

**AGENDA**  
**Veneta Planning Commission**  
TUESDAY – January 6, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.  
Veneta City Hall

---

**1. Review Agenda**

**2. Public Comment**

If you wish to address the Planning Commission; state your name, address, and limit your comments to 3 minutes. Maximum time 20 minutes. The Planning Commission will not engage in any discussion or make any decisions based on public comment at this time; however, they may take comments under advisement for discussion and action at a future Planning Commission meeting.

**3. Public Hearing: Legislative Land Use Decision. Amendments to the Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493 & Land Division Ordinance 494 – Improvement Requirements**

1. Open Hearing
3. Staff Report (pgs. 3-15)
4. Public Testimony
5. Questions from the Planning Commission
6. Close of Public Hearing
7. Deliberation and Decision

**4. Approval of Minutes**

- a. October 7, 2014 Joint Meeting of the City Council & Planning Commission (pgs. 17-22)
- b. October 7, 2014 Planning Commission (pgs. 23-28)
- c. October 29, 2014 Joint Meeting of the City Council & Planning Commission (pgs. 29-35)
- d. November 4, 2014 Planning Commission (pgs. 37-39)
- e. November 19, 2014 Joint Meeting of the City Council & Planning Commission (pgs. 41-44)

**5. Other**

**6. Adjourn**

**Location is wheelchair accessible (WCA). Communication interpreter, including American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation, is available with 48 hours' notice. Contact Darci Henneman; Phone (541) 935-2191, FAX (541) 935-1838 or by TTY Telecommunications Relay Service 1-800-735-1232.**  
**THIS MEETING WILL BE DIGITALLY RECORDED.**

The Planning Commission considers all public comments, staff reports, and City ordinances in arriving at a final decision. **Staff reports are available for review at Veneta City Hall - 88184 8th Street - Veneta, Oregon.**

**LAND USE DECISIONS - Veneta Municipal Code Chapter 18.05**

Whenever this chapter is in effect, the following procedures or procedure similar thereto shall be followed by the city staff and applicable decision-making body: (1) Preparation of brief statement setting forth the criteria and standards considered relevant to the decision of the city staff. Such shall utilize criteria and standards found in the applicable ordinance, the comprehensive plan, and other ordinances and rules and regulations now in effect as from time to time adopted by the city council and appropriate decision-making body.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS** - Please observe the following rules.

**WRITTEN TESTIMONY:**

Written comments received seven (7) days prior to the meeting have been incorporated in the staff report. All comments, including those received up until the meeting, are presented to the Planning Commission members to be considered in their decision.

**ORAL TESTIMONY:**

If you wish to testify with regard to a matter which has been set for *Public Hearing* please observe the following rules:

1. **State your name and address.**
2. **Indicate if you are in favor of or opposed to the proposal.**
3. **Limit your testimony to three (3) minutes. Testimony must be specific to the issue at hand. Keep your comments brief and to the point.**

The Planning Commission considers all public comments, staff reports, and City ordinances in arriving at a final decision. **Staff reports are available for review at Veneta City Hall - 88184 8th Street - Veneta, Oregon.**

**VENETA PLANNING COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT  
File # A-2-12**

FILE: File # A-3-14 Amendments to Land Development Ordinance 493 and Land Division Ordinance 494  
HEARING DATE: January 6, 2015  
REPORT DATE: December 8, 2014  
APPLICANT: City of Veneta  
PROPERTY OWNER: Not Applicable  
LOCATION: Citywide  
PUBLIC NOTICE: Public Notice Published/Posted, December 21, 2014  
DLCD Notice July 2, 2014  
PROPOSAL: Amend the Veneta Land Development Ordinance No. 493, Sections 5.14, 6.04, 6.05, and 13.02 and Veneta Land Division Ordinance 494, Sections 7.04, 7.05, and 6.03.

**REQUEST**

Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to City Council on proposed code amendments to Veneta Land Development and Land Division Ordinances relating to required improvements and irrevocable petition in lieu of improvements at the time of partitioning or development and to add broadband fiber conduit as a utility improvement.

**BACKGROUND**

Per Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493, *“an amendment to the text of the Land Division and Land Development Ordinance may be initiated by the City Council, the City Planning Commission or by application of a property owner or city resident. Staff is requesting City Council initiate the proposed code amendments to be prepared by staff.”*

City Council initiated the code amendments at their June 23, 2014 meeting. The amendments relate to required improvements and agreements when a property is developed or is divided. The proposed code revisions are meant to further clarify when improvements are required to be constructed and when an irrevocable petition is allowed in lieu of improvements.

An irrevocable petition is a legal document associated with property, signed by the property owner, which commits that property to support and participate in the cost of improving an adjacent unimproved street or installing other public improvements in the future. The irrevocable petition can include improvements such as extensions of wastewater sewer lines, water lines, and storm system improvements. The petition is recorded in lieu of improvements when they are not practical.

When property abutting an unimproved street or alley is partitioned or development is proposed, the property owner/developer is required to construct necessary improvements that serve the development. In some cases improvements are not practical and the City allows improvements to be waived with the condition the property owner/developer sign an agreement and in some cases are required to submit a deposit for future improvements.

The current code language in Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493 gives property owners two options at the time of development: 1) construct all required improvements or with City Administrator's approval, waive sidewalk improvements when there is no curb or gutter. If improvements are waived the property owner is required to submit a deposit for the cost of constructing the sidewalk or record an irrevocable petition for the future installation of sidewalks.

An Irrevocable Petitions is also an option during the partitioning process when installation of improvements is not practical. The code language waiving improvements is sufficient but could be made clearer. Therefore staff is recommending revisions to Veneta Land Division Ordinance that aligns with the proposed revision to the Veneta Land Development Ordinance.

The proposed amendments are intended to eliminate the either/or option of the current code language and will allow a waiver for any type of improvement, not only sidewalks, when construction of the improvements is not practical.

The code revisions will: 1) require construction of improvements if practical, or 2) allow City Administrator to substitute the improvements with an irrevocable petition for all required improvements. In conjunction with the irrevocable petition the developer may be required to submit a deposit to cover construction costs of all or some of the improvements.

On January 13, 2014 City Council gave direction to staff to draft amendments to the Municipal Code in order to require broadband conduit to be installed at the time of development. The amendments were initiated as a result of Veneta's participation in the Regional Fiber Consortium of Lane County. In 2013-14 Lane Council of Governments installed broadband fiber at anchor institutions within the community (government offices, schools, and medical clinics) and when Veneta extended fiber to the West Lane Shopping Center for the new call center.

Staff anticipates future expansion of broadband fiber throughout the community and would like new development to provide the necessary infrastructure and facilities in anticipation of the expansion of fiber. Staff worked with the City Attorney to draft amendments to Municipal Code, Section 13.30. City Council adopted the amendments to the Municipal code at the January 27, 2014 meeting. Additional amendments were recommended to the Veneta Land Development and Land Division Ordinances in order to address broadband fiber conduit installation. The proposed amendments are attached as Exhibit A.

### **APPROVAL CRITERIA**

#### **1. Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493, Section 11.0 Amendments.**

Staff Response: Section 11.0 states: "An amendment to the text of this ordinance may be initiated by the City Council, the City Planning Commission or by application of a property owner or city resident." On April 14, 2014 City Council directed staff to draft amendments to the Land Development Ordinance 493 for Planning Commission review and recommendation.

#### **2. Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and Applicable Statewide Planning Goals.**

Staff Response: Attachment A, Proposed Final Order, includes findings of the proposal's consistency with the Veneta Comprehensive Plan and applicable Statewide Planning Goals.

### **AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS**

The required 35-day notice was sent to DLCD July 2, 2014 in anticipation of an earlier public hearing.

Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Fern Ridge Review, December 24, 2014 at least 10 days prior to the first hearing Per Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493, Section 2.11(1).

No public comments were received.

### **POSSIBLE ACTIONS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

In considering the proposed amendments, the Planning Commission may take the following actions after the closing of the record:

1. Move to recommend approval of the proposed amendments as presented in Exhibit A of the Proposed Final Order.
2. Move to recommend revisions to any of the recommended provisions contained in Exhibit A. Modify the proposed draft language and recommend approval to the City Council with specific changes.
3. Move to not recommend approval of the proposed amendments as presented in Exhibit A of the Proposed Final Order.
4. If more research is needed, the Commission may direct staff to conduct the needed research and bring revised language to the Planning Commission meeting on July 1, 2014.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

If no changes are recommended by Planning Commission at this time, staff recommends approval of the amendments as presented.

### **SUGGESTED MOTION**

*"I move that the Veneta Planning Commission recommend approval of the amendments to Land Development Ordinance 493, and Land Division 494 as presented in Exhibit A of the proposed Final Order."*

### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Final Order A-3-14 and Exhibit A – Proposed Amendments to Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493 and Land Division Ordinance 494.



**FINAL ORDER  
VENETA PLANNING COMMISSION**

**AMENDMENTS TO VENETA LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE 493 &  
LAND DIVISION ORDINANCES 494  
IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS  
File # A-3-14**

**A. The Veneta Planning Commission finds the following:**

- 1. The Veneta City Council initiated the amendments at the June 23, 2014 meeting.**
- 2. The Veneta Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 6, 2015 on the proposed amendments after providing the required notice as per Section 2.11 of Veneta’s Land Development Ordinance No. 493.**
- 3. The Veneta Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendments to the Veneta City Council at the January 6, 2015 meeting.**
- 4. The proposed amendments to the Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493 and Land Division Ordinances 494 are consistent with the goals and policies of the adopted Veneta Comprehensive Plan, Ordinance No. 504, and therefore comply with all applicable statewide planning goals.**
- 5. These amendments do not alter the intent or purpose of any portion of the Land Development or Land Division Ordinances. The intent of these amendments is to provide clarity, consistency, and to more fully implement the goals and policies of the Veneta Comprehensive Plan.**

**B. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the Veneta Planning Commission recommends approval of the proposed code amendments, as shown in Exhibit A, to City Council based on the information presented in the following findings of fact:**

**FINDINGS**

Applicable Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan provisions are set forth in *italics*, below. Findings showing compliance with the applicable criteria and standards are in **bold**.

**FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE NO. 493.**

*Per Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493 (VLDO 493), Section 11.01: “an amendment to the text of the Land Division and Land Development Ordinance may be initiated by the City Council, the City Planning Commission or by application of a property owner or city resident. Staff is requesting City Council initiate the proposed*

*code amendments to be prepared by staff.”*

- 1. The amendments are consistent with VLDO 493 as they were initiated by Veneta City Council at their June 23, 2014 meeting.**

*“PURPOSE OF LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE NO. 493: The purpose of this ordinance is to establish standards and procedures for the orderly development of land within the City of Veneta; to assist in implementing the Veneta Comprehensive Plan and to promote the public health, safety and general welfare.”*

- 2. The amendments to the Land Development Ordinance No. 493 do not affect the stated purpose of the Land Development Ordinance.**
- 3. The proposed amendments clarify existing regulations which will promote orderly development within the City.**

**FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY FOR LAND DIVISION ORDINANCE NO. 494.**

*“PURPOSE OF LAND DIVISION ORDINANCE NO 494 (VLDO 494), SECTION 1.02: The purpose of this ordinance is to establish standards and procedures for the division of land within the jurisdiction of the City of Veneta. These regulations are necessary in order to provide uniform procedures and standards for the division of land; to provide for the proper width and arrangement of streets; to coordinate proposed development with any overall plan; to provide for utilities and other public facilities; to avoid undue congestion of population; to assure adequate sanitation and water supply; to provide for the protection, conservation, and proper use of land; and in general to protect the public health, safety and welfare.”*

- 4. The proposed amendments do not affect the stated purpose of the Land Division Ordinance. The amendments clarify existing regulations which will promote orderly development within the City.**

**FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN NO. 504**

*“GROWTH MANAGEMENT:*

*Policy 2. Provide services in a timely and orderly manner:*

*(a) Review new developments based upon the City and other service providers' ability to provide needed public services and public facilities concurrent with or prior to such development.*

*(b) Use the Public Facilities Plan, the Transportation System Plan, the Veneta Urban Renewal Plan, and other public facilities plans to coordinate the provisions of necessary public services and public facilities in a timely, orderly, and efficient manner.”*

- 5. The City finds the proposed amendments are consistent with Veneta Comprehensive Plan Growth Management Policy 2. The amendments clarify existing regulations which will promote orderly development within the City and will ensure necessary utilities and infrastructure is provided to support proposed development.**

---

James Eagle Eye, Chairperson  
Veneta Planning Commission

---

Date



## EXHIBIT A

### Proposed Amendments Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493 and Land Division Ordinance 494 Improvement Requirements

Additions are indicated with underlined text and deleted text is indicated with ~~strikeout~~.

#### VENETA LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE 493

#### SECTION 5.14 IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS

All applicants for land development shall comply with all public improvement requirements specified in Article 7 of the Veneta Land Division Ordinance and shall install improvements in accordance with specifications approved by the City Engineer.

(1) Water and Sewer connections. All developments requiring water within the SFR, GR, RC, BC, CC, IC, and I zones shall be connected to City water and sanitary sewers. Developments in the RR zone and HC zone on Highway 126, east of Territorial Road, shall be required to hook up to city water and sanitary sewer when available, but connections are not required for development to occur.

(2) Agreement for Improvements.

(a) Before approval of a building permit, the land developer may be required to install required street, sidewalk, water, sewer, storm sewer, drainage and other required public facilities (“Improvements”), or execute and record against the property an agreement between the owner of land and the City specifying the period of time within which required Improvements and repairs shall be completed (“Improvement Agreement”). The Improvement Agreement shall provide that, if Improvements are not installed within the period specified, the City may complete the work and recover the full cost and expense, together with court costs and attorneys’ fees necessary to collect said amounts from the land developer or lien the property in this full amount. In any event, the land developer shall repair existing streets or other public utilities damaged in the process of building the development, and shall repair existing streets and other public utilities damaged in the development or execute and file with the city an agreement between the owner of the land and the city specifying the period within which required improvements and repairs shall be completed. If the improvements are not installed within the period specified, the City may complete the work and recover the full cost and expense, together with court costs and attorney fees necessary to collect said amounts from the land developer.

(b) In the City's sole discretion, the City Administrator may substitute an irrevocable petition to install one or more required Improvements for the Improvement Agreement referenced in (2)(a) of this Section 5.14 after determining that immediate Improvement construction is not in the City's best interest. Such a determination may, but need not, be based on circumstances where the proposed development is not adjacent to a paved street with curbs and gutters. In conjunction with the irrevocable petition, the developer may be required to deposit with the City a cash payment, surety bond, or letter of credit in an amount determined by the City Administrator not exceeding the cost of Improvement construction, as based upon an estimate approved by the City Engineer ("Deposit"). The irrevocable petition shall reference the deposit and cover future Improvement installation to the extent actual installation costs exceed the Deposit amount.

- (3) Specifications for Improvements. All improvements shall comply with the Public Improvement Specifications of Veneta Ordinances in addition to the standard of this ordinance. If the City does not have adopted standards or specifications, the developer shall submit proposed improvement standards and specifications to the City for approval by the City Engineer.
- (4) Improvements within a Public Right-of-Way. A construction permit shall be required for all improvements constructed within a public right-of-way. The City Engineer shall have the authority to approve, disapprove, or modify construction permits and plans in accordance with Veneta Ordinances.
- (5) Dedication of Street Right-of-Way. Before approval of a building permit, the City may require dedication of additional public right-of-way in order to obtain adequate street widths, in accordance with the Veneta Comprehensive Plan, Land Division Ordinance and any adopted street plans. Dedication shall be considered whenever the existing street width adjacent to or within a development is of inadequate width.
- (6) Utility and Drainage Easements. Before approval of a building permit, the City may require that an easement agreement be executed between the city and the property owner for sewer, water, electric, drainage, storm sewer or other public utility easements wherever necessary. The easements shall be at least fourteen (14) feet wide and located adjacent to lot or parcel lines, except for utility pole tieback easements which may be reduced to six (6) feet in width.
- (7) ~~Waiver. The City Administrator may waive improvement requirements for construction of sidewalk improvements when a paved street with curbs and gutters is not adjacent to the proposed development. If this requirement is waived, the developer may be required to deposit with the City the cash to cover the cost~~

~~of improvements based on an estimate approved by the City Engineer or sign an Irrevocable Petition for the future installation of sidewalks.~~

## SECTION 6.03 REQUIRED INFORMATION ON SITE PLAN

An application for a Site Plan Review, Site Plan Review with adjustments (Track 2), or Amendment, as applicable, shall include the following information based on the size, scale and complexity of the development. The Building and Planning Official, at his or her discretion, may waive certain application submittal items where such items are not relevant to the review or the information is already available.

(1) Site Plan. All maps must be drawn to scale and indicate clearly and with full dimensions, the following information:

(a) Vicinity Map. A scaled vicinity map clearly showing the relationship of the proposed site to surrounding developments, tax lots, streets, storm drainage(s), sewer, water and other required public facilities. ~~utility services including broadband conduit.~~

(b) Development Plans. A development plan shall include the following items in accordance with Article 5:

### 4. Utility Plans.

- a. Existing and proposed contour map of the site.
- b. Location, flow elevations and capacities of all existing and proposed storm drainage facilities designed and constructed in accordance with Section 5.16 of this ordinance
- c. Location of all existing and proposed water mains.
- d. Location, flow elevations and certified capacities of all existing and proposed sewer lines.
- e. Location of all other underground ~~facilities~~ utilities, including phone, electricity, and cable television.

## SECTION 6.04 IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS

This section promotes upgrades to features of nonconforming development that affect a site's appearance and functionality. Nonconforming developments may continue unless specifically limited by Section 6.04(1) below or by other provisions in this ordinance.

- (1) Development that does not comply with the following standards must be brought into compliance with current standards to an extent commensurate with the proposed changes.
  - (a) Landscaped setbacks for surface parking and exterior development areas;
  - (b) Interior parking lot landscaping;
  - (c) Landscaping in existing building setbacks;
  - (d) Minimum landscaped area (where land is not used for structures, parking, or exterior improvements);
  - (e) Screening;
  - (f) Paving of surface parking and exterior storage and display areas; and
  - (g) Commercial and residential design standards.
  - (h) Installation of public facilities utilities including phone, electricity, cable television.

## SECTION 6.05 APPROVAL CRITERIA

- (1) After an examination of the site and prior to approval of plans, the Planning Commission or Building and Planning Official must make the following findings:
  - (a) That all provisions of city ordinances are complied with.
  - (b) That traffic congestion is avoided; pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular safety are protected; and future street right-of-way is protected.
  - (c) That proposed signs or lighting will not, by size, location or color, interfere with traffic or limit visibility.
  - (d) That adequate water, sewer, and other required facilities and utilities, for the proposed use are available.

