

City of Lafayette

Phone: (503) 864-2451

Fax : (503) 864-4501

"Third Oldest City in Oregon"

486 Third Street - PO Box 55 - Lafayette, Oregon 97127-0055



LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE WILL MEET IN REGULAR SESSION THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2010 AT 7 PM IN THE CITY HALL MEETING ROOM AT 486 THIRD STREET (99W), LAFAYETTE, OREGON.

AGENDA IS AS FOLLOWS:

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL OF THE **March 18, 2010 minutes**
4. **Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments**
5. Goal Setting

The location of this meeting is accessible to the disabled. If you will need any special accommodations to attend or participate in the meeting, please notify City Hall, at (503) 864-2451, at least 24 hours before the meeting.

CITY OF LAFAYETTE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FOR
MARCH 18, 2010

Call to Order: Beth Cooke called the meeting to order at 7:02p.m.

Roll Call: Lori Labb called the roll.

Present: Marian Chasse, Ronald Kerr, David Gilbey, Beth Cooke, Todd Holt

Absent:

Staff Present: Jim Jacks and Lori Labb

Others: Darrell Flood

Approval of Minutes:

Marian Chasse made a motion to approve the December 17, 2009 meeting minutes. Ronald Kerr seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Jim Jacks provided the Commissioners and the audience with a Supplemental Report handout dated March 18, 2010.

Jim Jacks went over the over the staff report titled Supplemental Report.

David Gilbey noted that he felt that although he understands that there are a lot of typos in the Comprehensive Plan. A Comprehensive Plan is supposed to be forward looking and with just fixing typos it seem to just be band aids for the plan. He understood that we did not obtain the Technical Assistant Grant but questioned if there were things that can be done without amending the Comprehensive Plan for instance water resources, economic things for downtown, council goals and then possibly reapply for the grant next year.

Jim Jacks noted that the good thing that could come out of this review of the Comprehensive Plan is with all the several new Planning Commissioners over the years, there has not been a group review of the plan. This will allow the Commissioners a chance to review the plan, get a little more familiar with it and decide where the Community would like to be going. One issue is that the City is just about out to the Urban Growth Boundary with the City limits and development .So given that the state laws on land use planning in Oregon, they basically call for cities to be future looking and having a 20 years supply of land for residential, commercial and industrial growth.

David Gilbey questioned if that law applied to the City since the population was under 10,000.

Jim Jacks noted that the 10,000 and over population is when the City would be required to go through Periodic Review. There is a State Statute that requires all Cities to have a 20 year supply. This has issues in terms of sewer and water capacity and the Cities ability to plan and fund the improvements.

David Gilbey noted that he felt that now was the time to update the Comprehensive Plan to make sure it coincides with the transportation plan, water master plan, economic plan, etc.

Marian Chasse noted that it may be a good idea to talk to the City Council and get feedback and the backing for looking at the City of Lafayette's future and goals.

Lori Labb asked Jim Jacks if the wording and errors in the Comprehensive Plan were just a start to the entire process of the update.

Jim Jacks noted that housekeeping amendments are a start to the entire process. Then the City would need to insure that the Comprehensive Plan is recognizing the Transportation Plan, Park Plan, Water Master Plan, etc.

David Gilbey proposed that the Planning Commission preset themselves with a set of goals for the year and try to tackle those goals.

Discussion ensued.

Todd Holt noted that at this point there is no direction on where the City is going.

David Gilbey noted that the revisions of the comprehensive plan should be looking 20 years into the future.

Discussion ensued.

The Planning Commission took a few moments to review the handout given by Jim Jacks.

Darrell Flood noted that on page 5 of the memo it shows item 3.2 " The City shall maximize the utilization of its water resources." He noted that the City Council has spent the last 6 or 7 months discussion water rationing and how to solve the issue and he would hate to see that line stricken out of the Comprehensive Plan.

Jim Jacks noted that the way it is worded in the Comprehensive Plan it could be read as, the city should use as much water as possible or could it be read in terms of efficiency.

Discussion ensued.

Beth Cooke noted that this was to be deleted from this section and moved the policy to the Community resource chapter.

Ron Kerr noted that the sentence could be reworded to state "The City shall maximize the efficient use of water resources."

The Commissioners agreed with Ron Kerr.

David Gilbey asked Jim if the City was within the groundwater protection area.

Jim noted that he did not see that in the Water Master Plan. He noted that he would look into that to make sure.

Discussion ensued.

David Gilbey questioned if the City has heard from DEQ regarding the load allocations from the treatment Plant.

Lori Labb noted that she would ask Roy Loftis (Treatment Plant Operator).

The Planning Commission continued going over the Memo.

David Gilbey made a motion to simplify and leave the wording exactly how it is in the comprehensive plan regarding schools. The city does not have any regulatory over schools and we move to support Wascher Elementary and the McMinnville Schools District. Todd Holt seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion ensued.

Ron Kerr noted that it could read "support the highest quality educational services for the community in the most efficient orderly manner."

Jim Jacks noted that he would look into wording incorporating that language.

Beth Cooke stated that we are most likely due to the school boundaries to stay in the McMinnville school District. If there is a UGB expansion to the North, that will become part of the McMinnville School District instead of Carlton or Dayton. She felt that moving towards a situation where we might be in a split for school districts was adventitious and the wording should be left to support the McMinnville School District.

Discussion ensued.

There was a discussion on if the solid waste information in the comp plan should be taken out.

David Gilbey noted that Policy 10-1 could read, "The City shall coordinate efforts with the contracted disposal service to ensure that the solid waste disposal, recycling and yard debris needs of the community are being met in a most cost-efficient and energy conserving manner".

Todd Holt made a motion to add the information suggested by David Gilbey for section 10-1 and strike all other information listed above that section. David Gilbey seconded the motion. There was some discussion by the Planning Commission. Motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission would like to see 10-1 as a goal statement.

The Planning Commission continued going over the memo.

The Planning Commission decided to table the supplemental handout until next meeting.

David Gilbey suggested that the Planning Commissioners review their packets and email questions to Jim or Lori prior to the meetings. Beth asked if Lori could check into public record rules to make sure that this type of situation was allowable.

Discussion ensued.

There were no other issues or comments noted by the Planning Commission on the memo.

Marian Chasse made a motion to elect David Gilbey as Vice Chair. Todd Holt seconded the Motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn: David Gilbey made a motion to adjourn. Todd Holt seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously. 8:21 pm.

TO: LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JIM JACKS, CITY PLANNER

SUBJ: HOUSEKEEPING COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS -- UPDATE SINCE
MARCH 18 MEETING AND ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS
(April 15 and May 20 meetings were cancelled)

DATE: JUNE 17, 2010

BACKGROUND

At the last Planning Commission meeting on March 18, 2010, a memo, "Preliminary Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies," was provided to the Commissioners prior to the meeting. It covered the following sections and it proposed changes to many, but not all, of the sections:

Natural Resources Chapter.

- Air Resources.
- Natural Hazards.
- Water Resources.
- Fish and Wildlife Resources.
- Mineral and Aggregate Resources.
- Energy Resources.
- Open Space.
- Implementation.

Community Resources Chapter.

- Education.
- Transportation.
- Solid Waste.
- Energy Use.
- Public Facilities.
- Recreation.
- History.
- Public Safety and Service.
- Communications.
- Implementation.

Community Development Chapter.

- Population and Economics.
- Housing.
- Land Use and Urbanization.
- Implementation.

The March 18 memo covered the seven subjects in the Natural Resources Chapter, plus the Implementation Section. Since March 18 additional proposed changes have been identified by City and COG staff that are shown in this June 17 memo.

The March 18 memo also covered the nine subjects in the Community Resources Chapter, plus the Implementation Section, but additional work was needed for the nine subject areas and that work is shown in this memo.

The March 18 memo also covered the three subjects in the Community Development Chapter, plus the Implementation Section, but additional work was needed and that work is included in this memo.

On March 18 a second memo, “Supplemental Report: Water Resources and Public Facilities,” was handed out. It addressed those portions of the Water Resources Section that covered the municipal water system and move them to the Public Facilities Section. This June 17 memo includes those proposed changes that move some material from the Water Resources Section to the Public Facilities Section.

A memo dated May 20 was prepared and distributed prior to the May 20 Planning Commission meeting. It included additional proposed amendments to goals and policies that were not covered in either of the two March 18 memos. It began with the Water Resources Section and then moved to the Public Facilities Section. The May 20 memo is included in this June 17 memo.

A second May 20 memo was prepared with the subject, “Policy 17-8, Use of Population Projection,” and it is included in this June 17 memo.

This June 17 memo includes both of the May 20 memos and is augmented with additional material identified by City and COG staff.

PROPOSED CHANGES

In each Findings Section, propose removing the bullets and assigning numbers to clearly identify each finding.

NATURAL RESOURCES CHAPTER – AIR RESOURCES

No changes proposed in the 3/18 memo and none in this memo.

NATURAL RESOURCES CHAPTER – NATURAL HAZARDS

See changes proposed in the 3/18 memo and following.

Findings.

Second bullet.

