

## MINUTES

Creswell Planning Commission and  
Citizen Involvement Committee Joint Meeting  
Creswell Community Center – 99 South First Street  
Creswell, Oregon

May 17, 2012  
7:00 p.m.

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Blake Oelke, Alan Pointer, Lloyd Safley, David Christopher; Denise Walters, Creswell Planning; Jacob Callister, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), Staff

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Dennis Grice, Dan Stockbarger, Gary Ludeke

**CITIZENS INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE:** Mike Anderson, Sheila Hale, Troy Marquess, Blake Oelke, Lloyd Safley

Commissioner Oelke convened the meeting of the Creswell Planning Commission (CPC) at 7:00 p.m.

### **I. MINUTES OF APRIL 19, 2012**

*Commissioner Pointer, seconded by Commissioner Christopher, moved to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2012 meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **II. AUDIENCE**

None.

### **III. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

None.

### **VI. COMMENT ON DRAFT RESIDENTIAL BUILDABLE LANDS INVENTORY, DRAFT HOUSING NEEDS ANALYSIS & DRAFT OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSES**

None.

## **V. PREFERRED GROWTH CONCEPT: GROUNDING THE CONCEPTUAL MAP-DRAFT PLAN DESIGNATION MAP**

Ms. Walters said one issue tonight was for the commission to take a look at the concept map that evolved from public involvement and analogy for the urban growth boundary (UGB) and zoning and apply it to the tax lots. Mr. Callister had taken that information and interpreted it into the concept map presented.

Mr. Callister provided copies of the concept map entitled "Draft Creswell UGB Expansion Plan Designations."

Mr. Callister said they had discussed in the past some of the analysis that went into supporting the expansion and it supported the growth concept that was developed several years ago. He had made a draft map of what he termed "blobs", to generalize it, but not in detail. However, the UGB required a more detailed, specific boundary and they needed to be more methodical about recognizing the dynamics of property ownership and how boundaries affected property owners. One criterion was to try to match what was previously approved as closely as possible. A second criterion was to respect property boundaries so that full properties were brought in where possible and slivers of property would not be isolated. There were some instances where lots were split, but when that was done he tried to find a logical way to justify it.

Mr. Callister went over the map in general, but wanted to focus on some areas in the southeast and many of the multi-family areas that were proposed within the city. Because those were smaller lots they were the hardest to bring into the concept. He said the commissioner's local knowledge would be critical in determining if they had interpreted correctly. He pointed out the new proposed properties on the map.

Commissioner Oelke asked if the area that was part of the Parks and Open Space (POS) master plan was arbitrary in its location.

Ms. Walters said it was their attempt at redefining the POS master plan, but if it was not city owned, it could not be applied. It could be recommended and adopted into the map as a supplement, but they could not just take the acreage needed. They would have to pay for it or have it donated.

Ms. Callister said the only deviation from the original concept plan was the addition of 24 acres of residential up to Harvey Road.

Commissioner Oelke asked about bringing POS land into the UGB and later designating it as residential. He asked the question because there was a lack of level buildable land, especially if the UGB were expanded to Harvey Road.

Ms. Walters said the answer was that the area was designated floodway by FEMA. The floodway boundary was where hydrologic studies were conducted, and it was expensive to develop. She assumed open space would want to preserve those floodways.

Mr. Marquess asked what percentage of acres expanded had to be designated POS.

Ms. Walters said she did not run those numbers, but that it was a lot, and was a calculation based on population. She said since Creswell's population was doubling, parks were already low.

Ms. Hale said the master plan for parks wanted to emphasize small, local parks, or pocket parks.

Ms. Hale pointed out an area of 74 acres on Creswell Butte that she and her husband owned that was a land conservation easement and could never be built on. She said by adjusting the boundaries on the concept map it would allow many more acres of open space.

Mr. Oelke asked what percentage of infill medium density was being added.

Mr. Callister responded that for some of the pieces on the concept map, the infill assumption made was based on a 10% realization rate, or ten percent of the total infill in Creswell.

Mr. Oelke said the small infill pieces were difficult and expensive for a developer to develop. In addition, the landowner would need to be amenable to moving, so the small infill pieces may not be desirable to a multi-family builder, which was ultimately needed to make a project happen. He asked how much of the infill was problematic versus what was not problematic.

Mr. Callister said there were 28 acres with just under half that was infill. He said this was an important point with regard to DLCDD approval that wanted to see increased density in town, close to services.

Mr. Oelke said many issues needed to come together in order to be viable for all parties and become a useful medium density project.

Mr. Callister said it appeared at this point they needed more acreage to designate residential/commercial. Ms. Walters said they would determine where that could be and present options to the commission.

Mr. Callister said they had turned the concept into properties and identified property owners that could be affected overtly, and that was a step in the process. They had not done it yet, but the concept map would become the proposed UGB boundary.

## **VI. GOAL POLICY ORIENTATION (if time permits)**

Mr. Callister provided a handout entitled “Riparian and Wetland Policy Planning Decision Points”. He also presented a PowerPoint entitled “Multi-City/County Water Resources Assessment Project (MC-WRAP), City of Creswell”.

Mr. Callister said Creswell was one of eight communities that LCOG had worked with to work through the local wetlands inventory process. It was an opportunity for jurisdictions with common issues to work together, learn from each other and to navigate Goals 5 and 6, which were difficult and complex. He provided an overview and said they would discuss it at more detail at the next meeting.

Mr. Callister said it was a three-county process; Linn, Benton and Lane Counties. It was an eight-city process working together with an EPA grant to determine where local wetlands were, their functions and significance, and put it together in a Local Wetlands Inventory. The goal was to identify, assess, and protect “significant” water resources to help guide growth. Department of State Lands (DSL) approved the Local Wetlands Inventory, which was incorporated into the State Wetland Inventory.

In that process locally significant wetlands were identified, meaning there were functions those wetlands served that had local importance and significance; i.e., flood attenuation and storage, water quality, wildlife habit, etc.

Thirty-six wetlands were mapped in Creswell and all but four were considered locally significant, largely because of water quality dynamics, flood control, and habitat function at a high level. Of a total of 124 acres, 118 were locally significant. The process of public review resulted in a few minor changes. Most of the wetlands are inside the city limits and the UGB and occur on varied land use types.

Mr. Callister referred to a map on the PowerPoint that showed the 46 acres of public/right of way wetlands. Wetlands that occur on public lands (the City, ODOT or the school district) were somewhat less controversial than privately owned properties. There were approximately 15 acres of wetlands on public/private property, meaning they straddle private and public land, near the airport. Even less controversial as most were aware of the water features were 5.7 acres directly associated with streams or ponds. Lastly, there were 52 acres of "other".

The next step in the Local Wetlands Inventory process would be adoption by the City of Creswell. The state had approved it, but it would not have local relevance until the City adopted it. The State does not allow adoption until the City has an ordinance addressing the resources that were mapped.

The handout Mr. Callister provided had three options which the City can consider:

Option A was the Goal 5 Safe Harbor approach that required all Locally Significant Wetlands be protected from development. For the 32 acres in Creswell that were significant, the Safe Harbor approach would protect those wetlands to their mapped boundary fully. However, there were provisions within the Safe Harbor approach that allowed for basic maintenance, i.e., removing of non-native vegetation, but no development.

Option B allowed cities to develop their own analysis, which justified special treatment of various wetlands referred to as the Standard Process requiring an Economic Social Environmental and Energy (ESEE) analysis. Part of the grant LCOG received from the EPA was to assist cities with the ESEE analysis.

Option C allowed the city to mix and match both Options A and B.

Mr. Callister explained there was also an option similar to C, which could be pursued under Goal 6, which protected the quality of land, air and water. For example, Mr. Callister said that because all of the wetlands, with few exceptions, were designated locally significant because of their water quality function, an ordinance could be developed to essentially preserve water quality.

Mr. Callister said the riparian piece was similar. Those options were:

- protect only fish bearing streams (Hill Creek)
- protect other waterways (e.g. perennial) for water quality
- protect all waterways with a single buffer distance
- have a mixture of buffer widths based on locally determined criteria.

The Riparian Inventory included Hill Creek, Garden Lake, Old Lane Creek, Pond 1 (Bald Knob) and unnamed streams 2 and 3, all associated in the southeastern portion of Creswell and associated with Hill Creek.

If Creswell took the Safe Harbor approach it would put a 50-foot buffer on any fish-bearing stream. A non-fish bearing stream would have no buffer.

A second option would be the riparian version of the ESEE analysis; protection of other waterways (e.g. perennial) for water quality by establishing buffers differently for streams for water quality purposes. Determination of varying buffer widths could be expensive and time consuming.

A third option, under Goal 6, would be to protect all waterways with a single buffer distance. Findings needed to be established for justification, but it could be an easier way to do it. Mr. Callister felt the City was in a good position to use Goal 6.

Ms. Hale asked if these regulations were going to be made and apply to private property, how did the owners of the property become involved in the decision-making process.

Ms. Walters said policy decisions would apply to private as well as public lands, there had already been public workshops for the inventory, and affected property owners would receive meeting notices of opportunity for public input during the policy discussion.

Ms. Hale asked if there was a map of the final Wetlands Inventory and Ms. Walters said it was available on line. She said she would also print the maps and mail them.

Commissioner Oelke asked if the City of Creswell did not want to rubber stamp the wetlands and wanted the analysis, would the City have to hire LCOG for their expertise.

Mr. Callister responded that LCOG was available within limitations. The EPA grant provided they would provide the cities where needed assistance with ESEE analysis. The focus was mostly on public infrastructure ESEE analysis.

Mr. Callister recommended the commissioners review the handout and PowerPoint for discussion at the next meeting. He felt Creswell was in a favorable position as it was part of the MC-WRAP partnership. He said many communities adopt the Safe Harbor option, as they cannot afford an ESEE analysis.

Ms. Walters said when the significance determination was conducted two methodologies were applied and they had good data and information that could be used in making decisions and in explaining decisions to the State.

Ms. Walters said they would plan for either a June or July 2012 meeting.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

Commissioner Oelke adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission

*(Recorded by Ginger Morton)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date *July 19, 2012*