## SECTION 13.02 DEFINITIONS

<u>Facilities Utilities</u>	<u>For the purposes of this Code, facilities utilities are water, sewer, stormwater, telephone, cable, natural gas, electric, telecommunication facilities and broadband fiber conduit.</u>
-----------------------------	---

VENETA LAND DIVISION ORDINANCE 494

SECTION 7.04 IMPROVEMENTS IN PARTITIONS

The same improvements required to serve a subdivision shall be required to serve each building site of a partition.~~may be installed to serve each building site of a partition as is required of a subdivision.~~ However, if the Planning Commission or Building and Planning Official finds that the nature of development in the vicinity of the partition makes installation of some improvements, such as street width expansions, sidewalks or storm drainage unreasonable, the Planning Commission or Building and Planning Official may except those improvements. Exceptions to these improvements may be made only if a street grade has not been established or if installing such improvements could make traveling or walking dangerous due to the intermittence of the improvements. A recorded irrevocable petition will be required for excepted as a substitute for one or more of the required improvements. In conjunction with the irrevocable petition, the developer may be required to deposit with the City a cash payment, surety bond, or letter of credit in an amount not to exceed the cost of improvement construction, as based upon an estimate approved by the City Engineer. The irrevocable petition shall reference the deposit and cover future improvement installation to the extent actual installation casts exceed the deposit amount. In lieu of excepting an improvement, the Planning Commission may recommend the installation of the improvements to the City Council under special assessment financing or other facility extension policies of the City.

SECTION 7.05 AGREEMENT FOR IMPROVEMENTS

Before final approval of a subdivision plat or, unless excepted under Section 7.04, a partition map, the land divider shall either install required improvements and repair existing streets and other public facilities damaged in the development of the property or execute and file with the City an agreement between himself and the City, specifying the period within which required improvements and repairs shall be completed and providing that, if the work is not completed within the period specified, the City may complete the work and recover the full cost and expense, together with court costs and attorney fees necessary to collect said amounts from the land divider. The agreement shall also provide for reimbursement of the City for the cost of inspection by the City in accordance with Section 7.06.

SECTION 8.06 DEFINITIONS

<u>Facilities</u>	<u>For the purposes of this Code, facilities are water, sewer, stormwater, telephone, cable, natural gas, electric, telecommunication facilities and broadband fiber conduit.</u>
-------------------	---



# Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Veneta Planning Commission and Veneta City Council For Veneta Economic Development Strategic Planning October 7, 2014

Council: Sandra Larson, Thomas Cotter, Victoria Hedenstrom, Thomas Laing

Planning Commission: James Eagle Eye, Len Goodwin, Kevin Conlin, Lily Rees

Community Members: Joan Mariner, Herb Vloedman

Absent: Brittany Boothe, Calvin Kenney, Jason Alansky

Others: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder; and Bob Parker, Amanda D'Souza; and Michael Howard of the University of Oregon Community Service Center

---

Planning Commission Vice Chair, Len Goodwin and Mayor Sandra Larson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

## I. Introductions

Introductions were made throughout the room.

### Project Context

Bob Parker said he has worked with Kay Bork and Len Goodwin in the past. He said he has also worked with ECO Northwest on several economic assessments over the last 10 years. He said the program at the University has a dual mission to provide services but also education so it's a great way for students to get applied experience in communities with faculty supervision. He said he worked with Veneta in the late 80's and at that point the focus was on business recruitment and to provide a list of companies to call. He said now most communities are looking at ways to build their capacities. Mr. Parker reviewed what the EOA is and why communities go through the process.

### Timeline

Ms. D'Souza reviewed a timeline for each meeting. She said the first meeting will have discussions on vision, goals, and employment forecast. The second meeting will focus on economic opportunities, discuss target industries previously identified, and identify potential new industries based on the findings from the EOA. She said action item development will also take place for the first of the previously identified goals. Meeting 4 will finalize the draft EOA and the economic element of the Comprehensive Plan and adoption of Goal 9 Economic Element.

### Goal 1 - Economic Development Commitment

**Strategy: Demonstrate commitment to long-term economic development in Veneta.**

The group spent a few minutes completing the visioning exercise. Mr. Parker said his staff would compile the suggestions and bring them to the next meeting. Priorities identified were as follows: First, improvements to Highway 126, business recruitment; creating businesses in downtown area and provide business assistance. Followed by providing commercial building stock, specifically in the downtown area. Next, infrastructure improvements, fiber build out, and sponsorship of some kind of civic clean up or beautification program to follow over the next five years. The following priority was land use and complete code and map updates to be flexible with less regulation, reconfigure industrial retail land, provide for new industries, (wine & manufacturing) pursue agriculture and tourism, small scale medical service, recruit a hotel or motel complex. Lastly, provide other transportation improvements, including transit and connectivity to Eugene and Elmira; also continue to improve community amendments, improve public safety, and provide affordable

property.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Mr. Parker said long term economic development would be a 20 year horizon or a goal level statement. He said that doesn't provide much direction but if you are to be successful, you need to follow and have a consistent vision. He said that's part of what they want to get from the meeting tonight. He said they will take these ideas and craft them into tangible actions that staff can implement. He said it is better to focus on three things that we can do well, rather than 20 things with no direction.

Ms. D'Souza reviewed the five main goals and opened them for discussion. She said Goal 1 is to provide for an economic development, commitment, and strategy.

Victoria Hedenstrom questioned hiring another full time employee.

Thomas Cotter said he's not sure the goals that were highlighted in previous plans are still relevant, should this goal still be in the plan.

Herb Vloedman said one important point is to "demonstrate" the key component, but unless residents get the feeling that it's wanted, supported and will be successful, we have a commitment, but in order to be successful, we need to have consistent support of it.

Len Goodwin said there is a strategy that involves Veneta becoming a focal and visible partner in the region as part of our commitment to economic development and suggested that be a second strategy.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Ms. D'Souza said these were the five goals that stood out.

Mr. Parker said they came up with the five goals after reviewing the documents staff provided his team. He said he doesn't want to start from scratch but extract those five goals from what the City has created over the last 20 years.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Mr. Parker said we will discuss how to become a full regional partner at a future meeting.

## **Goal 2 – Business Attraction, Expansion, and Retention**

**Strategy: Facilitate economic development in Veneta through the attraction of new businesses and the expansion and retention of existing businesses.**

**Strategy: Make the community attractive to business and resident through marketing efforts.**

Mr. Parker said Business Oregon is talking less about recruitment and more about retention and expansion. This is a new policy for them but that may not be the right strategy for Veneta. He said but talking with business leaders, many businesses in larger cities feel like recruitment is placed as a higher priority rather than retention and expansion. He said he's not sure if this is true but it's important to make sure we're clear about what we want to accomplish. Whether we want to address business-recruitment and retention-expansion as separate issues.

Len Goodwin said we may want switch it to business retention and expansion and attraction – put them in a different order. He said on a statewide level, attraction and recruitment of new business is almost a chance encounter. He said many business opportunities for which Oregon is a choice because of the preferences of the chief executive officer and not from a benefit the state offers. He said it's true that the point of retention and expansion becomes more important but in a small city like Veneta, we have to remember that successful economic development is more likely to happen because of cluster economics; like a food or beer cluster. He said Springfield has developed a

medical cluster, we clearly have to attract new businesses, and Sweet Creek Foods in Elmira could be the core start of a food cluster.

Mr. Parker said in his mind there's no reason why breweries can't be competitive from Veneta. He said one of the challenges is knowing what the next opportunity will be.

Kevin Conlin said its not just enough to attract businesses. He said to be successful we need to be doing both; attraction and retention and we need to be making some effective marketing efforts.

Len Goodwin said the first thing any industry will think before coming to Veneta is what will the City do to retain my business?

Mr. Parker suggested the Committee focus on two strategies; one attraction and the other retention.

Victoria Hedenstrom said the second strategy should be attraction – the strategies should be separated.

Joan Mariner said local businesses feel ignored by City infrastructure. She said many artisans from the Oregon Country Fair (OCF) would like to market their wares but the City hasn't made much of an effort to provide a place for those artisans to sell their wares.

Ingham said we tried to do that with the Farmers' Market but many vendors know they can go to Eugene or Springfield and sell a lot more product.

### **Goal 3 – Retail & Commercial Development**

**Strategy: Create a vibrant downtown core area that encourages residents and visitor to shop and spend time.**

**Strategy: Focus on retail and commercial development that will offer a full spectrum of products/services for the community.**

Mayor Larson suggested the emphasis should be how to create a more vibrant downtown.

Mr. Parker said the challenge to be vibrant is that we need activity. He asked the question, how or what can the City do to attract private investment to the core area. He said there are several things the City can do but it wouldn't be cheap. What businesses can locate here that have big enough markets to sustain them – another grocery store but we may be waiting around for a while. He said there are costs with every aspect of economic development. Providing retail space will be expensive.

Herb Vloedman said many people don't know that downtown Veneta exists. He said they consider Veneta to be Ray's and the four corners area. Downtown is separated from the corridor by the railroad tracks. He said if we want to have a commercially viable downtown, it needs residents and visitors. He said if we put a Starbucks downtown, travelers would not know it was there. He said even another restaurant downtown as an anchor wouldn't have the visibility the four corners area has.

Len Goodwin said both he and Ingham have talked about the high ratio of residents to employment. He said it seems that we could get people to notice downtown if we have more people employed in Veneta going downtown and making a choice to shop. He said there's no talk about industrial or employment if we don't focus any attention on increasing the employment capacity of Veneta. He said if we were to succeed on that, we would probably create the atmosphere that retail and commercial would be viable.

Ingham said we know that we have an enormous amount of retail leakage and that 80% of resident retail dollars are spent outside our community. He said we continue to miss that opportunity and suggested working to create an attractive place for people to spend their dollars.

Victoria Hedenstrom disagreed. She said there are opportunities. She said we have dental, medical, and chiropractor offices. She said she felt the problem is beyond what is or isn't here and there's a component that needs to be addressed.