Propose deleting “agricultural” because there appears to be no agricultural uses occurring in the flood plain. The sewage treatment plant’s settling ponds are in the flood plain. The property in agricultural use north of the settling ponds is above the flood plain and is zoned industrial. Other riparian areas in the flood plain appear to be in open space.

2. The majority of the flood hazard lands are in ~~agricultural~~, open space ; and public facility use;

NATURAL RESOURCES CHAPTER -- WATER RESOURCES

See the changes proposed in the 3/18 memo. See the proposed changes in the 5/20 memo which are carried forward in this memo, below.

Natural Resources; Water Resources (p. 9). The Findings, Goal and Policies appear to mix naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows (rivers and streams) and the city’s municipal water system. Because the Water Resources Section is in the Natural Resources Chapter, it is assumed the Water Resources Findings, Goal and Policies should relate to the naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows.

Findings. Amend to separate the subject of the naturally occurring water resources such as groundwater and surface flows from the city’s municipal water system.

First Bullet: Amend to make it a clearer statement.

1. The most abundant groundwater source is ~~most likely~~ south of the planning area ***in the Dayton/Lafayette well field.***

Second Bullet:

Delete it from the Water Resources Section and move it to the Community Resources Chapter, Public Facilities Section, and amend to clearly indicate the source of the city’s municipal water supply. See Finding No. 1 in the Public Facilities Section, below.

~~Lafayette’s water supply is derived from groundwater sources.~~

Third Bullet: Renumber and amend to be clearer.

2. ~~There is little recreational use provided by t~~ ***The groundwater and surface water resources in the planning area have a low level of use for recreational purposes.***

Fourth Bullet: Renumber and amend to correct a typo -- change “need” to “needs.”

3. A sensitive groundwater area underlies the planning area. The City needs to be aware of potential impacts on sensitive groundwater areas from underground storage tanks, storm drainage, chemical spills, residential on-site sewage disposal systems, and other similar land uses.

Goal. Amend to correct a typo (change “are” to “area”), and make it clear the goal refers to groundwater and surface water resources, not to the municipal water system.

Goal 3-A. To maintain and improve the quality of ***groundwater and surface*** water resources of the planning ~~are~~ ***area*** and Lafayette ***within the City***.

Policy 3-1: Amend to refer to underground and surface water resources.

3-1. The City shall cooperate with and support State and Federal agency efforts to maintain and improve ~~the~~ ***groundwater and surface*** water resources.

Policy 3-2: Delete it from the Natural Resources Chapter and move it to the Community Resources Chapter, Public Facilities Section, because it appears to refer to the municipal water system. Once moved, amend to more clearly state the City’s intent.

~~3-2. The City shall maximize the utilization of its water resources. ***The City shall ensure the public water system is economical and efficient and shall maintain the system in an economical manner.***~~

Policy 3-3: Amend to be clearer and to ensure it addresses underground and surface water resources.

~~3-3.2. All effluent from future developments shall ***The City shall adopt regulations requiring new development to connect to the municipal sanitary sewer system to ensure*** not detrimentally affect the water quality ***of groundwater and surface waters*** of the planning area.~~

NATURAL RESOURCES CHAPTER – FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

See changes proposed in the 3/18 memo and below.

Findings.

First Bullet:

Propose amending to reflect the Federally listed species based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listing “which may occur within Yamhill County.”

No endangered fish or wildlife species exist in the planning area. ***1. The following are listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as of June 2010 as endangered species, threatened species or areas of critical habitat designated for threatened or endangered species “which may occur within Yamhill County.” It is not known if any of the species or the critical habitat exists within the urban growth boundary.***

Birds:

***Marbled murrelet, Brachyramphus mamoratus. Critical habitat. Threatened.
Northern spotted owl, Strix occidentalis caurina. Critical habitat. Threatened.***

Invertebrates (insects):

***Fender’s blue butterfly, Icaricia icariodes fender. Critical habitat. Endangered.
Oregon silverspot butterfly, Speyeria zerene hippolyta. Critical habitat.
Threatened.***

Plants:

***Willamette daisy, Erigeron decumbens var. decumbens. Critical habitat.
Endangered.
Water howellia, Howellia aquatilis. Threatened.
Kincaid’s lupine, Lupinus sulphureus ssp. Kincaidii. Critical habitat.
Threatened.
Nelson’s check-mallow, Sidalcea nelsoniana. Threatened.***

Third bullet: Capitalize Coho Salmon.

3. The Yamhill is a migration route for ~~e~~-Coho ~~s~~Salmon, winter steelhead trout and cutthroat trout. Encroachment in natural areas and waterways threatens these fish and wildlife resources.

NATURAL RESOURCES – MINERAL AND AGGREGATE RESOURCES

See the 3/18 memo.

NATURAL RESOURCES – ENERGY RESOURCES

See the 3/18 memo for proposed changes to the lead-in paragraph.

Findings.

First Bullet: Amend to add wind and clarify.

1. ~~Woodburning and~~, solar ***and wind*** are the locally available forms of ***renewable*** energy source utilization.

NATURAL RESOURCES – OPEN SPACES

See the 3/18 memo.

NATURAL RESOURCES – IMPLEMENTATION

See the 3/18 memo.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – EDUCATION

The 3/18 memo proposed several changes (p. 7). In addition, the third bullet is proposed to be further changed as follows (the 3/18 changes are shown in bold italics and the 6/17 changes are within brackets and are in bold italics):

Findings.

Third bullet:

The 3/18 memo's changes were to revise it make it clear the elementary school referred to is the same one, Wascher Elementary, as was mentioned in the first bullet. The added change is to state that an expansion was constructed and that the School District indicated the expansion would meet the community's needs to 2017.

3. With the construction ***[and expansion]*** of ~~the~~ ***Wascher e Elementary s-*** School, the community's ~~educational~~ ***elementary school*** needs will be met through the year ***[2005 2017]***.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – TRANSPORTATION

Findings.

Add a new finding to recognize the existence of the Yamhill County Transit Area (YCTA).

11. ***The Yamhill County Transit Area (YCTA) provides public transit services to the City of Lafayette.***

Policies.

Policy 9A-13:

Propose changing the policy to delete “as soon as possible” to “when feasible,” to reflect that the City may not have the funds to contribute financially if a new signal is to be installed as soon as possible. Additionally, add a reference to “warranted” to reflect that a signal should not be installed until it meets the warrants for a signal. The warrants may be generated by overall traffic or by a specific new development or redevelopment of

property that loads its trips onto the 3rd Street/Madison intersection or another intersection on 3rd Street.

The City of Lafayette shall work with ODOT on a continual basis to have a traffic signal installed at the 3rd Street and Madison Street intersection, and other appropriate 3rd Street intersections, ~~as soon as possible~~ **when feasible and when warrants are met.**

Policy 9C-1:

Propose changing the policy to recognize the Yamhill County Transit Area and to commit the City to work with the YCTA to provide public transit service.

The City ~~seeks the creation of~~ **will coordinate with and support the Yamhill County Transit Area (YCTA) to provide** a customer-based [oriented] regionally coordinated public transit system that is efficient, effective, and ~~founded~~ **based** on present and future needs .

Policy 9C-4:

Propose changing the policy to reflect the Yamhill County Transit Area.

The City supports the ~~development of~~ **Yamhill County Transit Area providing** a daily commuter and shopper shuttle service to the major activity centers in McMinnville.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – SOLID WASTE

See the 3/18 memo which indicated Findings 2 and 3 needed updating (see below) and which proposed an amendment to Policy 10-1.

Findings.

Second Bullet:

Propose changing to update the tons of garbage and recyclables generated per week.

2. Lafayette generates approximately ~~5~~ 35.02 tons of ~~refuse weekly~~ garbage and recyclables per week.

Third Bullet: Propose changing to update the capacity of the Riverbend Landfill.

3. The Riverbend Landfill has adequate capacity to meet the needs of the planning area beyond ~~2005~~ 2014. **When the landfill expansion is complete, it will have adequate capacity to meet the needs to about 2044.**

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – ENERGY USE

The 3/18 memo briefly addressed Energy Use calling for updating the statistics and suggesting Policy 11-4 could specifically include wind and solar energy. At the March 18 meeting the Commission did not specifically discuss whether wind and solar energy should be added to Policy 11-4. The following improves upon the 3/18 memo's material.

Findings.

First Bullet:

PGE has been contacted and will supply information to update the expected energy consumption in the next 20 years.

Third Bullet: Clarify that solar and wind are potential resources.

3. ~~The harnessing of s~~ Solar radiation is a **and wind are** potential energy resources for **in** the County.

Fourth Bullet: Minor change.

4. The demand for energy and **the** costs to produce energy are continually rising.

Policies.

Policy 11-3:

Amend to be more realistic. It currently requires “energy efficiency” to be a main criterion in all land use issues. The Lafayette Zoning and Development Ordinance does not include “energy efficiency” as a criterion in all of its development application approval criteria. It is not clear how “energy efficiency” would apply to all land use issues. For example, how would it apply to a request to enlarge a house that is nonconforming as to the side yard setback?

