STAFF REPORT
E \& M REMODELING \& CONCRETE SIX-PUMP GAS STATION
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CUP 1-23
APRIL 19, 2023

## PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

| Date application filed: | March 24, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date application complete: | March 31, 2023 |
| Applicant: | E \& M Concrete \& Remodeling <br> 16498 Brown Road <br> Dallas, OR 97338 |
| Owner: | GJR, LLC <br> PO Box 125 <br> Sheridan, OR 97378 |
| Location: | 2604 (77967) South 6 |
| 21-03-04-21-00800 Street |  |

## MATERIALS TO BE PART OF THE RECORD

City of Cottage Grove File(s): CUP 1-23 and SDR 1-23

- Applicant's Application
- Applicant's Narrative
- Site Plan
- Traffic Impact Memorandum, March 31, 2023
- Minutes and information from Community Meeting dated March 15, 2023
- City of Cottage Grove Completeness Correspondence
- Affidavit of Posting
- Affidavit of Notice
- Engineering Comments dated April 6, 2023
- Written Comments submitted by Parker, dated March 15, 2023

Proposal: This Type III Conditional Use Permit application with concurrent Site Design Review (SDR 123) application is to construct a six-pump gas station with 2,940 sf convenience store where the current Hillcrest Market is located at 2604 South $6^{\text {th }}$ Street (21-03-04-21-00800). The site location has operated as a convenience store for several decades and previously had a two-pump gas station. That gas station was discontinued in the 1990's. The applicant's proposal included the demolition of the existing structures on the site and a complete redevelopment. The property is zoned C2P Community Commercial and the proposed use of "quick vehicle servicing is permitted per Table 14.23 .110 as "Conditionally Permitted Use with Standards (Section 14.23.180), hence this application. Section 14.41.800 requires the applicant to host a noticed neighborhood meeting within six-months of application date. The applicant completed a notice to adjacent property owners within 300 ' of the development site and completed an on-site posting. The meeting was held on March 14, 2023 and there were three attendees. The notes from that meeting are attached to this staff report.

Per Table 14.23 .110 drive-up uses are conditionally permitted and shall meet the standards shown in Section 14.23.180, hence this Type III Conditional Use Permit Application. Following the consideration of this Conditional Use Permit application, CUP 1-23, if approved as proposed or approved with additional/revised conditions the Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing on Site Design Review application SDR 1-23, which will review the proposed development for compliance with Chapter 14.23 and Chapters 14.30 through 14.38 .

Per Section 14.23.180, the siting of the proposed drive-up shall not be placed between the main building entrance and the right-of-way as shown in the graphic below.


Not.Acceptable
Figure 14.23.180.A(1) Drive-Up and Drive-Through Facilities
The applicant has proposed the location of the drive-up facility (gas pumps) to be located at the west side of the proposed development between the right-of-way and the entrance to the walk-up retail space located on the eastern half of the development site. There are parking spaces for the retail space located on the north side of the proposed new building with a direct pedestrian connection to the convenience store. The proposed layout does not meet the code standards for location of the drive-up use, however given the constraints of the development site, the adjacent un-incorporated uses of single-family dwellings abutting the subject property to the north, east, and south, and the concerns expressed by the
neighbors regarding vehicle movements, including delivery vehicles, the proposed layout is the best use of the development site that also mitigates the impacts to adjacent uses while providing adequate space for vehicle movements. To address pedestrian access to the convenience store from the right-of-way to the entrance of the building the applicant has proposed a delineated ADA accessible path from the right-of-way east to the store entrance. As proposed staff recommends approval of the proposed configuration of the site plan.

## COMMENTS RECEIVED

Comments were received from Branch Engineering, City of Cottage Grove Engineer on April 6, 2023. The comments are addressed in this staff report and included in the conditions of approval.

Per Chapter 14.41.800 of the Code, a Neighborhood Meeting was held on March 14, 2023. Minutes submitted by the applicant are included as an exhibit.

Comments were received from Michael and Lizette Parker, 77969 S $6^{\text {th }}$ Street, Cottage Grove, OR 97424 dated March 15, 2023 and where relevant are addressed in the staff report.

Comments were received from Chris Silva, Emerald Peoples Utility District (EPUD), on April 5, 2023.
APPROVAL CRITERIA; CUP 1-23

## Chapter 14.44.400 Conditional Use Permits - Criteria, Standards and Conditions of Approval.

The City shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny an application for a conditional use or to enlarge or alter a conditional use based on findings of fact with respect to each of the standards and criteria below:

## A. Use Criteria.

1. The site size, dimensions, location, topography and access are adequate for the needs of the proposed use, considering the proposed building mass, parking, traffic, noise, vibration, exhaust/emissions, light, glare, erosion, odor, dust, visibility, safety, and aesthetic conditions;

Staff response and findings of fact: The subject property currently is developed and includes a $1,300 \mathrm{sf}$ convenience store that is located in the middle of the parcel. The site has operated as a convenience store for several decades and also included a gas station (two-pump) until the 1990's. The gas pumps were located between the existing building and the right-of-way of South $6^{\text {th }}$ Street. The applicant's proposal is to demolish the existing structures and build a new 2,940 sf convince store located in the southeast corner of the site and install six new gas pumps between the right-of-way and the building. The gas pump area will be covered with a canopy. The subject property is zoned C2P - Community Commercial and is 0.24 acres. The proposed placement of the gas pumps (parallel to $S 6^{\text {th }}$ Street allows vehicles and delivery trucks to pull into the site from either of the two proposed (existing) 30' driveway approaches in the same manner the site is used now. This pattern also reduces the amount of light spill onto adjacent developments. Parking for customers not fueling, but using the convenience store is located on the north side of the building. There are four spaces proposed with one of those being a van accessible ADA parking space, which abuts the raised pedestrian path to the front entrance of the store. Per Table 14.33.300 quick-vehicle servicing requires a minimum of two parking spaces or per Conditional Use review and the general retail request two spaces per $1,000 \mathrm{sf}$ of leasable floor area. As proposed the four provided spaces meet the minimum requirements.

The subject site is located on South $6^{\text {th }}$ Street a minor arterial per the 2015 Transportations System Plan. Per the traffic analysis memo provided by the applicant the estimated traffic from the redevelopment of
the site will cause an increase in daily vehicle trips to the site, but the exiting road facilities have the capacity to handle the increase and no mitigation actions are warranted.

The external impacts (noise, vibration, exhaust/emissions, light, glare, erosion, odor, dust, visibility and safety) are similar to the existing use of the site, but with the redevelopment the applicant has included additional measures such as additional paving, fencing between the subject property and adjacent uses, no parking signage where appropriate to maintain access to the property to the east. Additionally, the new development will need to meet requirements that mitigate light spill on to adjacent uses. The applicant has also provided vehicle turning movements for delivery vehicles showing that there is adequate space for deliveries to occur and not conflict with access to the residential property to the east.

Staff finds that this criterion has been met.
2. The negative impacts of the proposed use on adjacent properties and on the public can be mitigated through application of other Code standards, or other reasonable conditions of approval;

Staff response and findings of fact: The proposed site plan and building elevations of the replacement convenience store and gas station will be constructed to current code standards that include requirements for landscaping, buffering/fencing, storm drainage, lighting requirements, etc. These current code requirements in conjunction with the measures proposed by the applicant the negative impacts of the site redevelopment are mitigated. The proposed fencing abutting the adjacent properties is shown to be 3 ' tall and the agreement to pave the easement area at the north end of the site shall be required and a condition of approval.

Additional requirements regarding the mitigation of impacts to the adjacent properties include that all mechanical equipment, such as HVAC and other refrigeration equipment, shall be located on the roof of the proposed building and screened from view and to mitigate the noise associated with the machinery. The equipment shall be placed such that it is located as far as possible from the single-family dwellings located to the east and south. This shall be a condition of approval.