#### **Goal 4 – Business Readiness**

**Strategy: Remove obstacles to business development in Veneta.**

**Strategy: Incentives.**

Kevin Conlin said he doesn't know what we'd do other than create an environment that would provide the best businesses would relocate in Veneta. He said we don't word smith it to death but it's fairly comprehensive. He said retail and commercial involve a lot of things. He said we could recognize the limitations and some of the rough edges but leave it where it is until we find something that clearly mandates a specific change when we get to the policy level.

Mayor Larson said local residents say they want more retail, more restaurants and that's a good goal - developing community loyalty and employment opportunities could be part of the action.

Mr. Parker said we need to identify what the obstacles are and focus on the ones that we actually have control over.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Ms. D'Souza said business readiness would be a business wanting to expand.

Mr. Parker said to accommodate new business the City has to provide the right land and infrastructure for new business and provide incentives for residents to buy local.

Victoria Hedenstrom and Lily Rees both suggested partnering with Lane Community College and the school district to create that employment partner to provide an internship program and/or a business college.

Ms. D'Souza suggested some kind of work force strategy.

Len Goodwin said based on his experience, incentives don't generally work and they end up costing more than they benefit.

Thomas Cotter agreed except if you're purchasing land to build something, incentive can be important. He said certainly incentives would only apply within City limits. He said we need to be careful on what partnerships we enter into because we've seen Eugene's examples of incentives where after a six year program the business has moved out.

Mr. Parker said there's different kind of incentives the City could provide. He wasn't assuming the City would have a lot of money to offer financial incentives. He said maybe that goal should be re-characterized.

#### **Goal 5 – Infrastructure Improvements**

**Strategy: Make aesthetic and infrastructure enhancements and improvements to make Veneta attractive to residents, visitors, and potential industries.**

Mayor Larson said aesthetics are more important at this point. She said we have a lot of work that

needs to be done although we can't do all of it.

Len Goodwin said this is one thing the City can do. It's within the City's power to create the infrastructure. Of all of these things, this is one that if there is will and resources, it can be done.

Kevin Conlin said this is the spine, if you don't have this everything else is wishful thinking. It's all founded on that.

In response to a question from Mayor Larson, Ingham said we've already done so much of the infrastructure now we need to focus on the aesthetics.

Herb Vloedman said when we talk about aesthetics we talk about downtown, but no one sees downtown.

Ingham said we have several plans for the four corners area but unfortunately, they all involve ODOT so it's a lengthier process.

## **II. Next Steps**

### **Employment Forecast**

Ms. D'Souza said an employment forecast is required as part of the Goal 9 Economic Element. It is used to determine the land need based on expected growth of employment in Veneta. She said the associated administrative rule that Mr. Parker referred to outlines two methodologies used to determine the employment forecast. She will review both of those and ask which methodology the committee would like to use. She said there are many steps involved which she reviewed.

Ms. D'Souza said there are two safe harbor methods outlined in the administrative rule that should be used to determine employment growth. She reviewed both methods and said it's up to the City to determine which method to use. Their recommendation is to use the employment growth rate because they believe the population growth rate over estimates the need for industrial land in Veneta.

Mr. Parker said they recommend the committee select one of the two safe harbor methodologies. He said they can chose another forecast but it would take more work. He said the employment growth rate of 2.92 is really aggressive and the committee should be realistic about where we want to get to. He said his team would like some direction so they can document it. He said Veneta has enough land to accommodate quite a robust employment growth level over the next 20 years.

Len Goodwin said there's another good reason for using the employment safe harbor. He said the current and future economy is going to result in fewer employees per acre and lower net employment densities than in the past. He said to go with the population forecast assumes we will follow past trends and that is likely not going to be accurate.

Kevin Conlin agreed and said there's no reason to complicate the day by choosing population method unless there was compelling circumstance or something that requires us to use that mode of analysis.

Mr. Parker said Veneta is fortunate to have that industrial land inventory but there will be complications associated with developing it. Once we let it go, it will be difficult to replace. In addition, if Veneta starts re-designating industrial as commercial, how will it affect what's happening downtown? He said it's a big decision to make and he will provide some implications for where Veneta ends up in the long term.

Ingham said no one received a hard or electronic copy of Mr. Parker's information so staff will get

that information to all Committee members and let everyone digest the numbers for an easy decision at the next meeting.

Mr. Parker clarified that the next meeting will include a discussion on the employment forecast technical document.

Ms. D'Souza said the next meeting will be October 29<sup>th</sup>. Agenda items discussed will be: Repetition of the employment forecast; target industries, and development of the action items.

**III. Other**  
None

**IV. Adjourn**

Chair James Eagle Eye and Mayor Sandra Larson adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Eagle Eye, Chairman

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra Larson, Mayor

ATTEST:

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder

# Minutes of the Veneta Planning Commission

## October 7, 2014

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

Absent: Calvin Kenney

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

---

### I. Review Agenda

Chair James Eagle Eye opened the Veneta Planning Commission meeting at 7:42 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.

### II. Public Comment

None

### III. Approval of Minutes

**MOTION: Len Goodwin made a motion to approve the September 2, 2014 Planning Commission minutes. Kevin Conlin seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 4-0.**

### IV. Public Hearing – Variance Request, V-2-14, West Lane Fitness

a. Variance request to Veneta Land Development Ordinance No. 493, Section 4.05(7) (a) and Section 5.12(3) (b) to allow a reduced setback from off-street parking areas along the east and south property lines and reduced landscaping.

1. Chair James Eagle eye opened the Public Hearing at 7:44 p.m.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest or Ex-Parte Contacts

Kevin Conlin said he has talked to the applicant but only on procedural matters. It was determined that no Planning Commission member present had any ex-parte contacts.

3. Staff Report

Garbett said this is an existing business proposing to relocate to the Broadway/Commercial zone. She said there is off street parking areas along the east and south property lines. The applicant is requesting a reduction in the landscape requirements from 10% to 7% and reduced setback from off-street parking areas. Garbett said notices were sent and posted at the site, published in the Fern Ridge Review and posted at City Hall. Staff did not receive any formal public comment but a neighbor, Mr. Cashmere, voiced a few concerns. She said staff recommended conditional approval of the variance due to existing and unusual circumstances regarding off-street parking, stormwater treatment, pedestrian circulation routes, and the unique existing Quonset-hut architecture that limits new occupant commercial uses. The setback reduction is necessary per Veneta Land Development Standards. Also, at the time the staff report was created, staff researched other opportunities for the applicant to relocate in the West Broadway area for comparison; the only other available property was three times smaller.

4. Public Testimony

**David Cashmere, 88177 Fifth St., Veneta, OR**

Mr. Cashmere lives directly behind the proposed West Lane Fitness site. He said the wall that divides the two properties is an uneven, 20 ft. corrugated structure, and he heard that a ball court was going on the other side of the wall. He requested the wall stay.

Ms. Freeman said the ball court will not be included.

Mr. Cashmere said he would prefer a wood fence. He said he is concerned about the parking and the two ft. setback. He said nose in parking would bring the bumper right to the fence and it wouldn't take much for a vehicle to go through the fence and he felt that is a safety issue to have a bumper that close to a fence. He said the cinderblock wall is very unsafe and is crumbling and also the chain link fence is falling down. He's concerned about traffic and curbing on the west side of Fifth St. and whether the curbing will be installed all the way down to Dunham St. or if the curbing will stop at the business.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Garbett said the City Engineer did not comment on the variance but he did provide comments on the site plan review. However, those comments did not address Mr. Cashmere's concerns. She said the code requires a site obscuring fence when a commercial property abuts a residential property and the Planning Commission can require an additional fence. She said staff is proposing a 75% site obscuring fence be installed between the two properties.

Bork said bollards can be installed to keep vehicles from hitting the fence and that would be included in the variance because it's not a requirement through site plan review. She said the Planning Commission could recommend the obscuring fencing during either process.

Len Goodwin said in the site plan review, it looks like the wheel stops are two ft. from the property line which suggested the vehicle will be within the two ft. setback, if we approve it on that form, there's only a three to six in. set back.

Garbett said the applicant is proposing 18 ft. parking stalls so the wheel stops could be moved further back.

Len Goodwin suggested moving the wheel stops to 16 ft.

Garbett said that would be added as a condition of approval.

#### 5. Questions from the Planning Commission

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Garbett said the Veneta Land Development Ordinance requires off street parking but doesn't list a fitness facility as a use. She said staff recommended that the applicant prepare a parking study so they hired a consultant to prepare it. The parking study provided 20 off-street parking spaces and seven on-street spaces which staff and the City Engineer concurred was acceptable. She said City code allows on-street parking to potentially be used in lieu of off-street. She said the parking diagram provided in the site plan review packet (Sheet S) shows all proposed parking spaces (on-street & off-sreet).

#### 6. Chairman James Eagle Eye closed the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m.

#### 7. Deliberation and Decision

**MOTION:** Len Goodwin made a motion to approve the variance with specified conditions of approval based on recommendations by staff. In addition, a condition that the wheel stops for off-street parking be placed at least four ft. from the property line to provide for a minimum two ft. setback. Lily Rees seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 4-0.

**V. Public Hearing – Variance Request, V-3-14, Hess/Parish**

a. Variance request to Veneta Land Development Ordinance No. 493, Section 4.02(6) (b) to allow a reduced side yard setback for carport along the west property boundary.

1. Chair James Eagle Eye opened the Public Hearing at 8:01 p.m.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest or Ex-Parte Contacts:  
None

3. Staff Report

Garbett said staff is presenting a variance request which, if granted, will allow a carport to be constructed within three ft. from the west side property line. She said the applicant requires access for an electronic wheelchair along the west side of the carport. Garbett said Mr. Parish is in attendance to answer any questions the Commissioners may have. She said all notices were sent in accordance of Section 2.11 of Veneta Land Development ordinance. She said staff received one agency referral comment from the City Building Official. He indicated that the setback should be a minimum of three ft. or that the carport be constructed of non-combustible materials, i.e., metal or steel. No public comment was received although the applicant provided a letter from the adjoining neighbors that they were agreeable with the carport being constructed within the setback, but they would like drainage or a trench be included to address any potential excess water associated with the additional impervious surface. Garbett said the existing garage door is not large enough to accommodate a vehicle and a grade change from inside the garage will not allow for a wheelchair. In regards to the neighbor's comment about the trench, if the carport is in need of a building permit, the applicant will have to comply with stormwater retention and treatment standards. She said a swale could potentially be required to catch any excess water that may occur, staff recommended approval with conditions given the unusual circumstances listed in the staff report.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Garbett said staff doesn't have specific plans for the actual construction of the roof or what materials will be used.

Bork said staff is recommending a three ft. setback.

Len Goodwin said he is concerned that if we get a similar variance from the adjoining property to the west, those two carports in such close proximity to one another could create a hazardous situation if there is a fire. He said in the case of a fire, the flames tend to spread horizontally. He said he is concerned granting the variance may create a challenge if the neighbor wants to build a carport.

Garbett said in that scenario there would be about six ft. between the two carports.

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Bork said a referral was sent to the Building Department for fire review but it did not go to the Fire Chief.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said there is potential that part of the carport does cross onto the neighbor's property line. However, with the suggested conditions, it would be required to have a three ft. setback and moved over.

Mr. Parish said it does not cross onto her property. There is a block wall and it stops at that wall. He said his neighbor was concerned about the block wall coming down.

4. Public Testimony  
None

5. Questions from the Planning Commission  
None

6. Chair James Eagle Eye closed the Public Hearing at 8:10 p.m.

7. Deliberation and Decision

**MOTION: Len Goodwin made a motion to approve variance with conditions of approval specified by staff. Kevin Conlin second the motion which passed with a vote of 4-0.**

**VI. Request for Site Plan Review, SR-1-14, West Lane Fitness**

a. Request approval of site plan review for a proposed athletic facility (West Lane Fitness) in accordance with Veneta Land Development Ordinance No. 493, Section 6.01 and Section 6.07.

Garbett reviewed the approval criteria for the site plan review which includes Land Development Ordinance Article 6. She said notice was sent to all residents within 300 ft. and no formal comments were received. She said a few issues include parking, which was already discussed and the demand study proposed 20 off street and 7 on-street parking spaces. She said the City Engineer responded that the study appears reliable and the proposed parking demand rate can be applied to the site. Another challenge was improvements to Fifth St. which abuts the site on the west side and does not have curb, gutter, or sidewalk. She said the applicant is proposing those improvements and the City Engineer commented that those improvements shall be constructed or the applicant record an irrevocable improvement agreement. Garbett said the variance and landscaping were previously discussed and based on the findings in the site plan review request, stated in the proposed final order, staff is recommending conditional approval.

**MOTION: Lily Rees made a motion to approve the site plan with the specified conditions of approval. Kevin Conlin second the motion.**

In response to a question from James Eagle Eye, Garbett said the obscuring fence conditions were also included and listed as condition 10(c) – “six ft. site obscuring fence along the south property line that provides separation. . . .”

**VOTE: 4-0.**

**VII. Review and Comment, Applegate Landing Phase 3, SR-2-14, Conceptual layouts for Lots 110-113 and Lot 141 (i.e. Proposed building footprints in relation to Greenway Subzone.)**

Garbett said the materials for this agenda item were not included in the packet but materials were provided at the meeting. Garbett said the Planning Commission previously approved the tentative subdivision for Applegate Landing Phase 3. She said previously the applicant’s consultant provided layouts that depicted the lots that would be affected by the greenway with the variance that was approved. She said the language, conditioned as part of that variance, that the applicant shall use best efforts to minimize placing the building footprint in the greenway in lots 110-113 and lot 141. Staff is requesting direction on how to apply that condition of approval at the time of building permit review. She said staff is anticipating building permits will start coming in and they want to make sure the intent is solidified with that greenway layout. Staff is asking the Planning Commission to review and comment on staff’s recommendation. Garbett reviewed staff’s recommendations for individual lots which were based on the two building footprints the applicant provided. Garbett said on lot 142, the applicant is

proposing the Orchard building footprint. Relocating the footprint to the south in order to avoid the greenway would eliminate a backyard for the homeowner, so staff recommended approving this layout so the homeowner could have a backyard. She said this impact seemed less valuable in terms of all the wetlands the applicant has preserved throughout the entire SWAP.

Len Goodwin suggested using a standard garage and not a three car garage or flip the floor plan like lot 112.

Garbett said lot 109 is completely encumbered by the greenway but the applicant is proposing a different building footprint which will have a 43% lot coverage - less than the 50% permitted when the SWAP was originally adopted. She said the applicant is proposing to impact the south section of lot 110. Staff recommended adjusting the footprint.

In response to a question from Lily Rees, Bork said at the last Planning Commission meeting, which Ms. Rees was not able to attend, the Planning Commission allowed impacts to the greenway by these lots as long as they were building the least impact to the wetlands as possible.

James Eagle Eye said the Planning Commission went back and forth and because it was previously approved in the original SWAP, they decided that was the best place for the road at that time and also because the wetlands had changed. He said the applicant's original wetland delineation had expired and when they did a new one it did encroach onto that previously approved site.

Bork said if this was a brand new subdivision, the layout would not have been allowed to encumber the greenway and there would have been more opportunity to work around it.

Garbett said the wetland on lot 109 was not technically mapped for Phase 1 and 2, when the SWAP was approved.

In response to a question from Bork, Len Goodwin suggested leaving lot 110 where it is.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to allow the applicant's building footprint for lot 111 which would possibly have a minor impact by the back deck area. She said it would have a 36% lot coverage which is less than the 50% permitted. On lots 112 and 113 staff is recommending using a smaller building footprint like the one proposed for lot 111 or another smaller model to give the homeowner's a larger backyard and not impact the greenway as much and for lot 142 use a smaller garage or flip the floor plan like lot 112.

#### **VIII. Residential Buildable Land Inventory and Housing Need Analysis, Review and Make Recommendation for Adoption**

Bork said the last time the Planning Commission reviewed the BLI was in February and at that time there were no additional changes requested by the Commission. She said she wanted to present this one last time after she made some small edits, added the findings indicating we were not including infill lots and re-developable inventory. She said also an executive summary was added. Bork said because potential development could utilize this information, staff would like the Council to adopt the Building Lands Inventory by resolution prior to finalizing the EOA.

In response to a question from Kevin Conlin, Bork said she would like the Commission to recommend approval of the BLI at the December meeting so the Council can adopt it by January.

James Eagle Eye said he would like to review the BLI at the next meeting prior to recommending it to the Council for adoption in December or January.

#### **IX. Other**

Bork provided an update on Phase 3 of Hayden Homes development. She said last Friday while grading, the ground crew did not get the message not to grade within the storm swale because they are

still waiting for their concurrence and the Dept. of State Lands (DSL) permit. She said they self-reported themselves to the City and DSL about the situation. At that time the City Engineer issued a stop work order and the applicant worked with DSL to get the corrections in place and were allowed to continue at their own risk. She said the City did remind them that our original notice to proceed still applies and DSL said they can proceed at their own risk knowing that they still have some obligations with their permit. She said they are still working to beat the weather.

Ingham asked for feedback from the Planning Commission on the EOA process and Mr. Parker's process.

James Eagle Eye said it was generally in line with what they've talked about in the past. He said when we get down to how we're going to do it and where we should focus our energy and whatever resources we have will help some of our more defining conversations.

Len Goodwin said he has some technical questions for Mr. Parker on the EOA.

Bork said the City will be presented with a five year recognition as a Tree City USA City. She said that will take place at the Tree Planting event at the Community Center on Saturday, October 11<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. She said Mayor Larson will give a welcoming presentation, the Oregon Dept. of Forestry will present the City with a recognition plaque, and an arborist will give a presentation. She said from there the event will move to Territorial Park to plant trees.

**X. Adjourn**

Chair James Eagle Eye adjourned the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 8:32 p.m

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Eagle Eye, Chairman

ATTEST:

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder

# Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Veneta City Council and Veneta Planning Commission October 29, 2014

Council: Sandra Larson, Thomas Cotter, Victoria Hedenstrom, Thomas Laing

Planning Commission: Calvin Kenney, Len Goodwin, Kevin Conlin, Lily Rees

Community Members: Jason Alansky, Joan Mariner, Phil Velie

Absent: Brittany Boothe, James Eagle Eye, Herb Vloedman

Others: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder; and Bob Parker, Amanda D'Souza; and Michael Howard of the University of Oregon, Community Service Center

---

Planning Commission vice Chair Len Goodwin and Mayor Sandra Larson called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

## I. Introductions

Introductions were made throughout the room.

## II. Economic Opportunities Analysis

### a. Employment Forecast

Ms. D'Souza reviewed the agenda and some of the key findings from the Economic Opportunity Analysis (EOA). She said the three goals for tonight's meeting will be to get direction from the committee for choosing one of the employment forecasts, establishing the list of priority industries and setting up the action items. She said as part of the EOA, Community Planning Workshop (CPW) estimated employment growth over the next 20 years. The EOA outlines two safe harbor methods; by the population or employment rate. CPW recommended the City use the employment safe harbor method because the population rate over estimates the need for commercial land.

Len Goodwin said industrial designated land is probably one of the most precious resources a city can have. In addition, industrial land likely requires larger sites. Commercial land can be met with smaller sites - one to five acres. For us to re-designate industrial land to commercial land, could have serious disadvantages if we're looking at large scale employers.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Len Goodwin said when we start the discussion about industries and businesses likely to locate here, we may find that Eugene and Springfield might have difficulty attempting to create additional employment land. That could create a situation where it's more likely that industries will look at outlying areas, rather than deal with infill in the two major cities.

