# Benedick Holdings, LLC Annexation and Zone Change 

Exhibit K-58A-I<br>Except K-58B<br>Planning Commission Testimony

Land Use Application


An accurate Plot Plan must be attached. Ask for a sample Plot Plan


Gene Benedick<br>27962 Ward Lane<br>Eugene, OR 97402

Harry Taylor
P.O. Box 1420

Veneta, OR 97487

RE: Land Use Compatibility Statement PA 05-5885
Subject Property: Map 18-12-10-40 \#400 \& 401

Dear Mr. Benedick:
I have reviewed your proposed project for consistency with the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan. The proposal to conduct limited clearing, as described in the "Idylewood $5^{\text {th }}$ Addition Limited Clearing Plan", is consistent with the zoning provisions of the applicable Beaches and Dunes Combining District, Lane Code 10.270(1). Provided that no grading occurs, the removal of a limited amount of vegetation within the future road alignment area is not considered "development". as that term is defined in Lane Code 10.020. Sand stabilization techniques should be employed wherever vegetation is removed.

Please call if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,


Whom Lanfear
Associate Planner
Land Management Division
(541) 682-4054
(541) 682-3947 (FAX)

Thom.Lanfear@co.lane.or.us

[^0]
# IDYLEWOOD 5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ADDITION LIMITED CLEARING PLAN <br> Florence, Oregon 

May 16th 2005

| - Prepared For: | Gene Benedick <br> 27962 Ward Lane <br> Eugene, OR 97402 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site Location: | Kelsie Way Florence, Oregon <br> Assessor Map 18-12-10-40 Tax Lot 400 \& 401 |
| Prepared By: | EGR and Associates, Inc. <br> 2535 B Prairie Road <br> Eugene, OR 97402 |
| Project Number: | $2080-04-0044$ |

## BACKGROUND

The proposed fifth addition to Idylewood is located in Northern Florence in the Rhododendron Drive and Heceta Beach Road area (see Figure 1, Site Location Map). The property can be found on Tax Map 18121040 Tax Lots 400 and 401. There are three roads that are stubbed to the property. Kelsie way extends to the northern boundary and Oceana Drive and Sandrift extend to the western boundary.

The property is characterized by multiple well-stabilized in-active dune formations. Much of the eastern portion of the site is frequently inundated by ground water. Wetland areas are known to exist on the site but have not yet been delineated or mapped. Vegetation on the site is extremely dense, which has made site data collection nearly impossible and even field inspection very difficult.

The site is located within Lane County and outside of the Florence city limits. The current parcel zoning is RA/U. The site is also subject to the $/ \mathrm{BD}$ (Beaches and Dunes) coastal overlay zone. Outside of the Lane Development Code, several Federal and State criteria apply, the most critical of which is wetland preservation.

## WORK TO DATE

Effective subdivision design requires an accurate topographic survey and mapping of existing natural features such as wetlands and water bodies. In order to maintain compliance with the Beaches and Dunes overlay Zone and other development criteria while minimizing impact several non-invasive data collection methods have been employed to date.

## Site Topography

Work began with accumulation of file material and several site reviews by senior engineering staff, planning and wetland consultants to gain an understanding of the site, to investigate the presence and extent of probable wetlands, to investigate the presence of water bodies and likely seasonal high ground water tables, to gauge the extent of steep slopes and to estimate subdivision design possibilities. The City of Florence has a topographic data base that includes the project area and aerial photographs were obtained and reviewed (refer to Figures 2 and 3).

Using information gained from the field investigations and the city of Florence topographic mapping approximate areas of possible development were determined and an effort made to verify the accuracy of the city mapping through the use of several transect lines that were hand cut through the site using hand equipment. The city topographic mapping and the transect lines are shown on Figure 3, Site Topography. It should be noted that hatched areas shown on Figure 3 are those areas that are shown on city topographic mapping to be enclosed areas that in many cases coincide with water bodies or wetland areas or both. A comparison of the field survey and profiles generated from the city mapping indicate a difference in elevation ranging form zero to twelve feet and discrepancies in the locations of other land features by as much as forty feet horizontally
and whose locations are critical to the project design. A comparison of the topographic mapping and surveyed ground profiles is shown on Figure 4, Alignment Profiles.

After determining that the preliminary field efforts to acquire sufficient data for a reasonable design of the development were not adequate for their intended purpose, an informal request was made to the County Planning Department to consider allowing a limited and controlled clearing effort aimed at acquiring adequate data while still minimizing impact to the site and avoiding impact to and protecting critical landforms such as wetland areas and water bodies. This proposed clearing plan is a consequence of that informal request and is intended to define the proposed level of impact during the investigative phase, the methods to be employed to acquire the additional data, and the controls to be implemented while obtaining the appropriate level of field data that will allow the project to be appropriately designed.

## LIMITED CLEARING PLAN

## Probable Subdivision Layout

While the site information available has shown many conflicts, the field data and the city mapping have proven to be in general agreement in predicting high areas, low areas and probable areas (especially large areas) of seasonal water inundation.

In order to avoid unnecessary removal of vegetation and to avoid conflicts with landforms that require protection, a preliminary subdivision layout using the city topographic information, the zoning criteria, connectivity standards, and the knowledge gained from filed review of the site was created. This layout was then examined in the field by walking the hand cut transect lines and other open areas of the site. Field notes were made to the proposed layout based on this field review and the proposed subdivision layout thus refined (see Figure 5, Probable Subdivision Layout).

While this layout is not intended to be final, it includes what appears to be the most probable site access layout that is capable of providing road connectivity and a reasonable level of development that avoids or minimizes most conflicts with natural landforms requiring protection.

The above described probable subdivision layout was developed to define probable road corridors so that limited clearing could occur within these corridors and enable a more accurate site investigation that minimizes disturbance of portions of the site that will not otherwise be impacted during the subsequent development. Therefore, this limited clearing plan to the extent possible with the information known at this time is limited to the removal of vegetation to only those areas which are viewed to be necessary for the required site access. An illustration of the area proposed to be cleared under this limited clearing plan can be viewed on Figure 6, Limited Clearing Plan.

## Description of Clearing Activities

The clearing work will remove and mulch all vegetation within the proposed clearing limits that will restrict an accurate investigation of the proposed road alignment. Subsequent data obtained by ground surveying these cleared roadway alignments will be sufficient to develop a more refined subdivision proposal. Clearing activities will not remove trees greater than four inches in diameter at breast height. Cleared vegetation will be mulched and placed on the ground within the proposed road alignment areas to provide a ground cover that will minimize the potential for erosion.

In the first phase of the clearing activity the primary roadway alignments will be brushed to an approximate thirty (30) foot width. Any areas of standing water or potential jurisdictional wetlands that are encountered, will be avoided and given a minimum ten foot buffer from clearing activities.

After the primary roadways have been cleared and mulched and the alignments filed confirmed the second phase of clearing activity will commence. In the second phase the flag lot access ways will be brushed. Prior to initiation of the second phase of clearing, the proposed flag lot access alignments will be walked to verify the feasibility of the proposed lots and their position relative to the primary roadways. After the alignments have been field checked the alignments will be cleared to a ten to fifteen foot width.

## Site Control

The clearing activity limits will be controlled in the field by a survey crew and consultants familiar with the objective of this limited clearing plan and the landforms to be protected during implementation of this limited clearing plan. In areas where access can be gained flagging will be placed ahead of the clearing team to define the limits. Where access proves to be impossible, the survey crew will direct the limits of the clearing concurrent with the clearing work.

If during the course of the clearing activity an unexpected site feature should be encountered that effects the feasibility of the proposed road or drive way alignment the clearing activity will be stopped and the design team consulted. Should this occur, a revised plan will be submitted to the county for approval prior to commencing with the clearing activity.

## Equipment

The clearing will largely be performed using a Takeuchi Skid Steer, with a Fecon cutter head. The Takeuchi is sixty inches wide and will be able to maneuver into and around confined areas. It is propelled by rubberized tractor treads and can operate on slopes up to $25 \%$. The Fecon brushing attachment head will clear small trees, brush and above ground stumps. Cleared vegetation will be ground up by the Fecon attachment and dropped in place as mulch. Downed logs encountered along the clearing alignment will be either ground down in place or bucked and removed depending on size. Limited areas that can not be reached by the Skid Steer will be cleared using hand tools, and then processed by the Fecon grinder.

## Schedule

Proposed clearing activities will commence as soon after approval is obtained as is possible and will take approximately 2 to 5 days to complete. The County Planning Department will be notified of the proposed date clearing activities will commence and the date such activities cease so that they will be appropriately informed.


FIGURE 1 SITE VICINITY MAP IDYLEWOOD


FIGURE 2 AERIAL PHOTO IDYLEWOOD FLORENCE, OR
$\downarrow$ EGR \& Associates, Inc.






## LANE COUNTY RECEIPT



| Type | Method Description | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Payment | Check 3131 | 48.40 |
|  | Description | Current Pymt |
| 2000 | New Technology Fee | 10.00 |
| 2100 | Administrative Fee | 4.80 |
| 3060 | Planning Admin Approvals | 32.00 |
| 3065 | Long Range Planning Surc | 1.60 |

## PAID BY: HARRY TAYLOR

## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION



## LAND USE APPLICATION Preliminary Investigation Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 PLANNING: 682-3807

For Office Use Only: FILE \# PA 105822 CODE: AHCL
FEE: $\$ 1380$


Applicant (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541) 688-6402 $\frac{18,42}{(5) 4}$ Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Applicant Signature: $\qquad$

Agent (print name): EGR \& ASSOCIATES
Mailing address: 2535 B PRAIRIE ROAD, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-8322 Email: clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com
Agent Signature: $\qquad$

Land Owner (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402
Land Owner Signature: $\qquad$ Email: ejbenedick@msn.com a 20 hitter

LOCATION
$\left.\begin{array}{lllll}18 \mathrm{~S} & 12 \mathrm{~W} & 10 & 40 & 400,401 \\ \text { Township } & \text { Range } & \text { Section } & & \text { Taxlot }\end{array}\right) \& 801$ L

VACANT - NONE
Site address

PROPOSAL: A request for a Preliminary Investigation in accordance with Lane Code 10.270 (for land inside an Urban Growth Boundary) or-Lane Code 16.243 -(for-lanct outside an-Urban Growth-Boundary).-

This application is based on objective evidence and is not a land use decision; therefore, the decision is not subject to public notice and may only be appealed by the applicant.

## Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone Preliminary Investigation Application for Idylewood Fourth Addition Additional Information <br> 

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features. Include additional pages if necessary.

The subject property is best understood if we describe different sections separately as follows:

1) The northerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 1-19;
2) The central and westerly portion of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 20-41 and 57-62;
3) The southerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 42-56 and;
4) The easterly portion of the site not proposed for development.

A detailed discussion of the required grading and vegetation removal for each section is presented below.

It is important to note that other than for specifically surveyed transects, little accurate topographic information is available for this site. Available topographic mapping for the site was developed via aerial photographic means and due to the presence of extra-ordinarily thick vegetation is completely unreliable. In May of 2005, Applicant applied for and obtained from Lane County authorization to clear a portion of the site along proposed roadatignments in order to obtain more accurate survey data on the site (Idylewood $5^{\text {th }}$ Addition Limited Clearing Plan, Florence, Oregon, May $16^{\text {th }}, 2005$ prepared by EGR \& Associates, Inc.). Elevations and features described herein were determined as a consequence of that clearing action and the survey data compiled after clearing occurred.

## The northerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 1-19;

This area of the site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies across this portion of the site from an elevation of less than 82 feet MSL in the lowest areas to a high of approximately 123 feet MSL. This area of the site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood and Idylewood First Addition Subdivisions, on the north by the Heceta South Subdivision, and on the east by a coastal lake formation (see description of the easterly portion of the site below).

The geology of this portion of the site displays a classically formed transverse dune/deflation plain formation with relict incisions formed by the interplay between historic wind and water movements across the formation. These formations developed as the dune formation was formed with intermittent periods of sand blowing across the deflation plain and then being washed away by seasonal or cyclical movement of water across the deflation plain. These topographic incisions and the associated remnant sand between them are close together and steeply inclined where forces of erosion removed the sand placed by seasonal winds. Similar relict incisions can be observed across the Heceta South Subdivision to the north of the subject property. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development. Average slopes across this portion of the site in an east-west orientation are approximately $6 \%$.

The easterly fringe of this portion of the site drops abruptly at the lee side of the dune formation by as much as 35 to 40 feet and at a slope of approximately $50 \%$ to the edge of the coastal lake formation described below (see description of the easterly portion of the site). This "ridge" along the top of the old dune feature is at an elevation of approximately 110 feet MSL near the Heceta South Subdivision, rises to a peak of approximately 123 feet MSL approximately 250 feet south of the Heceta South Subdivision, and then falls to an elevation of approximately 100 feet MSL in the vicinity of proposed lot 23 .

Another narrow interim dune peak also occurs and lying along a north-south orientation beneath the proposed north-south extension of Oceana Drive and the proposed utility easement south of Oceana Drive. Peak elevations along this alignment vary from approximately 100 feet MSL to 118 feet MSL.

Further west, the site is generally flatter with elevations varying from approximately 85 feet MSL to approximately 95 feet MSL but being incised by the aforementioned erosional actions.

Proposed Lots 24-28 and Lot 62 topographically transition from the features described herein to the portion of the site described below and included therein as the central and westerly portion of the site.

## The central and westerly portion of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 20-41 and 57-62

This area of the site is characterized as a relatively flat and well-stabilized inactive sand dune formation covered with dense vegetation. Topography varies across from an elevation of less than 86 feet MSL in the lowest areas of the site to a high of approximately 92 feet MSL. This portion of the site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood First Addition Subdivision, on the north by the northerly section of the site as described above, and on the east by a coastal lake formation (see description of the easterly portion of the site below).

The geology of this portion of the site displays a subtle transverse dune/deflation plain formation with the highest elevations occurring along the proposed Bear Run Road alignment. Associated housing will also be located along this highest area of this portion of the site.

Minimal clearing and grading will be required on this portion of the site for development to occur.

## The southerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 42-56 and;

This area of the site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies from an elevation of less than 88 feet MSL in the lowest areas to a high of approximately 140 feet MSL. This portion of the site is bordered on the north by the Idylewood First Addition Subdivision and the central and westerly portion of this proposed subdivision, on the south and west by the Idylewood Second Addition Subdivision, and on the east by public lands.

The geology of this portion of the site displays a series of irregularly located high and low features suggesting that when the dune site was active it was subject to irregular and changing local influences resulting in other than "classically formed transverse" (south-west or north-west trending) dune/deflation plain formations. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development. Because of the odd orientation of these features, there are no "average slopes" across this portion of the site.

In order to provide access to this site with roadways meeting conventional design standards and to avoid adversely impacting adjacent neighboring properties, grading activity will be required during project development.

