he just got remanded for not having a greenway inventory and creating a greenway setback, LUBA asked "where's your greenway inventory".

In response to a question from Ingham, Len Goodwin said the definition of a greenway overlay zone is a buffer in and around all wetlands. Particularly around the Willamette River.

In response to a question from Bork, Len Goodwin said LUBA wanted the delineated areas identified.

Len Goodwin said if we're going to rely on the greenway as a constraint, we may need to make clear findings how we identified and delineated the greenway.

She said the way our code is written, a greenway is established when there's a delineated wetland so not all of the wetlands are delineated and a lot of the greenways are estimated.

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Bork said we have a wetland map but it doesn't indicate exactly where the wetlands end and the 50 ft. buffer or greenway starts and stops.

Garbett said it was an overlay subzone in our code.

Bork said when the constraints analysis was done, we just counted the greenway overlay zone and not the wetlands.

Bork said staff is recommending some of the greenway be developed because the code allows roads, pathways and storm facilities through the greenway as corridors. If we were to remove acreage from the greenway, she suggested 25% which is generally removed for public facilities. This percentage could be more or less.

Len Goodwin said if we're only building pathways and stormwater, none of that is developable so we could take the greenways as a 100% constrained. Even though it will be considered developed, it's not considered residential and therefore we should not be required to set aside a percentage of the land for development.

James Eagle Eye said it doesn't really need to be taken out.

Bork said with regard to slope, staff reviewed the previous subdivisions approved in the Bolton Hill area which have a density calculation of 2.31 dwellings per acre compared to the density calculation of the remaining residential land of 5.5 dwellings per acre.

James Eagle Eye said Bolton Hill 1st Addition is denser which could be throwing the average off.

Len Goodwin said the 1st Addition has more slopes than the lower range.

Bork asked if once staff finds the correct average to apply the density to the sloped areas and have it removed. She would use gross dwelling units per acre verses net because we're looking at vacant land. And we will be removing land for public facilities.

Len Goodwin said sloped areas will require more land be removed to accommodate public facilities, i.e., right-of-ways, etc. He said we may find we need to remove more than 25%.

Bork suggested sloped areas would require 31% for public facilities and the remainder of the City would require 25%.

Flood Hazard

Bork said the code does allow development in the 100-year flood zone and most of the flood zone is in the highway commercial district. This doesn't impact residential buildable lands except for on the eastside of City limits, the flood plain follows the greenway. She said we wouldn't remove the floodway as a constraint in the residential zone as long as our flood hazard ordinance is met. She wasn't able to get information on whether or not a flood plain within the for the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) plan for the stream counts as a constraint.

Len Goodwin said that is the way the second draft of FEMA proposal came out. He said it's very much up in the air and we'll likely need to follow as negotiations continue. He said there's a lot of volatility around how they're going to resolve this issue and his only concern is not to do anything with residential lands inventory that pre-judges what we're going to have to do when this issue is resolved.

Bork said by then we'll have more information and she said she would speak to the DEQ TMDL coordinator.

Bork referred to the total constraints on Table 4. She said 50 acres of the BLI is in the flood plain, 198 acres of greenway with 100% constrained, and 63 acres is considered sloped but this will change. She said these numbers will give us an idea of how much sloped land we have. She said the next step is removing acreage in residential areas that won't be residential, i.e., churches, parks, right-of-ways. Normally this number is 25% and we can go as high as 35% and apply more percentages on the hillside and dedications of public facilities.

Len Goodwin said it should be left the way it is now. He said what we're targeting is 8000 residents and that's a good starting point for the rest of the analysis. We can come back and look at the constraints again.

Bork said we can continue moving forward with our population numbers and housing units and we can always change the assumptions as long as it's documented.

Approve Methodology

Bork said the final table is not complete but it's pretty close to what we're getting at. She said we want to arrive at the net acres available for development. She said the tables will also be broken down by plan designation. She said based on direction from the Planning Commission, staff will bring back final tables. She said this will give us a good understanding of how much low, medium, and higher density land we have available.

Bork said in order to determine how many housing units we will need for the next 20 years, staff would like to provide population projections and look at safe harbor assumptions verses our assumption. She said then we can look at how much land we have and how many units we will need. She said the housing needs analysis will have demographic information but will likely be provided at the October meeting as well as a discussion about infill, development, and demographic information.

V. Other

Bork said Friday, August 9th is the last day to register for the Oregon Planning Institute (OPI) conference at a reduced rate. Bork said the OPI Conference is September 12th and 13th. She also said the Oregon City Planning and Directors Association conference is also coming up. She will provide the link or copies of the registration form if anyone is interested in attending.

Bork provided an update on the Trinity Terrace logging; staff sent a letter to the property owners who were interested in creating a buffer by purchasing some land from Mr. Demers. It was determined that this is a very complicated process requiring the property owners to have the subdivision re-platted among other things. She said the letter outlining the process and fees was sent to those interested property owners. She said they are interested in a group easement but the City would not be involved in that process.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Bork said Mr. Demers agreed to stop logging the area. She said she hasn't received anything from Mr. Demers regarding his plan to build a retirement facility on the Trinity Terrace land he was logging.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Ingham said the vault for the water pipeline is just about completed. He said the Lane County public works department is not willing to accept the road surface of Perkins Rd. and the chip seal on K.R. Neilson. He said this will likely push the project out further than we'd like.

In response to a question from Kevin Conlin, Bork said the Fern Ridge Service Center should be completed by the end of August. She said the partners have their own schedules; Senior Connections will be serving residents by mid-September, the Love Project will likely be around that time or a little later, and the Meals on Wheels program should be up and running out of the Center by October 1st. Bork said tours of the Service Center will be offered at the Harvest Festival and the time capsule will get buried during the Festival as well.

Len Goodwin commended Bork and Garbett on doing a good job on the residential lands inventory.

VI. Adjourn

Chair James Eagle Eye adjourned the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 7:51 p.m



James Eagle Eye, Chairman

ATTEST:



Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder