

2004 Urbanization Study Conclusions and Recommendations Assessment

Recommendation	Complete?	Comments
<p>The City should continue to work with the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) to resolve the population forecast coordination issue at the earliest possible point.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>LCOG adopted a coordinated population forecast in 2005. Lane County adopted the current coordinated population forecast July 2009</p>
<p>Use the Alternative A employment forecast. The LCOG Alternative A 2025 forecast is for 5,157 employees. The City will need to add about 57.6 gross acres of land to the UGB to accommodate the 2025 forecast (see Table 8-1, page 8-13). The Alternative A 2050 forecast is for 5,257 employees; a net growth of 2,269 over 2002 and 100 over 2025. Coburg will have to add about 5.6 acres to accommodate employment between 2025 and 2050 (see Table 8-1, page 8-13). The City should review both the employment forecast and the land supply for commercial and industrial land at an appropriate point in the future. The City should adopt this forecast.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>The LCOG data was used for planning purposes. Between 2005 and 2009, 45 of the recommended 57.6 acres were added to the UGB.</p>
<p>Expand the UGB to accommodate the Alternative A employment in the 2002-2025 study period. ECO estimates that Coburg has capacity for about 1,320 employees within the existing UGB. To accommodate the 2025 employment forecast of 5,157, the City will need to add about 57.6 acres to the UGB. This figure is based on 850 employees at 15 employees per gross acre (see Table 6-1, page 6-3). Council desires policies that predicate the need on the following factors:</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Between 2005 and 2009, 45 of the recommended 57.6 acres were added to the UGB or 78%.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coburg is working towards a better jobs housing balance 	<p>NO</p>	<p>Housing/jobs balance has not improved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infill development is encouraged before expanding the UGB 	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>Changes to code: secondary dwellings were allowed; post-wastewater smaller min. lots. No flag lots or higher densities.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequate infrastructure is available to serve development 	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>Planning for adequate infrastructure is well underway, yet the necessary projects have not yet been built including: Interchange reconstruction, Well #3, wastewater system, a new park. Planning for a community facility has not begun</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The development should be for a “clean and desirable” industry, developed in a campus type environment. 	<p>YES</p>	<p>The Comp Plan developed several policies and Code amendments to accommodate</p>

<p>Expand the UGB to accommodate housing needs. The housing needs analysis identified a need for about 168 acres of residential land, or 109 acres more than what the City presently has. The City will require an additional 240 acres for housing between 2025 and 2050 (see Table 8-1, page 8-13). The exact size of the UGB expansion will depend on what exceptions areas are brought in and final determinations about housing density and mix.</p>	<p>this.</p> <p>Between 2005 and 2009, approximately 32 acres of the recommended 168 acres were added to the UGB for residential or 19%.</p>
<p>Evaluate options for preserving community character. This recommendation applies to existing developed areas within Coburg. Options could include design standards, density standards or limits allowable uses in developed core area. With respect to residential areas, the residential zone currently allows multiple family housing types up to fourplexes. One option is to amend the residential district to allow only single family housing types. The City should facilitate additional discussions regarding these options.</p>	<p>Minimal design standards were developed. Duplexes and fourplexes are allowed in highly restricted fashion. The historic district is almost all single family residential.</p>
<p>Adopt infill standards that apply consistently to all developed residential areas within the city limit. Given concerns about the compatibility of in existing residential areas, the City should adopt design standards for any infill that occurs in existing residential areas.</p>	<p>Minimal residential design standards were developed</p>
<p>Amend the comprehensive plan to include high-, medium-, and low-density residential designations. The zoning code should be amended to include high-, medium-, and low-density districts similar to those described in Table 4-13 (see page 4-19). Residential plan designations could also include a mixed-use designation that would accommodate a variety of housing types as well as supporting commercial uses. If the City chooses to use such a system, it will need approximately 94 acres of low-density, 48 acres of medium density, 13 acres of high-density, and 13 acres of mixed-use residential lands (see Table 4-14, page 4-19).</p>	<p>Medium density district was developed which allows fourplexes, but this is only for about 3 acres of land.</p>
<p>Coburg should consider a range of tools to meet the housing needs of present and future residents. Goal 10 requires Coburg to adopt policies that allow it to meet identified housing needs, and that facilitate the attainment of needed housing density and housing mix. The City should adopt strategies to achieve the identified housing mix of 75% single-family and 25% multifamily. This mix, along with a revised zoning system will allow the City to meet an overall density of 7.0 dwelling units per net acre for new housing. Tools should include:</p>	<p>Less than 10 houses were built between 2005-2009 and most of these were rebuilt on existing lots</p>

<p>- Multiple residential zones. The city should revise the zoning code to include at a minimum high-, medium-, and low-density residential zones.</p> <p>- Consider a mixed-use zone. The housing needs analysis identified need for about 13 acres of land designated for mixed use. The City should also consider revising the zoning code to include a mixed-use residential/commercial zone. This zone should be applied near the downtown area or near other public facilities. The zone should allow for mixture of housing types and associated retail and office uses.</p>	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>Medium density district was developed which allows fourplexes, but this is only for about 3 acres of land.</p> <p>No mixed use zoned has been established.</p>
<p>- Provide sufficient land to meet identified housing needs. ECO identified a need for about 168 gross residential acres. This breaks down to about 148 gross acres zoned for single-family housing types and about 20 gross for multifamily.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>About 15% of the recommended land for multifamily has been established.</p>
<p>Reduce minimum lot sizes. The City should consider revising the zoning code to allow lot sizes smaller than 10,000 sq. ft. in areas of Coburg that are already developed. The City should consider minimum lot sizes of 7,000 sq. ft. in existing developed residential areas (supported by design guidelines). The City should consider minimum lot sizes of 6,000 sq. ft. in the low density residential zone, and minimum lot sizes of 5,000 sq. ft. in the medium density residential zones.</p>	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>Minimum lot size in residential was reduced to 7,500 sqft. (post-wastewater).</p>
<p>Accessory dwelling units. The City should adopt an accessory dwelling unit ordinance. An accessory dwelling unit ordinance could complement strategies to allow infill development in existing developed residential areas.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Accessory dwellings are allowed in all residential areas.</p>
<p>Adopt a 2025 employment forecast of 5,157</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This number was used for planning purposes.</p>
<p>Accept the Alternative A 2050 employment target of 5,257.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This number was used for planning purposes.</p>
<p>Amend the C-2 zone to place a maximum building size or footprint of 50,000 sq. ft. or less. This will preclude most big box development.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>C-2 maximum is 50,000 sqft.</p>
<p>Amend the C-2 zone to remove residential uses from the list of outright allowable uses. The C-2 zone presently allows residences as an outright use. The City should remove this permitted use to ensure that lands in C-2 are developed in commercial uses.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Residential uses were removed.</p>

<p>Add design standards for commercial uses in this zone. Design standards will give the City more control over development in the C-2 zone.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No commercial design standards have been developed.</p>
<p>Consider placing a master plan requirement on the 25- acre site adjacent to the interchange, or redesignate the site for business park uses. The 25-acre vacant parcel northwest of the interchange is a key asset to the City for future employment.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Master Planning requirements are in place for parcels over one acre (decision made by Planning Commission or City Council).</p>
<p>Develop and adopt a mixed-use plan designation and zoning district. The housing needs analysis identified need for about 13 acres of land designated for mixed use. The City should also consider revising the zoning code to include a mixed-use residential/commercial zone. This zone should be applied near the downtown area or near other public facilities. The zone should allow for mixture of housing types and associated retail and office uses.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>Mixed use was never established.</p>
<p>Coordinate the TSP with the comprehensive plan, zoning code, and public facilities plan update.</p>	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>IAMP has been completed, but the TSP has not.</p>
<p>Do not expand the UGB east of Interstate 5 until the City has more clarity on the configuration, timing, and cost of the interchange upgrade. Make it clear to ODOT that the City intends to expand east of Interstate 5 after the upgrade occurs and that land near the freeway and interchange will be designated for employment uses (primarily industrial and office).</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>This is a Comp Plan policy.</p>
<p>Address [truck traffic] this issue in the TSP update. The City should consider alternative routes that bypass the core area. One alternative is to link Roberts Road to Coburg Road on the south side of town.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>The TSP has not been updated</p>
<p>Complete the water and sewer system master plan. Coordinate the public facilities planning effort with the comprehensive plan update and the final decision of where to expand the Coburg UGB. Consider cost of providing services as a factor in determining where to expand the UGB</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>A wastewater master plan was completed</p>
<p>Complete the park master plan and adopt a Citywide park standard. Apply the adopted park standard to obtain a revised estimate of parkland need. The revised parkland need estimate should be included in a revised land need estimate.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>A parks master plan was completed and adopted in January 2005</p>
<p>UGB study areas 3 and 4 should be avoided because the large areas within the floodplain. Other potential UGB expansion areas can meet housing needs without placing property at flood risk.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>NO expansion was developed for these areas. The 2009 update readdresses the floodplain areas.</p>