## The easterly portion of the site - not proposed for development.

This area of the site is characterized as a coastal lake formation and also has a Lane County Planning PW-RCP zoning overlay. Seasonally and cyclically, water levels rise and fall across this portion of the site in response to movements in groundwater levels. Distinct areas of predominantly water are separated by interim ridges of higher ground vegetated with upland vegetation. Water levels between these distinct water bodies varies in response to the regional groundwater gradient that slopes approximately one foot in 400 feet in the vicinity of the project in an eastwest orientation toward the Siuslaw River approximately one mile to the west.

The geology of this portion of the site displays deflation plain characteristics except as separated by the separating sand formations described above. Elevations of this portion of the site are generally flat and vary from lows of 80 to 82 feet MSL to highs of approximately 90 feet MSL along the dividing sand formations.

During some years, when the seasonal and cyclical groundwater levels are low, most of this area is devoid of water and the site takes on the physical appearance of a coastal bog. When seasonal and cyclical groundwater levels are high, the site takes on the characteristics of a shallow water body.

No known channelized inflow or outflow channels exist from these features and the site is understood to be solely a reflection of groundwater levels.

No development, clearing, or grading is proposed for this portion of the site.

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## (a) Explain why your proposed vegetation clearance is not excessive:

The required clearing area is the minimum that will be necessary in order to construct roads, utilities, and to provide suitable building locations for the proposed development. In areas where irregular topography exists and proposed overall grading will occur, re-vegetation and sand stabilization will occur within the timelines required by other sections of this code. We consider this course of general grading and then re-vegetation to provide less overall disruptive impact than would occur if only road and utility infrastructure areas were initially cleared and graded and then followed on a case by case random basis as lots are developed one at a time with grading impacts and/or structural damage potentially occurring across proposed lot lines.

As previously described, some proposed roadway alignments were cleared of vegetation in 2005 in conjunction with an approved limited clearing plan and five years later, the impact of this clearing can hardly be discerned.

Portions of the site that do not require grading or installation of roads or utility infra-structure are not proposed to be cleared at the time of Subdivision development.

## (b) Vegetation free areas which are suitable for development shall be used instead of sites which must be artificially cleared.

## If you are not using the vegetation free area, explain why:

Generally speaking, vegetation free areas of the site are not suitable for development as they occur on portions of the site overlain by seasonal water bodies that are protected by other sections of Lane Code and that are proposed to remain in a common area or eventually be dedicated to a public or conservation agency.
(e) Development shall result in the least topographic modification of the site as is possible.

## Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain:

Yes. Grading activity will generally coincide with the above described clearing activity. The proposed grading activity and the proposed clearing activity are the minimum that will be necessary in order to construct roads, utilities, and to provide suitable building locations for the proposed development.

## (f) Slopes in excess of 25 percent shall be prohibited from development.

## Do you plan to disturb any slope greater than 25\%? If yes, explain:

Yes, on a localized basis (a few feet to tens of feet) existing slopes over portions of the site are in excess of $25 \%$ due to erosional incision and/or irregular and highly localized forces during dune formation. During prior conversations with Lane County Planning staff, these localized slopes were discussed in the context of the Code's intent. As we understand the intent of the Code, it is to prevent uncontrolled development on slopes that are, or may be unstable so as to minimize property damage to existing and future development. Because most of these steeper slopes are localized, grading activity on the site can occur in a manner that eliminates slopes in excess of $25 \%$ from the proposed development areas while preserving the significant features of the site and maintains buffer areas adjacent to existing development, remaining slopes in excess of $25 \%$, and areas subject to the PW-RCP zoning overlay.

Development of this property cannot occur without this localized grading activity because roadways could not be built.

Because of the aforementioned topographic irregularities over certain areas of the site, we propose to mass grade the internal portions of the site where roadways and building pads will be located. This approach will minimize future disturbance by completing all required clearing and grading at one time. In so doing, vegetation will be allowed to promptly re-establish itself and remain generally undisturbed at the time of lot development except where structures are located. This will minimize the potential impacts of sporadic lot development (anticipated with the poor building market) and disturbance that could cross lot lines if not completed at the time of subdivision development.

The nature of other development in this area is to maintain vegetative buffers between adjacent dwellings. It is the Developer's intent to maintain to the maximum extent possible, this development nature with this subdivision. By mass grading only those areas that must be graded for development to occur and completing most required clearing activity at the time of development of the subdivision, these internal buffer areas will be re-established sooner and prior to most lot development activity occurring.

Specific grading plans will be submitted with design drawings for the subdivision. As indicated above, the proposed grading activity and the proposed clearing activity will be the minimum that will be necessary in order to construct roads, utilities, and to provide suitable building locations for the proposed development.

Ins-allaw wo vegice recuored w/in $50^{\prime}$ rettard of PW jone.