Staff finds that this criterion has been met with the conditions proposed.

## 3. All required public facilities have adequate capacity to serve the proposal;

Staff response and findings of fact: Per Engineering comments, staff can find that all required public facilities have adequate capacity to serve the proposal. Required public facilities include streets, water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage.

## General

- All submitted plans and technical documents in the application must be sealed and signed by the design professional of record, if applicable.
- Development of the property will require that all cable utilities be placed underground including telephone, television and power. This requirement is inclusive of any connections to the feeder main. Separate permits from the individual private utilities will be required.
- Private utilities designs will be required prior to construction.
- Traffic control shall be in accordance of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for all work performed in the public right-of-way.
- Developer will be responsible for payment of all system development charges and design review and other associated fees.
- The City of Cottage Grove requires a minimum of five feet horizontal separation from its utilities and all other utilities. This distance is measured from outside of pipe to outside of pipe. Other utility companies may have stricter standards than this. The standard with the greatest separation will apply.
- An Erosion control permit will be required. Improvement plans shall include details and language on the method of erosion control in the contract documentation. Erosion control measures shall be in place before any construction begins.
- If site disturbance exceeds one-acre, the applicant shall obtain a DEQ 1200C permit. This does not appear to exceed one-acre of disturbance.


## $\underline{\text { Streets and Sidewalks }}$

- This project will utilize two existing accesses to South $6^{\text {th }}$ Street. No new access points are proposed.
- New and reconstructed driveway approaches shall conform to the City of Cottage Grove Standards.
- Any damage to sidewalks during construction, will result in replacement of damaged panels. Any damage to an ADA ramp or driveway will require complete replacement to bring the ramp(s) and driveway to current standards. Any replacement work shall meet City Standards.


## Water

- The submitted plans do not show the size of requested water service line.
- Water service lines shall be copper as per city standard.
- It wasn't clear in the plans if there is a nearby public fire hydrant. Applicant should verify with the Fire Marshal if a public hydrant is needed.
- Upon payment of fee, the City of Cottage Public Works crew will tap and set water meters. The crew tries to schedule installation within 10 business day. Crew will provide a stub out of the back side of the meter so private plumber can install backflow devices and install the remaining portion of the water service.
- Water meter(s) shall be placed in the sidewalk. The meter shall be place in a matter that they will not be covered up with parked vehicles, personal property, and/or trash cans.
- All new development is required to install a backflow device on the customer side of each water meter. This requirement can be deferred until the building permit process. Contact Utility Maintenance Supervisor for details.
- Show plumbing fixtures for all improvements on the building plans so staff can check meter size for each unit as outlined in the plumbing code.
- Please include any hose bibbs on the building permit plans.


## Sanitary Sewer

- A DEQ permit is required for decommissioning of the septic tank. Applicant should inquire with a licensed installer.
- Plans do not show the size of the requested sanitary sewer lateral from the proposed development to the sewer main.
- The applicant is responsible for the costs and the construction of the sewer services on private property.
- The proposed fuel transfer area under the proposed canopy shall be hydraulically isolated from stormwater runoff and associated drainage considered sanitary drainage. Sanitary drainage shall be captured in drains, piped to an approved and appropriately sized oil-water separator with code required venting, and connected to the public sanitary system.

Storm Drainage

- Storm water runoff is not to adversely affect adjacent property owners; therefore, no overland flow is allowed. All storm water runoff from this development shall be contained on the property prior to connecting the public storm drainage system. Building plans shall include spot elevations or enough detail to show staff that all storm water runoff from site is captured on site before entering the public storm drainage system, including from back of the driveway approach(s).


## Traffic Impact Analysis

- The submitted Transportation Assessment focused on the site access and safety as requested.
- The applicants traffic engineer has concluded:
- A review of the most recent five years of available crash data showed no significant trends or crash patterns were identified along the site frontage. No safety mitigation is recommended.
- The sight distance evaluation found all site accesses are expected to have adequate sight lines. No mitigation pertaining to sight distance is necessary or recommended.
- Truck turning plans show the site can safely accommodate larger passenger vehicles and fuel trucks circulating through the site.
- Primary trips are the basis for TIA applicability (not net trips after pass-by reductions), and therefore a TIA is required by CGMC Chapter 14.41.900. That criterion has been satisfied by submittal of the reviewed Transportation Assessment.
- Circulation diagrams were provided showing the path of travel for two design vehicles; a fuel tanker truck and an SUV.
- The submitted circulation diagrams shall be resubmitted with signatures included on the engineering seals as required by the board of engineers.
- The construction documents anticipated to be reviewed during the building permit phase shall include details of delineation protecting amenities in the right of way such as water meters, and preventing the fuel tankers from tracking outside of the designed path of travel.
- A plan showing merchandise delivery vehicle loading areas(s), and delineation/separation of large vehicles from queued fueling motorists shall be provided with the construction documents as well, with the focus on vehicles not having to stage, wait, or queue in the $6^{\text {th }}$ street travel lane(s).

Staff finds that this criterion has been met.

## 4. Willamette River Greenway criteria in Section 14.37 .400 have been met, as applicable"

Staff response and findings of fact: The site is not adjacent to or within the Willamette River Greenway. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.
B. Site Design Standards. The Site Design Review approval criteria (Section 14.42.600) shall be met.

The applicant has submitted a concurrent Site Design Review Application, SDR 1-23. Based on findings for that application, staff can find that this criterion is satisfied, provide all conditions of approval required by the Site Design Review SDR 1-23 are met.

### 14.44.500.B Conditional Use Permits - Additional Development Standards

### 14.23.180 Commercial Districts - Special Use Standards

This section supplements the standards contained in Sections 14.23.110 through 14.23.170. It provides standards for the following land uses to control the scale and compatibility of those uses:

- Drive-up and Drive-through Uses and Facilities
- Vehicle Repair
- Wireless Telecommunication Uses and Facilities
A. Drive-Up/Drive-In/Drive-Through Uses and Facilities. When drive-up or drive-through uses and facilities are allowed, no driveways or queuing areas shall be located between the building and a street. See Figure 14.23.180.A(1).Walk-up only teller machines and kiosks may be oriented to a street or placed adjacent to a street corner.

The applicant has proposed a site layout that maximizes the lot for the use. While the proposed siting of the drive-up facilities (gas pumps) does not meet the code the vehicle circulation pattern allows for driveup fueling and access to the convenience store in a way that is logical for a gas station use. Pedestrian access from the right-of-way to the building entrance will be provided via a clearly delineated ADA accessible pedestrian path.

This criterion is met.

## CONCLUSION

Conditional Use Permit approval pursuant to Section 14.44.400 Conditional Use Permits - Criteria, Standards and Conditions of Approval and subject to the recommended conditions is supported by the findings of fact that establish compliance with the applicable state and local standards.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Conditional Use Permit CUP 1-23 be approved for the proposed six-pump gas station with 2,940 sf retail space located at 2604 South $6^{\text {th }}$ Street pursuant to Section 14.44.400 Conditional Use Permits - Criteria, Standards and Conditions of Approval which are supported by findings of fact and conditions that can establish compliance with applicable state and local standards.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Conditional Use approval shall be effective for a period of 18 months from the date of approval. The approval shall lapse if: A public improvement plan or building permit application for the project has not been submitted within 18 months of approval; or construction on the site is in violation of the approved plan.
2. Major modifications to these plans shall be approved by the Planning Commission.
3. The 3' tall fencing shown on the site plan shall be installed.
4. The easement area to the north (off-site) as shown on the site plan shall be paved.
5. All mechanical equipment (HVAC, refrigeration equipment) shall be located on the roof of the building and be screened from view. It shall also be located as far as is practicable from the residential uses to the south and east.
6. Approval of SDR 1-23 shall be required prior to the issuance of any building permits. All conditions of approval of SDR 1-23apply to this conditional use.
7. City Engineering comments dated, April 6, 2023 shall be considered conditions of approval.

## EXHIBITS

A. Engineering Memo Dated, April 6, 2023
B. Applicant's Application and Neighborhood Meeting notes, March 15, 2023
C. Site Plan and Elevations
D. Traffic Impact Memorandum, March 31, 2023
E. Comments from Michael Parker, March 15, 2023
F. EPUD Comments, April 5, 2023

## EXHIBIT A

## MEMO

To: Eric Mongan, City Planner

From: Damien Gilbert, P.E., City Engineer

## Subject: Engineering Review Comments Hillcrest Market Site Review and Conditional Use Permit

Date: April 6, 2023
The following comments are based on a type III permit application for site design review and conditional use. The reviewed documents were received via email on April 3, 2023. Changes may occur during the review process and/or development phase that will be in conflict with statements below and some issues may have been overlooked that will be commented on during the building review process and/or development phase of this project.

## General

- All submitted plans and technical documents in the application must be sealed and signed by the design professional of record, if applicable.
- Development of the property will require that all cable utilities be placed underground including telephone, television and power. This requirement is inclusive of any connections to the feeder main. Separate permits from the individual private utilities will be required.
- Private utilities designs will be required prior to construction.
- Traffic control shall be in accordance of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices for all work performed in the public right-of-way.
- Developer will be responsible for payment of all system development charges and design review and other associated fees.
- The City of Cottage Grove requires a minimum of five feet horizontal separation from its utilities and all other utilities. This distance is measured from outside of pipe to outside of pipe. Other utility companies may have stricter standards than this. The standard with the greatest separation will apply.
- An Erosion control permit will be required. Improvement plans shall include details and language on the method of erosion control in the contract documentation. Erosion control measures shall be in place before any construction begins.
- If site disturbance exceeds one-acre, the applicant shall obtain a DEQ 1200C permit. This does not appear to exceed one-acre of disturbance.


## Streets and Sidewalks

- This project will utilize two existing accesses to South $6^{\text {th }}$ Street. No new access points are proposed.
- New and reconstructed driveway approaches shall conform to the City of Cottage Grove Standards.
- Any damage to sidewalks during construction, will result in replacement of damaged panels. Any damage to an ADA ramp or driveway will require complete replacement to bring the ramp(s) and driveway to current standards. Any replacement work shall meet City Standards.


## Water

- The submitted plans do not show the size of requested water service line.
- Water service lines shall be copper as per city standard.
- It wasn't clear in the plans if there is a nearby public fire hydrant. Applicant should verify with the Fire Marshal if a public hydrant is needed.
- Upon payment of fee, the City of Cottage Public Works crew will tap and set water meters. The crew tries to schedule installation within 10 business day. Crew will provide a stub out of the back side of the meter so private plumber can install backflow devices and install the remaining portion of the water service.
- Water meter(s) shall be placed in the sidewalk. The meter shall be place in a matter that they will not be covered up with parked vehicles, personal property, and/or trash cans.
- All new development is required to install a backflow device on the customer side of each water meter. This requirement can be deferred until the building permit process. Contact Utility Maintenance Supervisor for details.
- Show plumbing fixtures for all improvements on the building plans so staff can check meter size for each unit as outlined in the plumbing code.
- Please include any hose bibbs on the building permit plans.


## Sanitary Sewer

- A DEQ permit is required for decommissioning of the septic tank. Applicant should inquire with a licensed installer.
- Plans do not show the size of the requested sanitary sewer lateral from the proposed development to the sewer main.
- The applicant is responsible for the costs and the construction of the sewer services on private property.
- The proposed fuel transfer area under the proposed canopy shall be hydraulically isolated from stormwater runoff and associated drainage considered sanitary drainage. Sanitary drainage shall be captured in drains, piped to an approved and appropriately sized oil-water separator with code required venting, and connected to the public sanitary system.


## Storm Drainage

- Storm water runoff is not to adversely affect adjacent property owners; therefore, no overland flow is allowed. All storm water runoff from this development shall be contained on the property prior to connecting the public storm drainage system. Building plans shall include spot elevations or enough detail to show staff that all storm water runoff from site is captured on site before entering the public storm drainage system, including from back of the driveway approach(s).


## Traffic Impact Analysis

- The submitted Transportation Assessment focused on the site access and safety as requested.
- The applicants traffic engineer has concluded:
- A review of the most recent five years of available crash data showed no significant trends or crash patterns were identified along the site frontage. No safety mitigation is recommended.
- The sight distance evaluation found all site accesses are expected to have adequate sight lines. No mitigation pertaining to sight distance is necessary or recommended.
- Truck turning plans show the site can safely accommodate larger passenger vehicles and fuel trucks circulating through the site.
- Primary trips are the basis for TIA applicability (not net trips after pass-by reductions), and therefore a TIA is required by CGMC Chapter 14.41.900. That criterion has been satisfied by submittal of the reviewed Transportation Assessment.
- Circulation diagrams were provided showing the path of travel for two design vehicles; a fuel tanker truck and an SUV.
- The submitted circulation diagrams shall be resubmitted with signatures included on the engineering seals as required by the board of engineers.
- The construction documents anticipated to be reviewed during the building permit phase shall include details of delineation protecting amenities in the right of way such as water meters, and preventing the fuel tankers from tracking outside of the designed path of travel.
- A plan showing merchandise delivery vehicle loading areas(s), and delineation/separation of large vehicles from queued fueling motorists shall be provided with the construction documents as well, with the focus on vehicles not having to stage, wait, or queue in the $6^{\text {th }}$ street travel lane(s).

File No.:
Date Submitted by Applicant:


400 Main Street Cottage Grove, OR 97424

## TYPE III PERMIT APPLICATION

To: City of Cottage Grove Planning Commission
A. Applicant

| 1. Name: $\frac{\text { melissa poland }}{\text { Phone No.: } 5039495195}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Mailing Address: $\frac{16498 \text { brown rd dallas or } 97338}{}$ |  |
| 3. | Email Address: $\frac{\text { eandmremodeling@gmail.com }}{}$ |  |
| 4. Owner | Status: | $\ddots$ Agent |

Note: If agent you must have owner's consent and signature.
B. Owner (i fnot applicant)
4. Owner's Name: paul johal Phone No.: 5035606790
5. Owner's Mailing Address: po box 125 sheridan or 97378
C. Location of Property
6. Address/Location:
7. Map \& Tax Lot Number: 800 zoned C attached lot 900 need to change to C lots
8. Present Use: 800 already zones gas station C store, residence e behinds torr at 8001 ot tight now. Build new store and gas station
9. Proposed Use: convinence store
D. Request for Consideration
10. Type of Land Use Application applying for: commercial

Options: Conditional Use, Greenway Conditional Use, Cottage Industry, Historic Alteration, Land Use District Map changes (no plan amendment required), Master Planned Developments, Site Design Reviews, Subdivisions, Variance (Class C)
11. Is this application filed in association with other land use permit applications?

$$
\checkmark \text { Yes }
$$

No
12. Reasons for Application: $\qquad$

## E. Required Information

Narrative Statement: This application must be filed with one copy of a narrative statement that explains how the application satisfies each and all of the relevant criteria and standards in sufficient detail for review and decision-making.
Note: Additional information may be required under the specific application requirements for each approval, e.g., Chapters 4.2 (Land Use Review), 4.3 (Land Divisions), 4.4 (Conditional Use), 4.5 (Master Planned Developments), 4.6 (Modifications), 4.8 (Code Interpretations), 4.9 (Miscellaneous Permits) and 5.1 (Variances).
Plans: Three (3) sets of plans, including one (1) set of plans in a reproducible form that is no larger than $11^{\prime \prime} \times 17^{\prime \prime}$ in size. Content of plans will vary with application type. Refer to submittal requirements for specific application type.
$\square$ Neighborhood Meeting verification (for Master Planned Developments, Conditional Uses and Subdivisions). Must include copy of meeting notice and minutes and/or recording of meeting.
Non-refundable application fee.