If the Comp Plan itself is amended, the amendments must be shown to be consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals, including Goal 13 (Energy Conservation), but the Goal does not include the phrase “energy efficiency,” thus it is not clear if being consistent with Goal 13 would also be consistent with Policy 11-3. Goal 13 states:

To conserve energy.

Land and uses developed on the land shall be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based upon sound economic principles.

The Development Ordinance does not require a zone map change to address “energy efficiency” (3.102.03, A), but it requires a Zone Ordinance text amendment to address applicable Comp Plan Goals and Policies and applicable Statewide Goals (3.102.03, B).

This policy could be deleted, or significantly revised to be more realistic. As to the policy calling for “energy efficiency” to be a “main” criteria, realistically, it would be very difficult to prioritize criteria so that one or more criteria are more important than other criteria. Additionally, if one or more criteria are more important, it begs the question, how much more important. It is not clear how “energy efficiency” would be weighted more than other criteria for a a Partition or to allow an addition onto a house that is nonconforming as to a side yard setback.

Energy efficiency ~~shall~~ **should** be a ~~main~~ **reviewed by the City as a possible** ~~criteria~~ **critterion** in the evaluation of ~~all selected land-use issues~~ **development applications**.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – PUBLIC FACILITIES

Findings. Amend to reflect the 2007 Water System Master Plan.

Add a finding regarding the source of the City’s water as the first finding. Move the first finding to be the second finding, and so on. The concept expressed in this proposed new Finding No. 1 is moved here from the Natural Resources Chapter, Water Resources Section, second bullet.

1. Lafayette’s **municipal** water supply is derived from ~~groundwater sources~~ **springs and wells northeast of the city and from the Dayton/Lafayette well field south of the city. The springs and wells northeast of the City are the primary source, but their flow decreases in the summer and it is augmented by a well in the Dayton/Lafayette well field. (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 1.1, p. 1-1.)**

First Bullet: Change the first bullet to be No. 2 and update it.

2. ~~The City Park well presently violates Environmental Protection Agency standards~~ **The City’s finished water quality is generally good. The water is tested periodically for bacteriological contamination, organic and inorganic chemical contaminants, disinfection byproducts, and a variety of radioactive compounds. (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 4.3.3, p. 4-11.)**

Second Bullet: Change the second bullet to be No. 3.

3. A 500,000 gallon storage reservoir was completed in 1979 , **but its capacity is insufficient for the City’s current population resulting in water rationing beginning in the late spring or early summer.**

Third Bullet: Change the third bullet to be No. 4.

4. ~~The City's water distribution system is adequate for the present time. *The layout of the existing water system appears to be adequate to deliver the required domestic flow rates to the community. However, some portions of the system do not have the capacity to deliver required fire flows while maintaining the required 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure at all service connections. This lack of capacity is the result of pipe sizes that are too small and the configuration of the distribution system. (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 4.4.1, p. 4-11.)*~~

Fourth Bullet: Change the fourth bullet to be No. 5.

5. ~~The present water supply system will meet City needs to at least the year 2005. *The 1994 Water Master Plan anticipated a population of 3,014 in 2014 (Water System Master Plan, 2007, Section 4.4.1, p. 4-11). The July 1, 2009 estimated population by the Oregon Center for Population Research and Census was 3,925 which is 911 more people and five years prior to 2014.*~~

Fifth Bullet: Change the fifth bullet to be No. 6.

6. ~~The City's sewer system is in good condition and has adequate capacity to meet demand to 2005; only provided in the downtown business area and in new residential developments. *The November 1998 Wastewater System Facilities Plan projected a population of 3,791 in 2020. Due to significant population growth, however, the Pre-Design Report for the new wastewater facility revised the population projection and the City Council passed Ordinance 542 adopting a design population of 5,257 in 2024 for the purpose of constructing the wastewater facility.*~~

Add a new Finding 7 reflecting the new wastewater treatment plant.

7. *The City's waste water treatment plant was upgraded in the mid-2000's with a design capacity of 5,257 people which includes accommodating flows from commercial and industrial areas of the City.*

Add a new Finding 8 reflecting information from the November 1998 Wastewater System Facilities Plan.

8. *The collection system includes about 4,800 feet of undersized sewer lines.*

Goal. Amend to correct a typo (change and to an).

Goal 12-A. To provide ~~and~~ **an** orderly and efficient arrangement of water, sewer and storm drainage services to the City.

Policy 12-4: Amend to include water and sewer systems.

Policy 12-4. The City shall require new development to provide a **water, sewer, and** storm drainage and collection system within the development.