## KENDALL Jerry

From: Clint Beecroft [clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 10:26 AM
To: KENDALL Jerry
Subject: RE: Benedick Subdiv.
Jerry,
Thank you for your initial comments regarding the beaches and dunes preliminary investigation application. To what extent will the requirements of LC10.270-35(6) be applied to this site with respect to grading on steep slopes? In other words, one extreme case would be a site represented predominantly by slopes greater than $25 \%$ and thus the entire site would not be developable according to this code section while a site that is relatively flat with no slopes in excess of $25 \%$ would not be subject to this code section. As with your interpretation of LC 10.270-35(5), I assume that you will be looking for a balance between the two extremes with respect to development on sites with only minor steep slopes such as the proposed Idylewood site? $\qquad$
A majority of the slopes on the proposed development site is less than $25 \%$; however, as described in the physical features section of the /BD application, there are some slopes that exceed $25 \%$. For example, relict incision formations located on the northerly section of the site may have short slopes that exceed $25 \%$ in some areas, but the overall slope of this section of the site is approximately $6 \%$ east to west. As discussed in the /BD application these relic features are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development.

Another example is the southerly section of the site which is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations with varying slopes from relatively flat to in excess of $25 \%$. Due to the odd orientation of these features there are no average slopes across this portion of the site. In order to provide access to this site with roadways, and connection to Cloudcroft Lane to the south as suggested by City/County comments, grading activity will be required during project development that will generally level these dune formations such that a majority of these slopes will be less than $25 \%$ after initial grading activities are complete and cannot be avoided.

[^1]Clint

From: KENDALL Jerry [mailto:Jerry.KENDALL@co.lane.or.us]
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 4:53 PM
To: 'Clint Beecroft'
Subject: Benedick Subdiv.
Clint:
1.) I checked with some County staff and yes, the County owned tax lot 1600 (18-12-10.4) was acquired from the Siuslaw Nat. Forest back in 1970 for public park use, so yes we will want to see access to it established as the City so mentioned on p.1-2 of its referral.
2.) Re: your question on the /BD requirements and the concern that when you re-do the preliminary sub. layout and reconfigure lots that I (the County) don't come back later and say you overdid it and need to adjust again... about all I can say is it is a balance of sorts. Ill use hyperbole to illustrate:
-If you came back with a scenerio where every lot and roads was one level, it would violate the "...least topographic modification..." standard (LC 10.270-35(5).

- On the other hand, we need to realize that the above standard is advisory and somewhat subjective and leaves your client open to appeal, as one could argue that any modification is not the "least
$\qquad$

I'm looking for you to present a reconfigured site plan that is a balance between the two above extremes. My role is to evaluate what is presented (and not to do the designing).

I would like to point out LC 10.270-35(6), which prohibits development on slopes greater than $25 \%$. That standard may be a bit more difficult to meet with a long linear road layout, but you certainly would need to avoid creating a lot which is predominantly $25 \%$ slopes so that there is no buildable room left. In other words, if that occurs, I recommend combining lots or making some bigger.

I do ask that when you submit the reconfigured plan, that you provide a copy that shows all pre-existing grades that are greater than $25 \%$.

I hope that helps as a followup to our meeting of June 1
FYI, I am out of the office June 13-22.
Regards.
Jerry Kendall/Associate Planner/Lane County Oregon
PSB/LMD
125 E. 8th Ave.
Eugene, Or. 97401
ph: 541-682-4057
FAX: 541-682-3947
Jerry.Kendall@co.lane.or.us







## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION



# LAND USE APPLICATION Preliminary Investigation <br> Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone 

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 PLANNING: 682-3807

For Office Use Only: FILE \# PA 105822 CODE: AHCL FEE: $\quad \$ 1380$


Applicant (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: $\qquad$ Email: ejbenedick@msn.com

Applicant Signature: Shaula a (1)

Agent (print name): EGR \& ASSOCIATES
Mailing address: 2535 B PRAIRIE ROAD, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-8322 Email: clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com
Agent Signature: $\qquad$
Land Owner (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402
Land Owner Signature: $\qquad$ Email: ejbenedick@msn.com a \& hitter

LOCATION
$\left.\begin{array}{lrlll}\text { LOCATION } & & & 18.12 .10 .34 \\ 18 \mathrm{~S} & 12 \mathrm{~W} & 10 & 40 & 400,401 \\ \text { Township } & \text { Range } & \text { Section } & \text { Taxlot }\end{array}\right) \& 801 \leftarrow$

Site address

PROPOSAL: A request for a Preliminary Investigation in accordance with Lane Code 10.270 (for land inside an Urban Growth Boundary) or -Lane Code 16.243 -(f orland outside an-Urbant Growth-Boundary):-

This application is based on objective evidence and is not a land use decision; therefore, the decision is not subject to public notice and may only be appealed by the applicant.

INSTRUCTIONS: Completely fill out this application form. Attach additional pages if necessary. Failure to submit a complete application or answer every question will result in a delay or rejection of your application.
The Preliminary Investigation will determine the presence of any hazards to the proposed development. If a significant hazard is found that requires further review, a Site Investigation Report will be required. Details regarding a Site Investigation Report are contained in Lane Code 10.270-55 to 10.270-80 and Lane Code 16.243(12) to $16.243(16)$.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION What are you proposing? What are you going to build?
THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF A 62 -LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION OF THREE TAX
LOTS THAT HAVE A BEACHES AND DUNES COMBINING DISTRICT OVERLAY.
ROADS AND UTILITIES WILL BE CONSTRUCTED TO SERVE THE SUBDIVISION.
SITE PLAN A site plan must be included. Refer to the handout entitled "How to prepare your site plan".