## G. Signature

I hereby request a Type II Permit on the above described real property, which is either owned by or under contract of sale to the applicant, and is located within the City of Cottage Grove, Oregon.

I hereby acknowledge that this application is not considered filed and complete until all of the required information has been submitted as determined by the Community Development Director and all required fees have been paid in full. Once the original application is submitted, Staff has 30 days to determine whether an application is complete. Within 30 days a letter will be mailed to you either deeming the application complete or requesting additional information. If additional information is requested you have 150 days to either: submit the missing information, submit some of the information and written notice that no other information will be provided, or submit a written notice that none of the missing information will be provided. Once your application is deemed complete you will be assigned a public hearing date before the Planning Commission and Staff will have 120 days to complete the processing of your application. (ORS 227.178)

Signature:


Name:
paul johal
Date:


## Office Use Only

Date Application Received: $\qquad$

Initials: $\qquad$
Date Application Complete: $\qquad$ Initials: $\qquad$
Applicant Notified of Completeness: $\qquad$
Fee Paid: $\qquad$ Receipt No. $\qquad$ Initials: $\qquad$

## neighborhood meeting notes

1 message
Melissa Poland [eandmremodeling@gmail.com](mailto:eandmremodeling@gmail.com)
Wed, Mar 15, 2023 at 8:58 AM
To: Eric Mongan [planner@cottagegrove.org](mailto:planner@cottagegrove.org)
Hi Eric
From the meeting yesterday, I attached some notes. The others were to add a 3 ' fence on the parking lot side by the easement and the South side on the property line.
No parking on the easement.
--
Thank You Melissa

## E \& M Remodeling \& Concrete

16498 Brown Rd
Dallas OR 97338
Melissa Poland Office Manager/ Estimator (503) 949-5195
Fax (503) 831-2293
Email EandMRemodeling@gmail.com
Website www. EandMConcrete.comNHmeetingnotes.pdf 1527K

# Monday, March 13, 2023 

Michael C. \& Lisette A. Parker Living Trust

77969 S. 6 Street
Cottage Grove, Onegon. 97424
(541) 654-2151

Re: Proposed Site Plan

## E \& M Remodeling \& Concrete:

Receiving the proposed site plan has created some concerns and suggestions:
~ The setback means the building roof and/gutter should not cross the propenty line.
~What will the outside walls be constructed of, since future access could be denied?
~What is the height of the back and side walls? At this point there does not seen to be enough space for customers to part, since many tumes there can be as rnamy as six cars att the store. We don't see any additional parking shown in front.
~Will the (access) easement be pawed or lell as gravel? Pared
$\sim$ Where are the provisions for ample parking?
$\sim$ There does not seem to be enough space for a semi truck to unload goods. Truct paiking on the road blocks the view of north boumd traffic coming into towni Trucks panking on dhe road block the view of traffic from the casement.
$\sim$ Will the store take an active approach to removing the nuisance the muisuoce of the easement being blocked by delivery trucks?
~The side parking is not enough.
$\sim$ Light pollution is a concern. Will the canopy lights be on $24-7$ ? NO
$\sim$ Is there a plan for delivery trucks to park in front of the dumpster?
$\sim$ Will the delivery trucks park in the middle of 6 Street as they do in other areas of town?
$\sim$ The proposed site plan is 110 by 95 , leaving little or mo room for deliveries. Using the easement is not what the easement is designed for.
-Our hope is that there will be a fence from the north back comer to the end of the parking space. The parking we use con our side of the fence is not for store parking.
$\sim$ We are concerned about water runoff from the canopy and the roof is drained into the storm system. In the proposed site plan, the canopy is over the casement. That is not right.
$\sim$ We hope the back wall will not have windows. $N O$
$\sim$ Will the store only have restrooms that can be accessed from the inside?
$\sim$ With wells being so close to the proposed gas-holding tanks, is there a guarantee of no contamination to well water?
$\sim$ An ambulance is approximately 8 ff. wide and a fire truck is approximately 8 ft. wide as well. Most delivery trucks are 20 to 40 fit long and approximately 10 ft wide. A gas tanker truck is approximately 40 ft. by 8 fit. It is going to be tight for the tanker to offload.
$\sim$ During remodeling construction of the store, we hope that our easement is not used for workers' parking.

We hope that the final plan allows for a mutual improvenemit for all concerned parties.
Sincerely,





## Memorandum

To: Eric Mongan, City of Cottage Grove
Copy: Melissa Poland, E \& M Remodeling \& Concrete
From: Melisa
Date: March 31, 2023
Subject: 77967 S 6th Street - Transportation Assessment


RENEWS: 12/31/2023

## Introduction

This memorandum provides a transportation assessment for the proposed convenience store with gas station to be located at 77967 S $6^{\text {th }}$ Street in Cottage Grove, Oregon. The proposal consists of three fuel dispensers with six vehicle fueling positions, and a 2,940-square foot (SF) convenience store. Figure 1 presents an aerial image of the nearby vicinity with the project site outlined in solid red. A site plan is attached to this memorandum.


Figure 1: Aerial Photo of Site Vicinity (© Lane County ArcGIS Web Map)

The project site (Tax Map 21030421 Lot 800) encompasses approximately 0.24 acres and is located on the east side of $S 6^{\text {th }}$ Street midway between Cleveland Avenue and McKinley Avenue. An existing access easement running along the north side of the tax lot will be utilized by the development as well.

The site is currently occupied by the Hillcrest Market Convenience store and several apartments. According to Lane County Assessment \& Taxation Property Information Search, the convenience store is 1,300 SF and three apartments are located on the site, one in the same building as the store and two in a separate building.

## Site Trip Generation

To estimate the number of trips that will be generated by the proposed use, trip rates and equations from the Trip Generation Manual' were compared. Both the existing land uses and proposed land use will generate a combination of primary trips, which are new trips added to the transportation network, and pass-by trips, which are trips that leave the adjacent roadway to patronize a land use and then continue in their original direction of travel. The following land use codes and pass-by trip rates were used to estimated trips generated by the existing uses on the site and the proposed development:

- Existing Site Uses
- Hillcrest Market - Land use code 851, Convenience Store, was used to estimate trip generation based on 1,000 square feet (KSF) of gross floor area. A uniform pass-by trip rate of 51 percent from the Trip Generation Handbook² was applied to the morning peak hour, evening peak hour, and daily trip estimates.
- Apartments - Land use code 220, Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise), was used to estimate trip generation based on the number of dwelling units (DU). No pass-by trips are assumed.
- Proposed Site Use
- Convenience Store \& Gas Station - Land use code 945, Convenience Store/Gas Station, was used to estimate trip generation. Trips can be estimated based on either the number of vehicle fueling positions (VFP) or KSF of gross floor area. Both methodologies were applied for comparison. A pass-by rate of 60 percent was applied to morning peak hour trips, 56 percent was applied to evening peak hour trips, and 58 percent was applied to daily trips based on ITE Trip Generation Manual data.

The trip generation estimates are summarized in Table 1. Detailed trip generation calculations are included as an attachment to this memorandum.