Policy 12-5: Add a new policy committing the City to consider the recommended capital improvement plan (CIP) in the 2007 Water System Master Plan. The City should not be required to specifically follow the CIP because changing conditions may necessitate deviations from the CIP. A CIP is typically changed to reflect changing conditions.

Policy 12-5. The City shall consider the capital improvement plan in the 2007 Water System Master Plan, Section 7.1.2, p. 7-3.

Policy 12-6: Add a new policy committing the City to work with Yamhill County and the cities in the county to consider a joint water distribution plan.

Policy 12-6. The City shall support efforts, and shall participate in a process, to consider a joint water distribution plan for north-central Yamhill County.

Policy 12-7: Add this policy which is moved here from Policy 3-2 in the Natural Resources Chapter, Water Resources Section, and amend to more clearly state the City's intent. Note the 5/20 memo indicated Policy 3-2 should be moved and it showed the policy being deleted from the Natural Resources Chapter, Water Resources Section, but an error occurred and it was not shown as being added to the Community Resources Chapter, Public Facilities Section.

~~3-2. The City shall maximize the utilization of its water resources.~~ ***Policy 12-7. The City shall ensure the public water system is economical and efficient and shall maintain the system in an economical manner.***

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – RECREATION

Lead-in Paragraph:

Update to reflect the City has a Community Center that is rented for events, not a youth and senior citizen center.

For a healthy, well-balanced environment it is necessary to provide adequate space and facilities for the recreational needs of the citizens. Lafayette residents enjoy adequate space; however, there is a need for additional facilities. The City has already taken action by providing a ~~youth and senior citizen~~ **community**

center *that is rented for events*. It is the intent of the City to maintain a level of recreational areas and facilities to meet the community's needs.

The following is carried forward from the 5/20 memo. Additional material has been added and is noted.

Findings. Amend to reflect the 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan." Remove the bullets and assign numbers to clearly identify each finding.

First Bullet:

Amend to make it consistent with the 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan."

1. ~~The existing 7.23 acres of City parklands more than meet the standards, as set by the Parks and Recreation Branch of the Oregon Department of Transportation, for Lafayette's present population and the projected population to the year 2005. The 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan" indicates the 2003 park acreage was 8.07 which provided 2.68 acres of parkland per 1,000 population.~~

Note: Staff is checking to ensure the 8.07 acre figure is the current figure.

Second Bullet: Renumber and amend.

2. ~~There is no existing a community center or related facility to provide for limited indoor recreational activities.~~

New Finding No. 3 to be consistent with the 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan."

3. *The 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan" indicates a need for an additional 6.0 acres of park land to the year 2025 to maintain 2.68 acres of parkland per 1,000 population (Table 7-1).*

~~The 5/20 memo said the following, but it is deleted and updated below: The following changes address the Goals and Policies. It is assumed the City Council adopted by ordinance the 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan" which included new Goals and Policies and that the existing goal and policies at that time were deleted. Based on that assumption the following changes are based on the 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan" new Goals and Policies.~~

The 5/20 material, above, is updated as follows:

The 2004 "Lafayette Parks Development Plan" was adopted by the City Council by resolution. The Plan's main purpose was to provide the background and inventory information to support the adoption of a Parks System Development Charge. Because it was not adopted by an ordinance, Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, were not amended into

the Lafayette Comprehensive Plan. It is not known if the City desires to amend the 2004 Goals and Policies into the Lafayette Comprehensive Plan at this time (and delete the existing goals and policies). Such an action would be outside the concept of “housekeeping amendments.” In the event the City wants to adopt the 2004 Recreation Goals and Policies they are shown in the attached copy and selected changes to them are shown below.

Goals and Policies.

Amend the first Goal to add “13-A” and a minor amendment to read “park and recreation.”

13-A. Goal: To provide Lafayette residents with increased and improved ~~recreational~~ **park and recreation** facilities and opportunities.

Amend the second, third and fourth Goals to add 13-B, 13-C, and 13-D, respectively.

Amend the policies in Goals 13-A through 13-D to delete the bullets and add numbers for each policy.

Amend Goal 13-D to add acquiring park land through conditions of approval for development applications.

13-D. Goal: To encourage the continued provision of park and recreational facilities throughout the community. Reasonable efforts should be made to acquire park and open space areas to meet current and future long-range ~~recreational~~ **park and recreation** needs, **including conditions of approval for development applications.**

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – HISTORY

Amend the lead-in paragraph to delete reference to the “only museum in the County.”

The City of Lafayette contains a wealth of historical resources. In addition to being one of the earliest established cities in the State, the City was the first County seat. ~~The only historical museum in the County is located in Lafayette.~~ A number of historical structures still stand. The citizens of Lafayette appreciate the value of their historical resources and plan to preserve and protect them for future generations.