ZONING: RA, BD, U, PW
ACREAGE: 46.06

LOCATION Describe how to find the property. Is the address visible? Are there any identifying features?

FROM RHODODENDRON DRIVE TURN EAST ONTO OCEANA DRIVE. CONTINUE THROUGH THE INTERSECTION WITH SANDRIFT STREET TO THE END OF OCEANA DRIVE. THE PROPERTY ABUTS THE END OF OCEANA DRIVE. THE SITE IS VACANT AND HAS NO ADDRESS.

EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS Does the property contain any roads, structures, etc.?
NONE, EXCEPT FOR A STORMWATER PUMP STATION AND PIPE LOCATED ON TAX LOT 801 WHICH WILL REMAIN.

STAKE OUT THE DEVELOPMENT AREA. The location of the structure(s) must be staked out on the site and identified with colored ribbon or a similar item.

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Generally describe the vegetation. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features.
SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

LC 10.270 Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone: Applicable to land inside a UGB.
LC 16.243 Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone: Applicable to land outside a UGB.
These two sections from the Lane Code contain identical review and approval criteria for development in the Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone. The approval criteria are listed below.

Additional Site and Development Requirements. The following requirements apply to all development, except the harvesting of timber as allowed by the Zone with which the /BD-RCP Zone is combined. Timber harvesting activities shall conform to Oregon Forest Practices Act rules regulating logging practices in dune areas:
(a) Development shall not result in the clearance of natural vegetation in excess of that which is necessary for the structures, required access, fire safety requirements and the required septic and sewage disposal system.
Footprint of the proposed structure(s): $0 \quad$ sf
Total area of vegetation clearance: ( 16 AC ) 698,300 sf
Explain why your proposed vegetation clearance is not excessive: $\qquad$
SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
(b) Vegetation free areas which are suitable for development shall be used instead of sites which must be artificially cleared.
Does the property contain any vegetation-free areas?


If you are not using the vegetation-free area, explain why: $\qquad$
SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
(c) Areas cleared of vegetation during construction in excess of those indicated in LC 16.243(7)(a) above shall be replanted within nine months of the termination of major construction activity.
This will be a condition of approval.
(d) Sand stabilization shall be required during all phases of construction and postconstruction as specified by standards set forth in the Lane Manual.
If the site is comprised of sandy soil, you will be required to stabilize the soil during construction, and permanently stabilize the soil within 90 days after construction. Acceptable stabilization methods are listed in Lane Manual 10.056. If applicable, this will be included in the packet mailed to you.
(e) Development shall result in the least topographic modification of the site as is possible.

Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: $\qquad$
SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
(f) Slopes in excess of 25 percent shall be prohibited from development.

Do you plan to disturb any slopes greater than $25 \%$ ? If yes, explain: $\qquad$
SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
(g) Significant structural loads or structural fills to be placed on dune areas where, based on the Development Hazards Checklist, compressible subsurface areas are suspected, shall be allowed only after a thorough foundation check and positive findings are reported.

If applicable, an engineer may be required to prove the site can support the proposed structure. If so, this will be a condition of approval.
(h) The requirements for yards, setback, area, vision clearance and parking spaces shall be as provided in the respective zone with which the /BD-RCP Zone is combined, unless specifically provided otherwise by the provision of the/BD-RCP zone.
What is the property zoned: RA
What are the setbacks: 15-FOOT FRONT, 5-FOOT SIDE AND REAR
These setbacks and zoning will be verified by planning staff.

# Beaches and Dunes Combining Zone Preliminary Investigation Application for Idylewood Fourth Addition Additional Information 

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features. Include additional pages if necessary.

The subject property is best understood if we describe different sections separately as follows:

1) The northerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 1-19;
2) The central and westerly portion of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 20-41 and 57-62;
3) The southerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 42-56 and;
4) The easterly portion of the site not proposed for development.

A detailed discussion of the required grading and vegetation removal for each section is presented below.

It is important to note that other than for specifically surveyed transects, little accurate topographic information is available for this site. Available topographic mapping for the site was developed via aerial photographic means and due to the presence of extra-ordinarily thick vegetation is completely unreliable. In May of 2005, Applicant applied for and obtained from Lane County authorization to clear a portion of the site along proposed road alignments in order to obtain more accurate survey data on the site (Idylewood 5 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Addition Limited Clearing Plan, Florence, Oregon, May $16^{\text {th }}, 2005$ prepared by EGR \& Associates, Inc.). Elevations and features described herein were determined as a consequence of that clearing action and the survey data compiled after clearing occurred.

The northerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 1-19;

This area of the site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies across this portion of the site from an elevation of less than 82 feet MSL in the lowest areas to a high of approximately 123 feet MSL. This area of the site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood and Idylewood First Addition Subdivisions, on the north by the Heceta South Subdivision, and on the east by a coastal lake formation (see description of the easterly portion of the site below).