As shown in Table 1, the existing uses on the site are estimated to generate 82 morning peak hour, 64 evening peak hour, and 1,010 daily driveway trips. After deducting the pass-by trips, the primary trips on the network are estimated at 40 morning peak hour, 34 evening peak hour, and 506 daily trips.

[^0]Table 1: Trip Generation Summary

| ITE Code | Intensity | Morning Peak Hour |  |  | Evening Peak Hour |  |  | Daily <br> Trips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |  |
| Existing Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 851 - Convenience Store | 1.3 KSF | 41 | 40 | 81 | 33 | 31 | 64 | 990 |
| Pass-by Percentage |  | 57\% |  |  | 57\% |  |  | 51\% |
| Pass-by Trips |  | 21 | 21 | 42 | 16 | 16 | 32 | 504 |
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 3 DU | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 20 |
| Total Driveway Trips |  | 41 | 41 | 82 | 34 | 32 | 64 | 1,010 |
| Total Primary Trips |  | 20 | 20 | 40 | 18 | 16 | 34 | 506 |
| Proposed Development - Based on Vehicle Fueling Positions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 945 - Convenience Store/Gas Station | 6 VFP | 48 | 48 | 96 | 56 | 55 | 111 | 1,590 |
| Pass-by Percentage |  | 60\% |  |  | 56\% |  |  | 58\% |
| Pass-by Trips |  | 29 | 29 | 58 | 31 | 31 | 62 | 922 |
| Total Primary Trips |  | 19 | 19 | 38 | 25 | 24 | 49 | 668 |
| Net Increase in Primary Trips |  | -1 | -1 | -2 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 162 |
| Proposed Development - Based on GSF of Convenience Store |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 945 - Convenience Store/Gas Station | 2.94 KSF | 60 | 59 | 119 | 72 | 71 | 143 | 1,836 |
| Pass-by Percentage |  | 60\% |  |  | 56\% |  |  | 58\% |
| Pass-by Trips |  | 36 | 36 | 72 | 40 | 40 | 80 | 1,064 |
| Total Primary Trips |  | 24 | 23 | 47 | 32 | 31 | 63 | 772 |
| Net Increase in Primary Trips |  | 4 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 15 | 29 | 266 |

Using the number of vehicle fueling positions as the basis for trip generation of the proposed development results in an estimated driveway volume of 96 morning peak hour, 111 evening peak hour, and 1,590 daily driveway trips. After deducting the pass-by trips, the primary trips on the network are estimated at 38 morning peak hour, 49 evening peak hour, and 668 daily trips. When compared with the existing land use, the change in primary trips (highlighted in blue) is estimated as a net decrease of 2 morning peak hour trips and a net increase of 15 evening peak hour trips and 162 daily trips.

Using the gross floor area of the convenience store as the basis for trip generation of the proposed development results in overall higher trip generation estimates compared with using the number of vehicle fueling positions. The estimated driveway volume is 119 morning peak hour, 143 evening peak hour, and 1,836 daily driveway trips. After deducting the pass-by trips, the primary trips on the network are estimated at 47 morning peak hour, 63 evening peak hour, and 772 daily trips. When compared with the existing land use, the change in primary trips (highlighted in blue) is estimated as a net increase of 7 morning peak hour trips, 29 evening peak hour trips, and 266 daily trips.

## Safety Assessment

## Crash History

Using data obtained from ODOT's Crash Data System, a review of the most recent five years of crash data (January 2016 through December 2020) shows two crashes were reported along the site frontage. One of the crashes was a sideswipe collision caused by reckless driving and did not involve activity associated with the site. The other crash involved a vehicle backing into the roadway from the site. The proposed site plan will not require backing movements in the future.

Based this review, no significant trends or crash patterns were identified along the site frontage. No safety mitigation is recommended.

## Sight Distance

A sight distance analysis was performed for the planned project driveways. Both intersection sight distance (ISD) and stopping sight distance (SSD) are assessed. The ISD is an operational measure, intended to provide sufficient line of sight along the major street so that a driver could turn from the minor street without impeding traffic flow. The SSD is the minimum requirement to ensure safe operation of the roadway. Stopping sight distance allows an oncoming driver to see a hazard in the roadway, react, and come to a complete stop if necessary to avoid a collision. As long as the available intersection sight distance is at least equal to the minimum required stopping sight distance for the design speed of the roadway, adequate sight distance is available for safe operation of the intersection.

For $S 6^{\text {th }}$ Street, sight distance was measured and evaluated in accordance with standards established in A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets ${ }^{3}$. For intersection sight distance, the driver's eye is assumed to be 14.5 feet from the near edge of the nearest travel lane of the intersecting street and at a height of 3.5 feet above the minor-street approach pavement. The oncoming vehicle driver's eye height along the major-street approach is assumed to be 3.5 feet above the cross-street pavement. The standards for measurement were applied from the future curb location on the site frontage.

Stopping sight distance (SSD) is considered the minimum requirement to ensure safe operation of the driveway access. This distance allows the driver of a vehicle traveling on the major street to react to a turning vehicle or other object in the roadway and come to a complete stop to avoid a collision. To ensure safe operation of a driveway, the available sight distance must at least equal the minimum required stopping sight distance. SSD is the same for both passenger vehicles and trucks.
$S 6^{\text {th }}$ Street, which has no horizontal or vertical curvature to obstruct sight lines at the proposed site accesses. The posted speed on $S 6^{\text {th }}$ Street is 40 mph . Conservatively assuming a speed of 45 mph , the recommended intersection sight distance for intersecting driveways is 500 feet.

Photos of current sight lines (attached) were taken during a site visit on January 19, 2023. Looking to the south, sight lines exceed 500 feet. Looking to the north, overgrown vegetation currently blocks sight lines from the northern driveway; however, with removal of the vegetation, sight lines will exceed 500 feet.

[^1]Based on this sight distance analysis, all site accesses are expected to have adequate sight lines. No mitigation pertaining to sight distance is necessary or recommended.

## Site Circulation

The proposed development will include a series of three fuel pumps oriented in the north-south direction. Vehicles will be able to circulate through the fueling area in both a clockwise and counterclockwise direction using one of the two driveways to enter the site and the other driveway to exit the site.

Parking for the convenience store will be located on the north side of the building. Drivers patronizing the convenience store are anticipated to enter and exit via the northern driveway.

The underground fuel tanks will be located on the western side of the site. Fuel trucks are anticipated to enter the site from one driveway and exit from the other driveway.

Turning plans illustrating site circulation for a sport utility vehicle (SUV) and a fuel truck were prepared to show how larger vehicles would travel through the site. The turning plans are attached.

The illustration of the SUV shows a northbound vehicle making a right turn to enter the site from the south and exit the site to the north. The right turn movements can all be made without tracking into the opposing travel lane.

The illustration of the fuel truck also shows the truck traveling in the northbound direction. The truck would enter the sight making a right turn at the southern driveway, travel along there western side of the fuel pumps, and then exit making a right turn at the northern driveway. When entering and exiting the site, the fuel truck will briefly track into the opposing travel lane. This tracking is normal on two-lane roadways and truck drivers wait for appropriate gaps in traffic to complete their maneuvers. Furthermore, most fuel deliveries are made during off-peak traffic hours when roadway volumes are lower and more gaps in the traffic stream are available.

Based on a review of the turning plans, the site can safely accommodate larger passenger vehicles and fuel trucks circulating through the site.

## TIS Requirements

Cottage Grove Municipal Code (CGMC) Chapter 14.41.900 identifies the criteria for when a TIS shall be required with a land use application. These criteria are listed below together with a response indicating whether the criterion is applicable, and if so, whether the condition is met.