Mr. Parker encouraged the Committee to take a long term view of this and in Veneta's case, if we use the industrial lands, where does the next increment of supply come from. He said Veneta has pretty good sites now but this is a policy decision. He said industrial land is hard to get into your boundary and challenging to maintain it. He said many cities have chipped away at it and he suggested we carefully monitor it.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Ms. D'Souza pulled up and reviewed a map of Veneta's industrial and commercial lands.

Kevin Conlin said why take options away at such an early date. He felt this is a situation that we're going to be looking at over and over again as the process continues and as new data comes, the Committee can make adjustments as required. He said if we do it now, we take away options that may be difficult to replace.

In response to a question from Thomas Cotter, Ingham said there isn't really any place Veneta can go as far as expanding our Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). He said with the many wetlands and small rural developments there aren't many large tracks of land.

Mr. Parker said the fact that the City has serviced industrial and industrial/commercial land with access to Hwy 126 its worth thinking about. He said one thing to look at, as the cities develop around us, some cities are looking at mixed employment designations; non-retail and trading sector jobs - jobs that bring money in from the outside. Those could be office jobs and it may be a way to add some flexibility into the code without completely compromising it for uses that might not provide the kind of jobs we want in Veneta.

Len Goodwin said the reality is any significant land designation will require us to look at a UGB expansion; probably easterly along Hwy 126 because the rural designations would not be suitable or likely to prove suitable for re-designation as industrial because they're either resource lands or constrained by wetlands.

After a thorough discussion it was the consensus of the committee to move forward with the safe harbor employment forecast method.

Mr. Velie said they own the majority of the industrial land and he's concerned about the demand. He said many buyers have looked at those sites off and on for several years. He said no one has been looking at Cornerstone for some time so he's concerned about the demand; how long will they have to hold on to it. He said he's not sure, as far as industrial land goes, what kind of business will be utilizing that land. He said he doesn't know what they can do with it and he'd like to know what the City will do to provide industrial development.

Ms. Mariner said the advantage with sticking with the employment forecast is once we decide to make industrial land commercial land, we can't get it back once we carve it up for something else. She said if we carve it up, no industry will come.

Mr. Parker said his team is only requesting direction on the forecast and that doesn't preclude the Committee from taking any action on what is allowed on the land at this point. It just says there is a certain amount of demand and the City has to demonstrate that we have a sufficient land supply to meet that. He said it doesn't close down the options at this point but it does represent a more realistic employment scenario for the City. He said there will be more detailed discussions at the future meetings.

**b. Trends Affecting Growth**

Ms. D'Souza provided data pertaining to local, regional, and state trends. She said Lane County is growing at a slower pace (36% increase over the next 20 years) than the state is expected to grow at 41%.

Mr. Parker said most small cities in Oregon are not growing at all.

Ms. D'Souza said the data reflects an employment decrease in manufacturing, construction, and natural resources, and increases in education, healthcare and food services. Ms. D'Souza continued to review her power point presentation.

**c. Veneta's Comparative and Competitive Advantages**

Ms. D'Souza reviewed Veneta's advantages and disadvantages – particularly those that may impact target industries. She said Veneta continues to grow faster than Lane County at a rate of 2.92% per year. She reviewed the statistics for Veneta and Lane County.

In response to a question from Ingham, Ms. D'Souza said right now Veneta's median age is lower than Eugene's but Veneta's median age is rising and Eugene's median age is decreasing.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Mr. Parker said millennials looking for more concentrated urban environments may have something to do with Eugene's population growth. He said it may also have something do with growth at the U of O. He said there's about 25,000 students at the U of O and they get counted in Eugene's population numbers.

Ms. D'Souza continued with data about Veneta.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Mr. Parker said Veneta residents working in Elmira were considered residents that leave Veneta.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Ms. D'Souza said generally the aging population limits the work force in Veneta because it's difficult to match the kind of skill sets Veneta residents have to labor markets. She said this is somewhat of a disadvantage for Veneta.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Mr. Parker said rail based business is a very narrow segment. You would need to be moving bulky, heavy materials, like lumber or steel for a long distance and there are no mills in Veneta.

**d. Buildable Land Inventory and Implications**

Ms. D'Souza said the available lands are mostly smaller commercial industrial and no commercial sites over 10 acres. She said the larger industrial site is 19 acres which creates low redevelopment potential.

In response to a question from Ingham, Mr. Parker said Veneta doesn't have a lot of redevelopment potential because it has mostly vacant land. He said its easier to build on vacant land than to redevelop it. He said it's a pretty easy choice to make. He said it doesn't make sense to think about policies to push the market for redevelopment because our land use patterns don't suggest we should find traditional uses - switching one use to another use doesn't make sense unless it adds new employment. Also there would be no redevelopment because we are not doing a boundary change. He said if we identify redevelopment sites, there may be reactions from property owners that are not conducive with the overall objective.

Ingham said the only place Veneta could take advantage of redevelopment or reuse of vacant land is at the west end of West Broadway. He would like to see a conversion to more commercial or retail use.

Mr. Parker said that could take the form of adapted reuse of existing buildings or demolishing the existing buildings to provide building sites for future businesses.

Len Goodwin said he felt it would be unwise to focus too much attention on that. He said it would be good if we can stimulate re-devolvement selectively on the West Broadway corridor but as Mr. Parker suggested if we focus on developing the West Broadway corridor, we'll get a difficult reaction from the existing businesses. He said we don't want to encourage the existing businesses to move or make them relocate because we're about to re-develop the land.

Mr. Parker said just because a business is ugly doesn't make it right to make them move. He said retention should be the foundational strategy. He said from a recruitment standpoint, Veneta has the opportunity to increase its employment base and focus on the sites that are serviced and investments from the City, seem to be the most beneficial way to go.

### **III. Target Industries**

#### **Review previously identified targeted industries.**

Ms. D'Souza said the next subject is a discussion on potential target industries. She said the purpose is to help focus the strategic planning process. She said it will be essential as we move forward with goals and strategies. Given the location and land base, what characteristics of an industry would you like to see in Veneta?

Len Goodwin said there is a slight variation on that theme. He said it's really a focus on what are the industries that are likely to be attracted to Veneta.

Mr. Parker said we started looking at occupations of existing employment and a substantial amount of people living in Veneta are in business services. He said he wanted to figure out how we can capitalize on that. It explains a few things about that data and why Veneta has higher incomes than other places. He found that people are making intentional choices to live here because they like the lifestyle. He said if we also want those people to live and work here then we need to find occupations that fit that profile. He said it was interesting data that tells a lot of about the population in Veneta and a little bit about why they choose to live here.

Len Goodwin said it may suggest some attention should be focused on those professional industries that don't require physical interaction with a client.

Mr. Parker said like the Levi Strauss financial back office. He said that business could just as easily locate in Veneta and you have the appropriate infrastructure to support that. He said it's just the matter of do you have the labor force to support it. He said based on the data, there are highly skilled people living here that work elsewhere.

Joan Mariner said at the last meeting we talked about retention and she mentioned the craft people living in the area but was told we couldn't make it economically feasible for them to sell their wares here which means we're bleeding dollars all the time while they're marketing their wares elsewhere.

She said we also have a very active agricultural market which can be a 10 month market for produce which also goes to Eugene. She asked why not create a year round market at the community center. She said it could be twice a week to provide a place for crafts people and encourage farmers to expand marketing their products. She said all of the local artisans go to the Saturday Market and Holiday Market in Eugene. She said it would also draw a lot of tourism.

Mr. Parker said another important point he wanted to make was when Ms. D'Souza was reviewing the income data, it showed that Veneta residents have \$3000 more disposable income than the average Lane County household. He said we had a little discussion about how much retail leakage was occurring in Veneta. He said we could focus some attention on what would be the next retail service that would be interested in locating in Veneta. He said his team could provide more analysis of expenditure patterns to see what the relative distribution is and based on different

sectors of expenditures. He said it may be informative in terms of thinking about whether the City wants to be proactive about getting more retail activity or where it should focus its efforts.

Len Goodwin said we may want to focus on some kind of mixed tourism/production culture – something like an urban village or a yearly permanent facility that caters to local artisans and would also attract visitors from outside. He said for example, Lone Pine Farms and Thistledown have huge volumes of traffic moving to those facilities. He said another thought may be a concept of going beyond the small scale but amalgamating it to something larger.

Mr. Parker said it would be more than a Farmers' Market to engage people to sell at a permanent location. He said but we would need to make sure we have producers and find a location that could be marketed to residents. He said it may attract tourists but our community would need to sustain it.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Ingham said Hwy 126 has about 18,000 vehicles traveling it a day at peak traffic and Hwy 20 has about 60,000 traveling per day.

Mr. Parker said Sisters is a brand destination. He said it would take a lot to get the critical mass and significant capital investments to get something like that to work in Veneta.

Ms. Mariner said something like a community village for local farmers and crafters to sell their products. Then we can start adding birding expeditions, winery tours, and also include a diversity that would appeal to those traveling to the coast.

Ingham said we started the Veneta Downtown Farmers' Market eight years ago and we put plenty of advertising dollars and outreach but it never really seems to grow.

In response to a question from Victoria Hedenstrom, Mr. Parker said we need to find a way to create something that is interesting to the local community and will also draw in tourists. He said if it can't sustain itself it won't be successful. He said there's a reason BiMart chose to move into this portion of the county – the store provides a service that doesn't exist elsewhere. He said those are the kinds of businesses that we should attract. He said specialty businesses have a bigger challenge attracting customers.