The geology of this portion of the site displays a classically formed transverse dune/deflation plain formation with relict incisions formed by the interplay between historic wind and water movements across the formation. These formations developed as the dune formation was formed with intermittent periods of sand blowing across the deflation plain and then being washed away by seasonal or cyclical movement of water across the deflation plain. These topographic incisions and the associated remnant sand between them are close together and steeply inclined where forces of erosion removed the sand placed by seasonal winds. Similar relict incisions can be observed across the Heceta South Subdivision to the north of the subject property. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development. Average slopes across this portion of the site in an east-west orientation are approximately $6 \%$.

The easterly fringe of this portion of the site drops abruptly at the lee side of the dune formation by as much as 35 to 40 feet and at a slope of approximately $50 \%$ to the edge of the coastal lake formation described below (see description of the easterly portion of the site). This "ridge" along the top of the old dune feature is at an elevation of approximately 110 feet MSL near the Heceta South Subdivision, rises to a peak of approximately 123 feet MSL approximately 250 feet south of the Heceta South Subdivision, and then falls to an elevation of approximately 100 feet MSL in the vicinity of proposed lot 23.

Another narrow interim dune peak also occurs and lying along a north-south orientation beneath the proposed north-south extension of Oceana Drive and the proposed utility easement south of Oceana Drive. Peak elevations along this alignment vary from approximately 100 feet MSL to 118 feet MSL.

Further west, the site is generally flatter with elevations varying from approximately 85 feet MSL to approximately 95 feet MSL but being incised by the aforementioned erosional actions.

Proposed Lots 24-28 and Lot 62 topographically transition from the features described herein to the portion of the site described below and included therein as the central and westerly portion of the site.

## The central and westerly portion of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 20-41 and 57-62

This area of the site is characterized as a relatively flat and well-stabilized inactive sand dune formation covered with dense vegetation. Topography varies across from an elevation of less than 86 feet MSL in the lowest areas of the site to a high of approximately 92 feet MSL. This portion of the site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood First Addition Subdivision, on the north by the northerly section of the site as described above, and on the east by a coastal lake formation (see description of the easterly portion of the site below).

The geology of this portion of the site displays a subtle transverse dune/deflation plain formation with the highest elevations occurring along the proposed Bear Run Road alignment. Associated housing will also be located along this highest area of this portion of the site.

Minimal clearing and grading will be required on this portion of the site for development to occur.

## The southerly section of the site - generally consisting of the following proposed lot numbers 42-56 and;

This area of the site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies from an elevation of less than 88 feet MSL in the lowest areas to a high of approximately 140 feet MSL. This portion of the site is bordered on the north by the Idylewood First Addition Subdivision and the central and westerly portion of this proposed subdivision, on the south and west by the Idylewood Second Addition Subdivision, and on the east by public lands.

The geology of this portion of the site displays a series of irregularly located high and low features suggesting that when the dune site was active it was subject to irregular and changing local influences resulting in other than "classically formed transverse" (south-west or north-west trending) dune/deflation plain formations. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development. Because of the odd orientation of these features, there are no "average slopes" across this portion of the site.

In order to provide access to this site with roadways meeting conventional design standards and to avoid adversely impacting adjacent neighboring properties, grading activity will be required during project development.

## The easterly portion of the site - not proposed for development.

This area of the site is characterized as a coastal lake formation and also has a Lane County Planning PW-RCP zoning overlay. Seasonally and cyclically, water levels rise and fall across this portion of the site in response to movements in groundwater levels. Distinct areas of predominantly water are separated by interim ridges of higher ground vegetated with upland vegetation. Water levels between these distinct water bodies varies in response to the regional groundwater gradient that slopes approximately one foot in 400 feet in the vicinity of the project in an eastwest orientation toward the Siuslaw River approximately one mile to the west.

The geology of this portion of the site displays deflation plain characteristics except as separated by the separating sand formations described above. Elevations of this portion of the site are generally flat and vary from lows of 80 to 82 feet MSL to highs of approximately 90 feet MSL along the dividing sand formations.

During some years, when the seasonal and cyclical groundwater levels are low, most of this area is devoid of water and the site takes on the physical appearance of a coastal bog. When seasonal and cyclical groundwater levels are high, the site takes on the characteristics of a shallow water body.

No known channelized inflow or outflow channels exist from these features and the site is understood to be solely a reflection of groundwater levels.

No development, clearing, or grading is proposed for this portion of the site.

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

## (a) Explain why your proposed vegetation clearance is not excessive:

The required clearing area is the minimum that will be necessary in order to construct roads, utilities, and to provide suitable building locations for the proposed development. In areas where irregular topography exists and proposed overall grading will occur, re-vegetation and sand stabilization will occur within the timelines required by other sections of this code. We consider this course of general grading and then re-vegetation to provide less overall disruptive impact than would occur if only road and utility infrastructure areas were initially cleared and graded and then followed on a case by case random basis as lots are developed one at a time with grading impacts and/or structural damage potentially occurring across proposed lot lines.