<p>Review and revise the draft economic development strategy as appropriate. Adopt the economic development strategy in Chapter 5 as part of the Comprehensive Plan update.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No Economic Development Strategy has been developed.</p>
<p>Consider park and public/semi-public uses when finalizing the UGB expansion figures. These uses will consume land over the next 20 years; the City needs to provide land for these uses.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>These considerations were made and implemented.</p>
<p>Include parcels of sufficient size to meet the largest park identified in the City's park master plan. Park plans typically have several park classifications. The largest for communities Coburg's size is the "community park" classification which can range from 10 to 20 acres or larger. The City should ensure land of sufficient area and location is available to implement the park master plan.</p>	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>A community park need was identified in the master plan, but the land for such a park has not been identified.</p>
<p>Carefully evaluate each exception area's merit for inclusion in the UGB consistent with the seven Goal 14 factors. Coburg will be required to include exceptions areas in any UGB expansion for residential uses. Exceptions areas, are expensive to service and landowners may not be willing to divide and develop their lands. Goal 14 factors 2-5 should be reviewed carefully as the City makes a final determination of which exceptions areas to bring in. Lands in UGB study areas 1, 2 and 5 are good candidates and contain the majority of exception lands within the UGB study areas (about 200 acres and 520 dwelling units).</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>These areas were evaluated</p>
<p>Identify approximately 219.4 gross buildable acres of land to expand the UGB for the 2002-2025 period. Consideration of Goal 14 factors 1-5 suggests that UGB study areas 5 and 6 are the most appropriate location to expand the UGB for residential uses at this time. This recommendation is consistent with the Hybrid Map developed during the <i>Coburg Crossroads Vision</i> project. Goal 14 Factor 6 would place this study area as lower priority than Study areas 7 or 8. However, study areas 7 and 8 are both east of Interstate 5. Moreover, ECO recommends that the City consider these areas for employment growth as well as take steps to preserve these areas for future employment growth.</p>	<p>PARTIAL</p>	<p>The UGB was expanded by about 55 acres between 2005-2009</p>
<p>Coburg should make a strong case for a "special need" for the large tract of residential land adjacent to the existing UGB in study Area 6. ORS 197.298(3) allows cities to consider other factors when evaluating lands for inclusion in the UGB.⁴⁸ The area is close to the elementary school and the core area and can accommodate the higher density housing types identified in the housing needs analysis.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No expansion in this area took place</p>

<p>Develop better cost estimates of servicing the various UGB expansion study areas as part of the public facilities and services plan update. Coordinate this analysis with the comprehensive plan update and the final decision of where to expand the UGB.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No public facilities plan has been developed and thus no reliable cost estimates exist</p>
<p>UGB expansion study areas 5 and 6 provide the best opportunity for developing an efficient urban form. The City will probably incorporate all or significant portions of study area 5 into its UGB. Adding lands in UGB study area 6 will round out the boundaries and allow better opportunities for urban services to be extended to lands in area 5.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No expansion was made.</p>
<p>The City should develop a system of Urban Reserve Areas. This study not only reviewed land needs for the 2002- 2025 period, but to 2050. OAR 660-021 allows cities to establish Urban Reserve Areas (URAs). The intent of URAs is to allow planning for areas outside urban growth boundaries for eventual inclusion in an urban growth boundary and to protect such lands from patterns of development that would impede urbanization. The rules for identifying and establishing URAs are described in OAR 660-021-0030, and generally following the requirements of ORS 197.298 and Goal 14.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>The City decided not to pursue urban reserves through the Periodic Review process</p>
<p>Consider URAs that foster existing development patterns. Add the remaining 125 acres of UGB study area 6 and the 28-acre resource land area in UGB study area 5. Consider adding the remaining lands in UGB study area 1. Add lands in UGB study area 7 or 8 for the employment land need for the 2025-2050 planning period.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>No expansion was made.</p>

*L:\COG: L:\Small City Planning\COBURG\Urbanization Study 2009\City Council\CC November\Joint Session - Nov 4\Attachment 15.doc
Last Saved: Thursday, October 29, 2009*