

# MEMORANDUM

**To:** City of La Pine Planning Commission

**From:** Deborah McMahon, James Lewis; Comprehensive Plan Consultants

**RE:** Planning Commission Meeting/Work Session – November 12, 2009. As a follow up to initial Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing on October 13, 2009

**Memo Date:** November 4, 2009

## **Background**

Greetings Commissioners: This memorandum will serve as update to the Planning Commission for the upcoming work session on the Draft Comprehensive Plan. The work session meeting, which is at 7:00pm on November 12, 2009 at the La Pine City Hall, is the follow up to the public hearing which was held on October 13th. This work session is an opportunity for the Planning Commissioners to discuss the concerns of those that testified as they may influence the final Comprehensive Plan recommendation from the Planning Commission to the City Council.

Aside from the testimony at the aforementioned public hearing, we (Deborah McMahon and James Lewis – Consultants) gave an update on the project to the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners and staff on October 21<sup>st</sup> – this was with the consent of the La Pine City Councilors. The update was provide due to the fact that the County is a partner agency who must ultimately amend their own Comprehensive Plan to remove references to La Pine upon La Pine’s adoption of their Comprehensive Plan, but also because the County is a large land owner within the City. The comments from the County Commissioners and staff should also be considered by the Planning Commission as you decide upon a final recommendation to the Council.

## **Comments From Public Hearing Testimony**

Attached to this memorandum is a list of the comments, questions and suggestions from the testimony at the public hearing held on October 13<sup>th</sup>. Brief responses and suggestions (from consultants) are provided below – these responses were also explained and discussed in greater detail at the public hearing:

1. **Three comments concerning changes to the Findings document:** a.) The first comment is a policy decision as to the long term desire for the City to administer water and sewer services to residents. We believe this is a valid long term goal of the City. Rationale for this is explained and listed in the

policies of the Public Facilities and Services chapter (Chapter 7) in the draft Comprehensive Plan. b.) The second comment is valid and provides clarification for the rationale and intent of the findings as support for the Comprehensive Plan if the statement is in deed factual. c.) The third suggestion, stating that the BLM/Rodeo grounds should be referenced as being included in the City limits, is a policy issue. Overall ownership and management of the BLM/rodeo parcel/facility should be weighed as part of the decision to include this as a policy, as should the ability to provide public facilities and services to the site.

2. Because the amount of land currently inside the City limits (which is also proposed as the Urban Growth Boundary) is greater than the projected need for all land types to support the projected growth over the next 20-years, it would be very difficult to incorporate additional land into the City/UGB at this time, unless it was for a special purpose such as the rodeo grounds or the like.
3. Based on the same rationale as described in #2 above, the need to do Urban Reserves Planning is not necessary at this time.
4. One of the overall goals of this Comprehensive Plan text and map is to allow development to create complete neighborhoods. Three distinct neighborhood areas are shown on the draft map. The desire is to have a mixture and arrangement of residential, commercial and industrial lands that maximize the efficient provision of public facilities and services in close proximity to one another. By creating complete neighborhoods, residents are able to live, work and provide basic everyday needs and eliminate the perceived sense of isolation.
5. The airport studies are referenced in the draft Comprehensive Plan – in the transportation chapter (Chapter 8).
6. The airport studies are referenced in the draft Comprehensive Plan – in the transportation chapter (Chapter 8).
7. Whether or not the City decides to pursue a publicly owned airport is a policy question that is up to the City Council.
8. A policy could be included in Chapter 8, Transportation to address how the City could support exploration of an airport in the La Pine area – the policy could indicate that the City would support such discussions with the Transportation Advisory Group.
9. The administration of City business (how the day to day affairs of the City are managed) is not a specific point for inclusion within the Comprehensive Plan.
10. The reference to number acres necessary for residential lands to accommodate growth and the number of acres available was referenced incorrectly in the Findings document. This is a simple error to be corrected with the reference of available acres to read “over 2,700 acres.”
11. The Plan map can be corrected to reflect the existing business and this option for this property and area to be designated “commercial” if the Planning Commission so desires.
12. As stated under #4 above, the desire is to create complete neighborhoods and not strip development along the highway which has been the case in La Pine’s

past. Strip development along the Highway corridor would most likely not be supported by ODOT for access problems, and strip development is hard to provide services to.

### **Comments from Deschutes County Board of Commissioners/Staff**

Attached to this memorandum is a list of the comments, questions and suggestions from the consultant update to the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners and county staff at the Board's meeting on October 21<sup>st</sup>. Brief comments related to the comments are provided below:

1. The Findings document could have modified text to clearly indicate that the Transition Area on the northern portion of the County owned master planned neighborhood would allow for a transfer of desired densities from the widened open space corridor across the central portion of the property.
2. The open space corridor could be extended to the western City boundary.
3. Currently State land use laws prevent sewer service from being provide outside acknowledged Urban Growth Boundaries. However, in light of the potential sanitary septic issues in the outlying area, a policy could be developed to indicate that La Pine could be considered as a regional sewage treatment facility upon additional land being made available from the BLM for expansion of the existing facility.
4. The concerns of LIGI should be addressed as clarifications within the Comprehensive Plan text.
5. The actual method (meaning how it occurs) by which BLM transfers land to the County/City is more of an administrative issue and not necessarily an issue for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.
6. Whether or not the BLM/Rodeo grounds should be referenced as being included in the City limits, is a policy issue. Overall ownership and management of the BLM/rodeo parcel/facility should be weighed as part of the decision to include this as a policy, as should the ability to provide public facilities and services to the site.

### **Suggestions from Consultants**

1. Insert Transition Area Section into Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 12.
2. Discuss the comments raised during the public testimony at the October 13 hearing, as well as those raised by the Deschutes County Board of Commissioners and staff, and consider whether changes to the draft Comprehensive Plan are necessary to address those concerns (see consultant input as listed above).
3. Consider new policies related to:
  - a.) City participation in discussions related to future Airport creation as part of the Transportation Advisory Group;
  - b.) Inclusion of the BLM/Rodeo Grounds land transfer within the City limits
  - c.) Desire for City of La Pine to be considered as a regional sewer treatment area if land use laws would permit.

### **Continued Public Hearing on November 18, 2009**

The October 13th public hearing was formally continued until November 18 to allow time for additional written testimony to be submitted, for the public to gather more information and to allow final comments by the public before final Planning Commission deliberation and recommendation occur. Barring any unforeseen issues arising, it is anticipated that the Planning Commission can address all issues listed herein during the November 12th work session and the conclusion of the public hearing on November 18<sup>th</sup>. Subsequent to the formal recommendation to the City Council by the Planning Commission, a new public notice will be mailed notifying residents of the public hearing and adoption process by the City Council.

### **Attachments**

Attached to this document are the following documents:

- Copy of the Public Hearing Testimony Comments from October 13, 2009
- Copy of the Deschutes County Board of Commissioner and Staff comments from presentation on October 21, 2009

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 541-647-7831, or Deborah McMahon at 541-480-3266. Thank you, James Lewis