Finding. Amend the single finding to remove the bullet and assign a number to clearly identify it.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICE

At the March 18, 2010 Commission meeting, staff's understanding is that consensus was reached that the goals and policies relating to issues not covered by the Statewide Planning Goals should be deleted. The Statewide Planning Goals do not address Public Safety and Service, thus the Public Safety and Service Findings, Goal and three Policies are proposed to be deleted.

It is not clear what is meant by Public Safety and Service in the Comprehensive Plan because the Public Safety and Service Section addresses issues that are commonly considered to be public safety and service such as the Fire District, but makes no policy statement about police protection. The Section includes a significant amount of language about medical clinics, but they are not typically included in police, fire, and ambulance services. The third bullet finding states "Lafayette is administered by a mayor-council form of government" which is not a Public Safety and Service issue and is out of date because the City's form is now a Council-Manager form of government.

If the Planning Commission prefers to retain this Section, staff will propose some housekeeping amendments.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – COMMUNICATIONS

At the March 18, 2010 Commission meeting, staff's understanding is that consensus was reached that the goals and policies relating to issues not covered by the Statewide Planning Goals should be deleted. The Statewide Planning Goals do not address Communications, thus the Communications Finding, Goal and two Policies are proposed to be deleted.

If the Planning Commission prefers to retain this Section, staff will propose some housekeeping amendments.

COMMUNITY RESOURCES – IMPLEMENTATION

The Community Resources Chapter includes an Implementation Section (p. 31). The following amendments are proposed.

Section on the Development Ordinance.

Propose amending the last sentence in Implementation Item 1.

Transportation improvements, public facilities, *public* services, energy conservation and ~~recreational~~ *park and recreation* standards are specifically addressed during the processing procedure for a subdivision, ~~plat or partitioning request~~, *or site development review application*.

Propose amending the heading in Implementation Item 3.

Site ~~Design~~ **Development** Review. The impact....

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – POPULATION AND ECONOMICS

Lead-in paragraph.

Establishing a sound and diversified economic base is one of the major objectives of the City. It is ~~also~~ a complicated undertaking due to ~~problems~~ **issues** of financing City Services necessary to attract family-wage jobs. ~~Because of the attrition of the City's share of the property tax dollar a~~ Alternative methods to generate revenue ~~will have to~~ **should** be investigated and relied upon to complete necessary facility improvements. In addition to developing innovative local revenue sources, the City will continue to seek financial assistance from State and Federal agencies for capital improvements.

Findings.

13th Bullet: Amend to indicate there is a gas station in the city.

Significant commercial businesses, such as a bank ; **or** major grocery store ~~or gas station~~, are not available within the City.

Policies.

Policy 17-10: Amend to delete central business district as there is no adopted “district.”

The ~~Central Business District (CBD)~~ **area designated in the Comprehensive Plan Map for commercial uses and the area of commercial zoning in the Zone Map** is the major commercial area in Lafayette and competing commercial activity outside the ~~CBD~~ **area designated and zoned commercial** will be discouraged – linear (strip) commercial development will be discouraged.

Policy 17-11: Amend to delete central business district as there is no adopted “district.”

The ~~CBD~~ **area designated in the Comprehensive Plan Map for commercial uses and the area of commercial zoning in the Zone Map** is considered the area in the center of the City ~~that is designated~~ for future commercial use ~~on the future land use map~~ and **it** includes the area between Second Street and Fourth Street bounded by Jackson Street and Washington Street.

Policy 17-8: The following is from the May 20 memo.

In the early 2000's when the wastewater treatment plant upgrade was initiated, a 20-year population projection for 2024 was prepared to develop the facility's design capacity.

The projection was significantly higher than prior projections and it was related only to the wastewater facility. There were concerns that it not be used to justify an urban growth boundary (UGB) expansion, if one was proposed in the future, because it was not part of an overall land use planning process. This was a legitimate concern because at that time State Statute required all cities and counties to periodically review their comprehensive plans on a schedule established by each jurisdiction. The process is periodic review (PR).

Policy 17-8's purpose is to provide policy direction that the City would not use the wastewater plant's projection to justify a UGB expansion, and if the City contemplated a UGB expansion in its next periodic review a new projection would be prepared.

Since the early 2000's the PR requirement has been changed to require only cities greater than 10,000 to do PR. A city less than 10,000 can choose to do PR, but it is an expensive process and cities less than 10,000, especially those with significantly less than 10,000, would be challenged to fund it through local resources.