1. A change in zoning or a plan amendment designation that significantly affects a transportation facility per provisions of Section 14.47.800; or

The project will not require a change in zoning or a plan amendment. The Comprehensive Plan designation is Community Commercial. The parcel is currently in the process of annexation into the city. This criterion is not applicable.
2. Any proposed development or land use action that a road authority states may cause or be adversely impacted by operational or safety concerns along its facility(ies); or

A review of the 2015 Cottage Grove Transportation System Plan does not reveal any identified operational or safety concerns on this section of S $6^{\text {th }}$ Street. The roadway has two travel lanes and bike
lanes but sidewalks are sporadic and missing on the subject property. This safety concern will be addressed with required frontage improvements.

A review of the most recent five years of available crash data shows no significant trends or crash patterns were identified along the site frontage.

Based on the review of these materials, this criterion is not met.
3. Land divisions with 30 or more lots; or

The proposal does not involve a land division. This criterion is not applicable.
4. An increase in site traffic volume generation by 300 Average Daily Trips (ADT) or more; or

The trip generation estimates show that the net increase in daily traffic added to the transportation system will fall below the 300-trip threshold. This criterion is not met.
5. An increase in peak hour volume of a particular movement to and from the State highway by 20 percent or more; or

The site is not located on a state highway. The closest state facilities are the l-5 ramps which intersect $S 6^{\text {th }}$ Street south of the site. The state's 2019 interchange ramp volumes for Exit 172 show 1,220 average daily trips on the southbound off-ramp and 1,620 average daily trips on the northbound on-ramp. The proposed development will not generate enough added traffic to increase these ramp volumes by 20 percent. This criterion is not met.
6. An increase in use of adjacent streets by vehicles exceeding the 20,000-pound gross vehicle weights by 10 vehicles or more per day; or

The proposal will not generate 10 or more additional large trucks per day. This criterion is not met.
7. The location of the access driveway does not meet minimum sight distance requirements, or is located where vehicles entering or leaving the property are restricted, or such vehicles queue or hesitate on the State highway, creating a safety hazard; or

The sight distance evaluation shows all site accesses are expected to have adequate sight lines. No mitigation pertaining to sight distance is necessary or recommended.

Based on the review of sight distance, this criterion is not met.
8. Achange in internal traffic patterns that may cause safety problems, such as back up onto a street or greater potential for traffic accidents.

The site is not anticipated to create internal circulation patterns that will cause queuing onto the street. This criterion is not met.

Based on the assessment of the criteria outlined in CGMC Chapter 14.41.900, a TIS is not required.

## Conclusions

Key findings from this assessment include:

- When compared with the existing land use, the proposed development is estimated add a net increase of 7 morning peak hour trips, 29 evening peak hour trips, and 266 daily trips to the surrounding transportation network.
- A review of the most recent five years of available crash data showed no significant trends or crash patterns were identified along the site frontage. No safety mitigation is recommended.
- The sight distance evaluation found all site accesses are expected to have adequate sight lines. No mitigation pertaining to sight distance is necessary or recommended.
- Truck turning plans show the site can safely accommodate larger passenger vehicles and fuel trucks circulating through the site.
- Based on the assessment of the criteria outlined in CGMC Chapter 14.41.900, a TIS is not required.

Attachments:<br>Site Plan<br>Trip Generation<br>Sight Distance Photos<br>Crash Data<br>Turning Templates



TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS
Source: Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition

Land Use: Convenience Store<br>Land Use Code: 851<br>Land Use Subcategory: All Sites<br>Setting/Location General Urban/Suburban<br>Variable: 1000 SF GFA<br>Trip Type: Vehicle<br>Variable Quantity: 1.3

AM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 62.54

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 41 | 40 | 81 |

WEEKDAY

Trip Rate: 762.28

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 495 | 495 | 990 |

PM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 49.11

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $51 \%$ | $49 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 33 | 31 | 64 |

SATURDAY

Trip Rate: 1084.2

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 705 | 705 | 1,410 |

Land Use: Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise)<br>Land Use Code: 220<br>Land Use Subcategory: Not Close to Rail Transit<br>Setting/Location General Urban/Suburban<br>Variable: Dwelling Units<br>Trip Type: Vehicle<br>Variable Quantity: 3

AM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 0.4

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $24 \%$ | $76 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 0 | 1 | 1 |

WEEKDAY

Trip Rate: 6.74

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 10 | 10 | 20 |

PM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 0.51

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $63 \%$ | $37 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 1 | 1 | 2 |

SATURDAY

Trip Rate: 4.55

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 7 | 7 | 14 |

Caution: Small Sample Size

Source: Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition

Table E. 14 Pass-By and Non-Pass-By Trips Weekday, PM Peak Period Land Use Code 851-Convenience Market (Open 24 Hours)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SRE }\{1,000 \\ \text { SQ FT. } \\ \text { GFA] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | LOCATION | WEEKDAY SURVEY OATE | MO. CFINTERVIEWS | TIME PERIOD | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PASSBY } \\ & \text { TRIP (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | NON-PASS-CVY TRIPS (\$) |  |  | ADU STREET PENK HOUR WCLUNE | SOURCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | PRIMARY | DNERTED | TOTAL |  |  |
| 3 | Overtand Pas $k 3$ | Aug. 1587 | ${ }^{64}$ | 4:30-5:30 pas. | 34 | 53 | 13 | 66 | - | - |
| 3 | Overhand Pas Ks | Juty 1807 | 68 | 4:30-6:30 pme | 28 | \% | 22 | 72 | - | - |
| -1.9 | Biling, MT | 1987 | 451 | 4:00-8:00 peal. | 62 | 13 | 25 | 38 | - | ITE Momtana Section Toch Comm |
| * 50.0 | Chicago suburbs, IL | 1967 | 72 | $3 \times 60-6.00 \mathrm{par}$. | 28 | - | - | 72 | - | Kenig. OHza. Humes. Flock |
| ¢50.0 | Chrago suburbs, IL | 1987 | 54 | $3 \mathrm{co0-600} \mathrm{pas}$. | 78 | - | - | 22 | - | Kenig. OHisra. Hurnes. Flock |
| <50.0 | Cherego suburtis, IL | 1987 | 34 | $3 \mathrm{c} 00-6.00 \mathrm{pms}$. | 69 | - | - | 31 | - | Kinig, OHara Hurrian, Flock |
| $\leqslant 0.0$ | Cricago suburbs, IL | 1967 | 100 | 3x00-600 pma, | 151 | - | - | 3 | - | Kenig. OHara Humes, Flock |
| * 30.0 | Chicago suburbs, IL | 1967 | 43 | $3.60-6.00 \mathrm{pars}$. | 43 | - | - | 57 | - | Kenig. OHera. Humes, Flock |
| -50.0 | Chrago suburbs. IL | 1987 | 136 | 360-600 pas. | 39 | - | - | 61 | - | Kenig. OHisra Hurnes, Flock |
| 250.0 | Chicago atherfas, IL | 1967 | 74 | 3 c 30-600 pors. | 63 | - | - | 47 | - | Kenig, OHara Hurrisi, Flock |
| $\leqslant 0.0$ | Cricago suburbs, IL | 1967 | B | $3 \times 60-600 \mathrm{pm}$. | 64 | - | - | 36 | - | Kenig. OHara Humes, Flod |