Len Goodwin said with the close proximity to Fern Ridge Reservoir we have several opportunities to bring businesses that would benefit from that. He said a canoe manufacturer or bicycle manufacturing – industries that make the equipment that is highly used in this area.

Victoria Hedenstrom suggested high tech, unseen businesses like internet, medical support or cloud services that wouldn't rely on Hwy 126 or that don't require being physically present.

Ms. Mariner suggested a motel or hotel is a win/win.

Ingham said the results of the request for proposal (RFP) indicated that a hotel would only have a 27% occupancy rate in the winter and in order to be successful it would need a year round occupancy rate of 66%.

Thomas Cotter said he felt it is a worthy project.

#### **IV. Action Plan Development – Goal 1**

In response to a question from Calvin Kenney, Mr. Parker we're not likely to attract large food processing companies but more likely it would be small scale, specialty companies.

Mr. Parker suggested the discussion move toward focusing on foundational aspects that can be acted on to attract these types of businesses, also CPW is not suggesting you start contacting businesses. He said there's more effective ways to think about this.

Ms. D'Souza reviewed the Action Plan Development. She reviewed the key strategies.

Mr. Parker said commitment can take more than one form; resources we would commit to. Other ways to demonstrate commitment would be to develop a business friendly environment, partnering with other government agencies. He said where should we start and how much does the City want to invest? He said the level of investment will influence what ends up in the Action Plan. He said this is really a brainstorming exercise and CPW will finalize the list of ideas with the understanding that not everything will make it to the final plan and at some point the Committee will identify the top priorities. He said the more specific the Committee is the more useful it is.

Len Goodwin said this is a very narrow focus – a focus on what sort of human resources we are going to develop and he's not sure any of these approaches are the right fit. Wouldn't we be much better off getting involved with Lane Metro partnership so we could leverage the resources that we have with those of the greater region and likely have better more positive results.

Mr. Parker said that was strategy 1.2. He said the reason we bring this up, is because in the previous plan the City wanted to create an economic committee and staff it. However, CPW wanted to force the issue to get you to talk about what you want to do. He said if no one is assigned to this, not much is going to happen. He said there's got to be an economic development point person. He said if that's that what you want to do then we have to figure how to fit it in with current staffs' work load. He said they understand there are resource constraints and there may be ways to work around it but someone has to be there to work on those partnerships.

Kevin Conlin said volunteer committees don't prove to be that efficient. He said in this step we're talking about the person that is the face of the City, region, etc. He tends to lean more toward hiring an economic development coordinator.

Mayor Larson suggested hiring someone to take some of Ingham's responsibility so he can focus more of his time on economic development.

Mr. Parker said we don't have to make the operational decisions now but CPW would like to get a sense of where the Committee is at. He said it may not be financially feasible to hire a full time person. He said the Committee also needs to have a long term vision on this. He said you may not see success for five to 10 years and there's a lot of little things that need to happen before the big things happen.

Mayor Larson said that's kind of what's happened over the last 10 years. She said we've made many investments in infrastructure, redevelopment of W. Broadway, etc. and so maybe it's about to happen. She said Ingham has been instrumental in seeing those things happen and his foresight has been economic development which he has worked for some time. She said maybe our extra commitment should be in making Veneta more attractive and not so much on employing those that are working outside of Veneta. She said maybe we should work on bringing people in and build the community in more than one way.

Ingham said that's appropriate but he suggested the Committee move on to the next strategies. He said he felt CPW is asking the Committee whether or not extra resources and commitments be given towards trying to get additional payment on economic dollars without defining what those resources are.

Ms. Mariner said as a consistent volunteer, the economic development coordinator is not a volunteer position. She said there is a definite skill set needed.

There was a thorough discussion about the position.

Len Goodwin suggested a small scale cold storage facility for local farmers.

Victoria Hedenstrom suggested working on increasing Veneta's positive face. She said it seems as though we're missing something and wants to change the current concept of what Veneta is.

Lily Rees suggested looking into getting some kind of retirement development or upscale assisted living facility tied to a hotel or rooms for rent. She said we should look at the age of our population and focus on bringing citizens to the area that have discretionary spending ability but don't have a lot of mobility.

Ingham said it's important that the City builds those relationships but how do we show our elected officials the return on investment when it comes to building partnerships. Ingham said the City has positive partnerships with many of the organizations listed in the power point presentation. Ingham said a workforce ready community is an interesting concept but often times it's the school districts that takes the lead to create that certified work force.

Mayor Larson suggested the school district partner and LCC.

Mr. Parker said work force development is not a City function. He suggested coming back to this after they've reviewed the other strategies. He also will talk with staff about possible partnerships the City would like to have with other organizations. He suggested partnering with the Willamette Valley Vineyards.

**V. Next Steps**

Ms. D'Souza said the discussion will continue on strategy and action development at the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Parker suggested sending the Committee an online questionnaire outlining the four remaining goals that were not reviewed tonight then his team will summarize the results to be included with the next meeting's materials.

Mayor Larson said that would be helpful. She said she felt part of the confusion is we know we're supposed to be developing the plan but its hard to not focus on the action first.

Ingham said if anyone is interested, meeting materials can be mailed out or picked up at City Hall and staff will work on getting all the materials posted on the City's website. He said the next meeting is November 19<sup>th</sup> and the fourth meeting is December 8<sup>th</sup> with a Council meeting to follow.

**VI. Adjourn**

Chair James Eagle Eye and Mayor Sandra Larson adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Len Goodwin, Vice Chairman

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra Larson, Mayor

ATTEST:

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder



# Minutes of the Veneta Planning Commission November 4, 2014

Present: Len Goodwin, Kevin Conlin, and Lily Rees  
Absent: James Eagle Eye, Calvin Kenney  
Others: Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Lisa Garbett, Associate Planner; Ric Ingham, City Administrator; and Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder

---

## I. Review Agenda

Vice Chair Len Goodwin opened the Veneta Planning Commission meeting at 7:06 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.

## II. Public Comment

None

## III. Make Recommendation for Adoption: Residential Buildable Land Inventory and Housing Need Analysis

- IV. Bork said at the October meeting the Planning Commission was provided with a final draft of the Residential Buildable Land Inventory and Housing Need Analysis which was last reviewed in February. She said prior to the October meeting she cleaned up the tables, included an executive summary of the findings and addressed infill and redevelopment of certain parcels. She said the findings show we have 475 acres of available residential land, most of which is zoned Rural/Residential and Low Density Residential. She said the need shows 321 acres is required over the next 20 years so we will have a surplus of approximately 153 acres. Bork reminded all in attendance the study was a result of several months work by the Planning Commission.

**MOTION: Lily Rees made a motion to recommend the City Council adopt the Veneta Residential Buildable Land Inventory and House Needs Analysis. Kevin Conlin seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 3-0.**

## V. Review and Comment on Proposed Code Amendments – Irrevocable Petition for Public Improvements

Bork said this is the first time the Planning Commission has received information regarding proposed changes regarding Irrevocable Petitions. She said she is presenting code amendments initiated through the City Council to provide more clarification in the Land Development and Land Division codes when improvements and an Irrevocable Petition are required and when and how improvements can be waived. She said currently the code allows property owners to construct all required improvements or they can waive sidewalk improvements only. She said the City's practice has been to allow property owners to waive certain improvements that don't make sense at the time. She said there are situations where someone will develop a parcel along an unimproved street. The City therefore would not require improvements to their section of the street; leaving the remainder of the street unimproved. In that instance the developer will be required to sign an Irrevocable Petition for all improvements in the future. . She reviewed each amendment and the intended outcome of each.

### Background – What type of Development Triggers Improvements and/or an Irrevocable Petition

Bork said improvements are generally required during site plan review process. If someone is constructing a commercial building they will be required to improve the site along with potentially improving any street frontage or putting in water, sewer, etc. Improvements are also triggered at the time of subdivision and partition. She said usually in the case of subdivisions, all the improvements are required and are installed. Partitions are a little different, most improvements will be put in but often times partitions are on unimproved streets so those improvements won't be required at the time since it doesn't make sense to pave only a portion of the street when the

remainder of the street is unimproved. Staff would like to change the code to allow any type of improvement be waived if it's not in the City's best interest to have that improvement installed at the time.

It has been City practice to waive sidewalk improvements when there is no curb or gutter and also require the property owner to sign an irrevocable petition, and pay a deposit for the sidewalk improvement. The way the current code is written it only requires signing the petition or submitting the deposit but it's been the City's practice for years to require both. We are proposing the changes to make sure our code is consistent with our practice.

Bork said we want to make sure that broadband conduit fiber is added to our code as an improvement. She said the City Council amended the municipal code to require conduit to be installed during subdivision development. She said the proposed code amendments will make sure fiber is referenced specifically in the land division and land development code.

Bork said the current code states that when you pull a permit you will be required to install improvements. She said currently the way it's written, any permit could trigger the improvements that have to be installed. She said we asked legal counsel if we should leave the language that broad or should we get more specific of what type of development will trigger these improvements. Legal Counsel said it's not necessary to get that specific because it would make sense that the City is applying the code and requiring the improvements that relate to the type of development. So, generally single family homes always require sidewalks to be constructed along the street frontage. She said if someone came in for something smaller like a shed we probably wouldn't require all the improvements. She said a garage may have a large impact on a site and that may be the only time we would get a sidewalk installed. She said we don't need the code to be so specific and legal counsel felt comfortable leaving the language as is. She asked the Commission if they would like to discuss what type of development would trigger those improvements.