At this time Policy 17-8 is out of date because it commits the City to do a new population projection only in PR. It does not allow a new projection to be done outside of PR.

Policy 17-8 is proposed to be changed as follows:

Policy 17-8. The City established a new population estimate for the year 2024. This estimate was based on work done in conjunction with a proposed wastewater treatment facility. The establishment of this population estimate is not part of an effort to amend the urban growth boundary and will not be used for that purpose. Population projections for that purpose will be addressed as part of a Work Task within Periodic Review , *or outside of Periodic Review*, in conjunction with and prior to expanding the urban growth boundary.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – HOUSING

As indicated in the March 18 memo, a housing needs analysis will not be prepared as part of this review because a UGB expansion is not included in this initial housekeeping review of the Comprehensive Plan's findings, goals and policies.

Findings. No changes.

Goals. No changes.

Policies.

Policy 18-3:

Amend to replace “mobile home” with “manufactured home” and revise to reflect the special manufactured housing standards in the Development Ordinance.

~~*In accordance with State Statute, the City shall allow the continuation of the present policy of locating mobile **manufactured** homes on individual lots but shall establish **provided the** special development standards **for manufactured housing placement allowed in State Statute and adopted in the Lafayette Zoning and Development Ordinance are met** to reduce conflicts between mobile homes and conventional housing types.*~~

Policy 18-6:

Amend to clarify the City will require street lighting in all areas, not just residential areas, and the lighting will be coordinated with the electric utility provider.

~~The City shall establish **require** requirements for street lighting in residential, **commercial and industrial** areas, **and shall coordinate the lighting with the electric utility provider.**~~

Policy 18-7: Amend to clarify the City will investigate funding sources.

~~*The City shall investigate funding through Federal, state and local agencies shall be investigated for the rehabilitation of dilapidated housing in the City.*~~

Policy 18-11:

Amend to be clearer. The current language appears to reflect conditions about 20 to 30 years ago when there was land zoned for residential development that was at the edge of the city limits and urban growth boundary (UGB), and the city wanted to encourage development near the center of the city. The city wanted to develop from the core outward to the edge, not from the edge inward. Today, residential development has progressed outward and in many locations is out to the city limit and UGB. The policy could be deleted, but staff's recommendation is to retain it with significant revision.

~~The City shall direct **Residential development into areas currently platted and close to the City center shall occur in areas designated Residential on the Comprehensive Plan Map** before utilizing large areas of vacant land and land presently devoted to agriculture.~~

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – LAND USE AND URBANIZATION

Findings.

Second Bullet: Change “General Commercial” to “Commercial General.”

- ~~2. Lafayette has approximately 7.4 acres designated **General Commercial** **Commercial General**. An additional 36.3 net acres are designated Residential Commercial, allowing both residential and commercial uses.~~

Policies.

Policy 19-6:

Amend to reflect the Federal requirement that a Floodplain Development Permit be issued for development in the 100-year floodplain.

Development shall be limited in flood hazard areas along the Yamhill River through the establishment of a ~~restricted development review~~ **Floodplain Development Permit as required by Codified Federal Regulation.**

Policy 19-8:

This policy requires a change to the UGB to be based on 7 factors. The 7 factors are not consistent with current State Statute, therefore it is proposed that they be deleted and replaced with language that refers to the Oregon Revised Statutes and applicable Oregon Administrative Rules.

Policy 19-8. Change of the urban growth boundary shall be based upon consideration of the following factors: [7 factors are listed].

Propose deleting the 7 factors and Policy 19-8 would read as follows:

Policy 19-8. Change of the urban growth boundary shall be based upon consideration of the ~~following~~ factors **set forth in State Statute and applicable Oregon Administrative Rules.**

Policy 19-9 (p. 41) requires the city to establish a review schedule in conformance with the period review schedule established by LCDC, but periodic review isn't required any longer for cities less than 10,000 population. Consider adding a policy to review the comp plan based upon funding availability.

Policy 19-9. The City shall ~~establish a review schedule and procedure that will enable the City to maintain an updated and timely comprehensive plan in conformance with the schedule for periodic review established by the LCDC-~~ **review the Comprehensive Plan based on the availability of funding.**

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – IMPLEMENTATION

Lead-in Paragraph.

In the second sentence, replace “though” with “through.”

The City will obtain information and guidance from appropriate agencies to aid in the economic development of the community. Through proper communication

and coordination channels, the City can actively pursue State and Federal sources to provide revenue ~~through~~ **through** borrowing or grants for basic service. The City will also tap available resources from other governmental agencies to upgrade and diversity the housing stock in the City.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT AND PLAN DEVELOPMENT

No amendments are proposed.

End.