Average Pass-By Trip Percentage: 51
"-" means no data were provided

Table E. 15 Pass-By and Non-Pass-By Trips Weekday, AM Peak Period
Land Use Code 853-Convenience Market with Gasoline Pumps

| $\begin{gathered} \text { SZE } \\ (1,000 \text { SO } \\ \text { FL. GFA }) \end{gathered}$ | LOCATICN | as | NO. OF NTERVEWS | TME PERIOD | Ps 89. BY TRIP (N) | NON-PASS-EY TRIPG (\%) |  |  | ADU STREET PEAK HOLR wollme | SOURCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | PRMAARY | DIVERTED | TOTAL |  |  |
| 28 | Louisvila sinaik KY | 1903 |  | 700-0.00 2 血 | 54 | 11 | 98 | 46 | 1,240 | Barlon-hactrman Ascape. |
| 2.4 | Louswill area, KY | 1593 | - | 2. | 48 | 17 | 35 | 52 | 1,210 | Barion-Aschman Assoc. |
| 4.2 | Loutntly mean KY | 1093 | 47 | 700-8.00 $=1$ |  | 19 | 19 | 38 | 1. 205 | Parton-hacteran Ansoc: |
| 2.8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Onstimood, } \\ \mathrm{KY} \end{gathered}$ | 1593 | - | 700-900am | 72 |  | 13 | 28 | 940 | Barlon-Aschman Assoc. |
| 3 T | Lousnile men KY | 1863 | 49 | 700-8009an | 68 | 15 |  | 34 | 980 | Barion-hsctensan Assoc. |
| 3.0 | Narw Aluary. N | 1003 | 62 | 730-0.00 2.0 m | 74 | 10 | 18 |  | 750 | Banton-hactman Assoce. |
| 23 | Lousatho, KY | 1983 | B8 | 700-9000a.m. | 64 | 5 | 31 | 35 |  | Barion/hachman Aseoc. |
| 22 | Ninw Altwrys N | 1293 | 79 | 700-0.00 | 58 | 6 | 31 | 44 | 635 | M-Asctersen <br> , asoc. |
| 3.6 | Lotiswith area, KY | 1903 | 49 | 700-900 am | 67 | 4 | 29 | 33 | 1,935 | Barion-Asch acone. |

Average Pass-By Trip Percentage: 63
--" means no data were provided

## Proposed Development Based on Vehicle Fueling Positions

TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS
Source: Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition

Land Use: Convenience Store/Gas Station Land Use Code: 945

Land Use Subcategory: GFA (2-4k)
Setting/Location General Urban/Suburban
Variable: Vehicle Fueling Positions
Trip Type: Vehicle
Variable Quantity: 6

## AM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 16.06

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 48 | 48 | 96 |

WEEKDAY

Trip Rate: 265.12

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 795 | 795 | 1,590 |

PM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 18.42

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 56 | 55 | 111 |

SATURDAY

Trip Rate: 0

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | NA | NA | NA |

## Proposed Development <br> Based on Size of Convenience Store

TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS
Source: Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition

Land Use: Convenience Store/Gas Station Land Use Code: 945<br>Land Use Subcategory: VFP (2-8)<br>Setting/Location General Urban/Suburban<br>Variable: 1000 SF GFA<br>Trip Type: Vehicle<br>Variable Quantity: 2.94

## AM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 40.59

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 60 | 59 | 119 |

WEEKDAY

Trip Rate: 624.2

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 918 | 918 | 1,836 |

PM PEAK HOUR

Trip Rate: 48.48

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | 72 | 71 | 143 |

SATURDAY

Trip Rate: 0

|  | Enter | Exit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directional Split | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |
| Trip Ends | NA | NA | NA |

## Proposed Development - Pass-by \%

| Vehicle Pass-By Rates by Land Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual , 11th Edition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use Code | 945 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Convenience Store/Gas Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Setting | General Urban/Suburban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Period | Weekday AM Peak Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# Data Sites | 16 Sites with between 2 and 8 VFP |  |  |  |  | 28 Sites with between 9 and 20 VFP |  |  |  |  |
| Average Pass-By Rate | 60\% for Sites with between 2 and 8 VFP |  |  |  |  | 76\% for Sites with between 9 and 20 VFP |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pass-By Characteristics for Individual Sites |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | VFP | State or <br> Province | Survey <br> Year | \# <br> Interviews | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Pass-By } \\ & \text { Trip (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Non-Pass-By Trips |  |  | Adj Street Peak Hour Volume | Source |
| GFA (000) |  |  |  |  |  | Primary (\%) | Diverted (\%) | Total (\%) |  |  |
| 2 | 8 | Maryland | 1992 | 46 | 87 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 2235 | 25 |
| 2.1 | 6 | Maryland | 1992 | 26 | 58 | 23 | 19 | 42 | 2080 | 25 |
| 2.1 | 6 | Maryland | 1992 | 26 | 58 | 23 | 19 | 42 | 2080 | 25 |
| 2.2 | 8 | Maryland | 1992 | 31 | 47 | 34 | 19 | 53 | 1785 | 25 |
| 2.2 | < 8 | Indiana | 1993 | 79 | 56 | 6 | 38 | 44 | 635 | 2 |
| 2.2 | 8 | Maryland | 1992 | 35 | 78 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 7080 | 25 |
| 2.3 | 6 | Maryland | 1992 | 37 | 32 | 41 | 27 | 68 | 2080 | 25 |
| 2.3 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 58 | 64 | 5 | 31 | 36 | 1255 | 2 |
| 2.3 | 6 | Maryland | 1992 | 37 | 32 | 41 | 27 | 68 | 2080 | 25 |
| 2.4 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | - | 48 | 17 | 35 | 52 | 1210 | 2 |
| 2.6 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | - | 72 | 15 | 13 | 28 | 940 | 2 |
| 2.8 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | - | 54 | 11 | 35 | 46 | 1240 | 2 |
| 3 | < 8 | Indiana | 1993 | 62 | 74 | 10 | 16 | 26 | 790 | 2 |
| 3.6 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 49 | 67 | 4 | 29 | 33 | 1985 | 2 |
| 3.7 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 49 | 66 | 16 | 18 | 34 | 990 | 2 |
| 4.694 | 12 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 72 | - | - | 28 | 2440 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 12 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 78 | - | - | 22 | 1561 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 12 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 79 | - | - | 21 | 2764 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 12 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 55 | - | - | 45 | 1398 | 30 |
| 5.06 | 12 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 84 | - | - | 16 | 3219 | 30 |
| 5.242 | 12 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 74 | - | - | 26 | 1160 | 30 |
| 5.242 | 12 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 71 | - | - | 29 | 548 | 30 |
| 5.488 | 12 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 80 | - | - | 20 | - | 30 |
| 5.5 | 12 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 85 | - | - | 15 | 2975 | 30 |
| 4.2 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 47 | 62 | 19 | 19 | 38 | 1705 | 2 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 90 | - | - | 10 | 2278 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 74 | - | - | 26 | 2185 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 58 | - | - | 42 | 962 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 84 | - | - | 16 | 2956 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 79 | - | - | 21 | 1859 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 20 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 84 | - | - | 16 | 3864 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 68 | - | - | 32 | 2106 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 85 | - | - | 15 | 2676 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 75 | - | - | 25 | 3244 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 71 | - | - | 29 | 1663 | 30 |
| 4.993 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 75 | - | - | 25 | 1991 | 30 |
| 5.094 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 86 | - | - | 14 | 1260 | 30 |
| 5.5 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 82 | - | - | 18 | 1570 | 30 |
| 5.543 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 84 | - | - | 16 | 1933 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 77 | - | - | 23 | 2262 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 68 | - | - | 32 | 2854 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 58 | - | - | 42 | 1253 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 79 | - | - | 21 | 1928 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | --- | 84 | --- | --- | 16 | 1953 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Proposed Development - Pass-by \%