Lily Rees said it would depend on what the development was and where it's located in the City. She felt comfortable with staff having some flexibility with the language.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork agreed if a single family home came in on an unimproved street - no sidewalk on the entire street, the builder would undoubtedly take the Irrevocable Petition rather than install one section of sidewalk, or installation of stormwater systems. She said in the case of a single family dwelling we have required a deposit for the sidewalk but that will require discussion because the revisions will allow for both, it was either or - the petition or the deposit. She said going back and researching why the City required the deposit it was mostly to not leave the responsibility solely on the property owner if the property sells so the builder would assume some of that responsibility. She said if the City has plans to do an improvement in the next five years, it makes sense to take a deposit and we probably want the flexibility to take that deposit. If it's a project that we know won't happen in 20 years, we likely would not require a deposit.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said we take bonds from developers for improvements for partitions and subdivisions but not for construction of a SFR.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said we don't have to require both a deposit and an executed irrevocable petition in all cases. If a project isn't going to happen for quite some time, it may not make sense to take a deposit. She said it's so specific - where and what's happening in a particular area of the City.

Len Goodwin said if it's going to be further out in the future, you could require a bond which doesn't require upfront cash from the developer.

Bork said that could happen in certain subdivisions.

Len Goodwin thanked Bork for the report and asked the Commissioners if there were any questions. He said he would entertain a motion.

Bork said the motion would be to allow staff to set the public hearing for first reading.

In response to a question from Len Goodwin, Bork said because we are revising the Land Development ordinance, she filed the 30 day notice to Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation (DLC) back when the Council initiated the process. She said the hearing can be at the December meeting or be postponed until the January meeting.

**MOTION: Lily Rees made a motion to direct staff to set up a public hearing date. Kevin Conlin seconded the motion which passed with a vote of 3-0.**

**VI. Adjourn**

Vice Chair Len Goodwin adjourned the Veneta Planning Commission to order at 7:20 p.m

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Len Goodwin, Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder



# **Minutes of the Joint Meeting of the Veneta City Council and Veneta Planning Commission November 19, 2014**

Council: Sandra Larson, Thomas Cotter, Victoria Hedenstrom, Thomas Laing

Planning Commission: James Eagle Eye, Kevin Conlin, Calvin Kenney, Len Goodwin, Lily Rees

Community Members: Jason Alansky, Tim Brooker, Joan Mariner, Herb Vloedman

Absent: Brittany Boothe, Phil Velie

Others: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Community Development Director; Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder; Bob Parker, Amanda D'Souza; and Michael Howard of the University of Oregon, Community Service Center

---

Planning Commission Chair James Eagle Eye and Mayor Sandra Larson called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

Ms. D'Souza reviewed the agenda, along with the goals to be discussed with the strategy and action development plan. She said she will review Veneta's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) for Veneta and how we achieve our economic vision.

Len Goodwin said what is not on the list is recreational opportunities in our immediate region.

Mayor Larson said Fern Ridge Reservoir is not mentioned.

### Strengths

Ms. D'Souza reviewed Veneta's strengths as follows: Available land, redeveloping downtown, infrastructure (Utilities), proximity (wineries, agriculture, Eugene/Springfield), supportive City staff, School District, and available workforce.

### Weaknesses

Ms. D'Souza reviewed Veneta's weaknesses as follows: Distance and access to I-5, outdated infrastructure, the community being divided by Highway 126, traffic on Highway 126, entering and exiting Highway 126 and Territorial Highway, restrictive ordinances and many vacant buildings, no active development in downtown, downtown is not visible from Highway 126; no workforce training opportunities and there's no active external communication about Veneta's efforts. It was a consensus of the committee that our public streets are not really a weakness.

In response to a question from Kevin Conlin, Ms. D'Souza said her interpretation of no active external communication was there wasn't much attention drawn to Veneta's successes.

Ingham said we think that when we identify catalyst projects, i.e., the pipeline and the Service Center, we did get good coverage but what would be the means to get that external communication out.

In response to a question from Mayor Larson, Mr. Parker said his team will list Veneta's strengths and weaknesses in a matrix form and will be included in the plan.

### Opportunities

Veneta's opportunities were reviewed which included: tourism, recreational activities, potential small scale industries like agriculture, wineries, breweries, services for residents, a redeveloped downtown, business park infrastructure, community support or community involvement.

Len Goodwin said the availability of industrial land may be an issue.

Kevin Conlin asked for clarification. He said we're not talking about opportunities for Veneta in the future but opportunities that currently exist.

There was a thorough discussion about the difference between opportunities and strengths. The following was identified as opportunities: Residents support bond measures, providing moderately priced homes which also attracts families, and discretionary spending is higher in Veneta.

### Threats

Threats to Veneta were reviewed which included the following: Increased retail and employment leakage to Eugene/Springfield, weak local infrastructure to support economic development, land availability in the Northeast Employment District, the external perceptions of Veneta, continued national and state economic weakness.

Ingham said the issue in the Northeast Employment District is there's an abundance of land but there's problems with the zoning.

Mr. Vloedman said zoning ordinances should be more transparent so residents can read and understand it.

There was a thorough discussion about amending the zoning districts in the Northeast Employment District to make them more flexible and less vague. That the restrictive land use is perceived as a threat.

Bork said no one has asked to rezone those parcels and she doesn't feel zoning districts are really a threat because the zoning ordinance is pretty flexible, however, it will be worth re-visiting.

### Goal 2 - Business Retention, Expansion and Attraction

Ms. D'Souza reviewed Goal 2 as a first strategy to develop an outreach plan and provided an explanation of each action item.

### Goal 3 – Retail and Commercial Development

Mr. Parker said goals are simply statements and don't point to an outcome but are really an action statement.

Ingham said we don't have a lot of resources directed at economic development.

There was a thorough discussion about how to identify and inventory home based businesses; make face to face visits with the Chamber members, work with a survey consultant to survey local employers or send an online survey to businesses asking how we may provide assistance - things we want to include in the plan. Mr. Parker said at the December meeting, hopefully his team can identify what we realistically feel we can accomplish.

Business associations to contact included the Veneta's Farmers' Market, Travel Lane County, local winery associations. It was also suggested to prepare a needs analysis perception survey. Mr. Parker said it's not something that needs to be done frequently but it could build a

relationship with community business partners and also sends a message that Veneta is a partner and we may be able to help. Another suggestion was that any outreach program conducted should include a survey and include an action item to identify and work with other small cities that resemble Veneta.

After a brief discussion it was the consensus to not follow through with an action item to identify and work with small cities but to work with local associations.

Mr. Parker said the end product will include a list of associations, identified groups and clusters and provide staff guidance to work with those groups. He suggested partnering with Travel Lane County may yield better results. He said the next action item would be to take advantage of local wineries, breweries and recreational sports to take advantage of the reservoir.

A discussion took place to identify what that partnership would look like; some kind of birding event, winery tours, or a sporting event at the reservoir. The committee also discussed contacting local wineries and ask them what they need or would like to see from the City. Also discussed was how to create enough activity to support a hotel or a bed and breakfast and restaurants on Broadway.

Mr. Parker said rather than strengthen City events, the City could sponsor local wineries events to draw those people already driving through our City on their way to other events.

Kevin Conlin said he is concerned about the City offering loans and grants to start-up businesses.

Mr. Parker said he proposes a discussion about incentives should take place at the next meeting. He said the survey could be left open to those that did not complete it.

Ms. D'Souza reviewed the responses on how to market the City.

Mr. Parker said there are formal approaches that place spending a lot of money on development strategies. He said there are dozens of ways we can go.

Mr. Vloedman said there is a great opportunity to change Veneta's perception. He said we haven't had a new commercial building since BiMart came to Veneta 14 years ago. He suggested sending out a quarterly business newsletter to get information out and use the statistical information we already have to identify those business owners. He feels it is important to have a focused targeted business economic development format and we need to sell the business community. Also, there may be many residents thinking about becoming entrepreneurs or starting a business and a business newsletter may get them interested. He said it may send the message that says Veneta is open for business.

Lily Rees suggested sending out a separate quarterly email directed to businesses.

Len Goodwin said he strongly disagrees that the Highway 126 beautification project should be included on the list. He said improving the infrastructure is the issue not beatification.

Thomas Cotter disagreed.

Ms. D'Souza said the final strategy to increase capacity will require dedicating more resources – assigning to a new staff member, hiring an intern or an assistant for Ingham so he can focus on economic development. Ms. D'Souza reviewed the responses and the final goal.

Len Goodwin suggested the downtown standards should be reviewed.

Mr. Parker said the City owns downtown land, is there a strategy the City wants to use as an incentive?

Ingham said staff is having that conversation with the Urban Renewal Agency because there are many possibilities and complications. He said we have to be clear on what we do and don't do but the Council will make those decisions.

Thomas Cotter said the City has the land and we're willing to assist businesses and to build retail space but we don't have anyone to do it for. He said it's difficult to build a building when we don't know what's going to be in there.

Mr. Parker suggested the City be externally clear about what to do and what not to do because if we're not it may contribute to the lack of activity.

Ms. D'Souza reviewed some strategies for developing a campaign to support local businesses.

Mr. Parker said one risk factor the City will struggle with is if we invest a lot of money and nothing happens for a while. He said also we need to be careful about spending Urban Renewal Agency dollars and choosing the project for those dollars. He asked if a market analysis should be completed and if so, if we didn't want to spend the money to update the market analysis, we could talk with developers about the perception of the current market.

Mr. Parker said his team will work with Bork and will also get the survey out again.

Ingham said the next meeting will be Monday, December 8<sup>th</sup>, at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall. He said he is excited that we want to get a new and fresh look at this. He said what we've accomplished over the last few years is getting us to a place where we want to be as a building block.

Adjourn

Chair James Eagle Eye and Mayor Sandra Larson adjourned the meeting at 7:37 p.m

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Eagle Eye, Chairman

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra Larson, Mayor

ATTEST:

**XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Darci Henneman, Assistant City Recorder