| Vehicle Pass-By Rates by Land Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual , 11th Edition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use Code | 945 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Convenience Store/Gas Station |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Setting | General Urban/Suburban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Period | Weekday PM Peak Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# Data Sites | 12 Sites with between 2 and 8 VFP |  |  |  |  | 28 Sites with between 9 and 20 VFP |  |  |  |  |
| Average Pass-By Rate | 56\% for Sites with between 2 and 8 VFP |  |  |  |  | 75\% for Sites with between 9 and 20 VFP |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pass-By Characteristics for Individual Sites |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | VFP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | State or Province | Survey Year | \# Interviews | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Pass-By } \\ & \text { Trip (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Non-Pass-By Trips |  |  | Adj Street Peak Hour Volume | Source |
| GFA (000) |  |  |  |  |  | Primary (\%) | Diverted (\%) | Total (\%) |  |  |
| 2.1 | 8 | Maryland | 1992 | 31 | 52 | 13 | 35 | 48 | 1785 | 25 |
| 2.1 | 6 | Maryland | 1992 | 30 | 53 | 20 | 27 | 47 | 1060 | 25 |
| 2.2 | < 8 | Indiana | 1993 | 115 | 48 | 16 | 36 | 52 | 820 | 2 |
| 2.3 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 67 | 57 | 16 | 27 | 43 | 1954 | 2 |
| 2.3 | 6 | Maryland | 1992 | 55 | 40 | 11 | 49 | 60 | 2760 | 25 |
| 2.4 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | - | 58 | 13 | 29 | 42 | 2655 | 2 |
| 2.6 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 68 | 67 | 15 | 18 | 33 | 950 | 2 |
| 2.8 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | - | 62 | 11 | 27 | 38 | 2875 | 2 |
| 3 | < 8 | Indiana | 1993 | 80 | 65 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 1165 | 2 |
| 3.6 | $<8$ | Kentucky | 1993 | 60 | 56 | 17 | 27 | 44 | 2505 | 2 |
| 3.7 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 70 | 61 | 16 | 23 | 39 | 2175 | 2 |
| 4.2 | < 8 | Kentucky | 1993 | 61 | 58 | 26 | 16 | 42 | 2300 | 2 |
| 4.694 | 12 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 78 | - | - | 22 | 3549 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 12 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 67 | - | - | 33 | 2272 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 12 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 66 | - | - | 34 | 3514 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 12 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 71 | - | - | 29 | 2350 | 30 |
| 5.06 | 12 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 91 | - | - | 9 | 4181 | 30 |
| 5.242 | 12 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 70 | - | - | 30 | 2445 | 30 |
| 5.242 | 12 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 56 | - | - | 44 | 950 | 30 |
| 5.488 | 12 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 73 | - | - | 27 | - | 30 |
| 5.5 | 12 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 84 | - | - | 16 | 4025 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Maryland | 2000 | - | 89 | - | - | 11 | 2755 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 73 | - | - | 27 | 1858 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 59 | - | - | 41 | 1344 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 72 | - | - | 28 | 3434 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 81 | - | - | 19 | 1734 | 30 |
| 4.694 | 20 | Delaware | 2000 | - | 76 | - | - | 24 | 1616 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 67 | - | - | 33 | 2.954 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 78 | - | - | 22 | 3086 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 83 | - | - | 17 | 4143 | 30 |
| 4.848 | 16 | Virginia | 2000 | - | 73 | - | - | 27 | 2534 | 30 |
| 4.993 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 72 | - | - | 28 | 2917 | 30 |
| 5.094 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 86 | - | - | 14 | 1730 | 30 |
| 5.5 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 90 | - | - | 10 | 2616 | 30 |
| 5.543 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 87 | - | - | 13 | 2363 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 81 | - | - | 19 | 2770 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | Pennsylvania | 2000 | - | 76 | - | - | 24 | 3362 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 61 | - | - | 39 | 1713 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | - | 86 | - | - | 14 | 1721 | 30 |
| 5.565 | 16 | New Jersey | 2000 | --- | 81 | --- | --- | 19 | 2227 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Sight Lines Looking to the South


Sight Lines Looking to the North

OREGON.. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPoRTATION - TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
transportation data section - Crash anaylysis and reporting unit
county road crash listing
LANE County
S 6 TH ST, MP 0 to $1.2,01 / 01 / 2016$ to $12 / 31 / 2020$
1-2 of 2 Crash records shown.






# michael（ Parker 77969 S 6 th Street cottage brock e or 

City Hall Meeting
March 15， 2023

$$
541-654-2151
$$

My thanks to the mayor，city council and city officials for allowing mme to speak．On March 14 ，yesterday，there was 田 site review meeting．Neighbors of the $\mathbb{H}$ Hill crest $\mathbb{M}$ Market were able to express concerns about the site plan with E \＆M Remodeling and Concrete．

Eric and Melissa n conducted a good two－way conversation．They took motes，listened and made eye－contact．Sadly，what wras missing was a city official or one of their bosses from the council．

Probably it is written that the urban growth population is mot a concern at this point．I just think it would have been gracious and respectful had a city official been there．

As I said Eric and Melissa n listened to the individuals．They answered the questions they were asked．Some concerns could mot be answered by them．For instance： 1 ．Excessive speed on the street．2．Blocked line of sight in the Hill crest Market area． 3 Concerns about traffic congestion．

The site plan looks good butt there might not be enough space for wehicles and delivery trucks． Had a city official been at the meeting，they would have been able to discuss these issues with our neighbors．When citizens are asked to gather and discuss future development，taking time out of their lives，it should be important enough that a city official be present．

I am young enough to know that everyone answers to someone．．I believe the council answers to its citizens and manages its city employees．Having said that，I suggest that the council receives its agenda and necessary info earlier than they do now．

Citizens who are asked in the future to attend site meetings should be given more than four working days／notice．Doing that would allow for better decision making．

It has been educational for my wife and I and stressful to receive all the mailings about the Hillcrest Market remodel，even though we are very grateful for all the information．

The city employees／staff have had to deal with my opinionated Irish personality．They have been great．

I was able to speak to Eric on the phone at the very beginning of all this. He answered my questions and explained briefly the procedures, and we are thankful for that.

In closing, the site plan puts the back of the building on the property line. So I amn sure that council members and city officials would not mind a $70 \mathrm{ft} \times 20 \mathrm{ft}$. grey brick wall on their homes' property line.

I do want to see our neighborhood be successfull, but concerns about city procedures and the overall neighborhood safety, out-weigh a commercial success.

I would like to thank my wife, Lisette, for keeping me on track and typing this for me.
Thank you all.

EXHIBIT F

## Planning/Development Comments

Chris Silva [chriss@epud.org](mailto:chriss@epud.org)
Wed, Apr 5, 2023 at 12:58 PM
To: Eric Mongan [planner@cottagegrove.org](mailto:planner@cottagegrove.org)

Eric,

NESC and EPUD require the following clearances and also guidance regarding gas stations;

NESC Table 234-1: Clearance of Signs to 20.8 kV unguarded rigid parts (wire)
Horizontal: 7 ' to portions that are readily accessible to persons / 7 ' to portions that are not readily accessible to persons. EPUD typically wants to see $10^{\prime}$ from any structure to the closest phase wire.

Vertical: 14' over or under cat-walks and other surfaces upon which personnel walk and $7.5^{\prime}$ over or under other portions of such installations that are deemed as not being readily accessible to personnel.

Gasoline Dispensing Stations per NESC;
"Electric equipment installed in areas used for dispensing flammable liquids shall be installed in accordance with application sections of NFPA 30A-200 and the NEC." NESC does not reference clearances to these types of facilities, so we will rely on the site being built under the conditions listed in the NESC.

Hopefully this helps? Let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.

Thanks,
Chris
[Quoted text hidden]


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition, 2021.
    ${ }^{2}$ ITE, Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition, 2017.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2018.