As previously described, some proposed roadway alignments were cleared of vegetation in 2005 in conjunction with an approved limited clearing plan and five years later, the impact of this clearing can hardly be discerned.

Portions of the site that do not require grading or installation of roads or utility infra-structure are not proposed to be cleared at the time of Subdivision development.

## (b) Vegetation free areas which are suitable for development shall be used instead of sites which must be artificially cleared.

If you are not using the vegetation free area, explain why:
Generally speaking, vegetation free areas of the site are not suitable for development as they occur on portions of the site overlain by seasonal water bodies that are protected by other sections of Lane Code and that are proposed to remain in a common area or eventually be dedicated to a public or conservation agency.
(e) Development shall result in the least topographic modification of the site as is possible.

Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain:
Yes. Grading activity will generally coincide with the above described clearing activity. The proposed grading activity and the proposed clearing activity are the minimum that will be necessary in order to construct roads, utilities, and to provide suitable building locations for the proposed development.

## (f) Slopes in excess of 25 percent shall be prohibited from development.

## Do you plan to disturb any slope greater than 25\%? If yes, explain:

Yes, on a localized basis (a few feet to tens of feet) existing slopes over portions of the site are in excess of $25 \%$ due to erosional incision and/or irregular and highly localized forces during dune formation. During prior conversations with Lane County Planning staff, these localized slopes were discussed in the context of the Code's intent. As we understand the intent of the Code, it is to prevent uncontrolled development on slopes that are, or may be unstable so as to minimize property damage to existing and future development. Because most of these steeper slopes are localized, grading activity on the site can occur in a manner that eliminates slopes in excess of $25 \%$ from the proposed development areas while preserving the significant features of the site and maintains buffer areas adjacent to existing development, remaining slopes in excess of $25 \%$, and areas subject to the PW-RCP zoning overlay.

Development of this property cannot occur without this localized grading activity because roadways could not be built.

Because of the aforementioned topographic irregularities over certain areas of the site, we propose to mass grade the internal portions of the site where roadways and building pads will be located. This approach will minimize future disturbance by completing all required clearing and grading at one time. In so doing, vegetation will be allowed to promptly re-establish itself and remain generally undisturbed at the time of lot development except where structures are located. This will minimize the potential impacts of sporadic lot development (anticipated with the poor building market) and disturbance that could cross lot lines if not completed at the time of subdivision development.

The nature of other development in this area is to maintain vegetative buffers between adjacent dwellings. It is the Developer's intent to maintain to the maximum extent possible, this development nature with this subdivision. By mass grading only those areas that must be graded for development to occur and completing most required clearing activity at the time of development of the subdivision, these internal buffer areas will be re-established sooner and prior to most lot development activity occurring.

Specific grading plans will be submitted with design drawings for the subdivision. As indicated above, the proposed grading activity and the proposed clearing activity will be the minimum that will be necessary in order to construct roads, utilities, and to provide suitable building locations for the proposed development.

## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

## LAND USE APPLICATION Legal Lot Verification with Notice

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E 8 th AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 Planning: 682-3807
For Office Use Only FILE \# PAIO5823 CODE: DALLVRN DEEDS: $\frac{5 \times 128}{640} \xrightarrow{\text { FEE: } 1508}$

## 8

Applicant (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC. 2148

Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402 Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Applicant Signature: $\qquad$ hare 984 butler.

Land Owner (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541) 688-6402 Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Land Owner Signature: $\square$ 4 mitten

Zone: RA, BD, U, PW Was this property used to qualify a tract for a dwelling? Yes No


VACANT - NONE
Site address

PROPOSAL: Approval of a final legal lot determination and notice, pursuant to Lane Code 13.020.

## REQUIRED SUBMITTAL

- The property description card. This is available in the Assessment and Taxation Department.
- Submit every deed listed on the description card. Deeds are available at the Deeds \& Records Office.
- The tax map for the subject property. This is available in the Assessment and Taxation Department.
- The applicable fee. The fee for the legal lot research is a base fee plus a fee for the number of deeds and other documents needed to make a determination. When additional documents are required fees will be charged for each document.
- This application form.
- Please make all copies single sided on $8{ }^{1 / 22^{\prime \prime}} \times 11^{\prime \prime}$ paper and DO NOT STAPLE.


0 AGR
SHANE HUGftes Version 3/2009

# CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 

PA10-5823
HOLDINGS
3-14-2011

This is to certify that I, Chris Rogers, mailed Notification of


To the persons) shown on the attached copy of mailing labels \&/or attached letter, and delivered said information to the authorized agent for the us Post Office in Eugene, Oregon on

DATE MAILED:


END OF COMMENT PERIOD: $\qquad$

APPEAL DEADLINE:


NOTE: Surrounding property owners listed are "the owners of record of all property on the most recent property tax assessment rolls" on RLID as per Lane Code $14.300(3)(\mathrm{d})$. If a tax lot appears on the notice list $\&$ there are no corresponding addresses then the tax records have not been updated; therefore, these property owners were not notified.

# NOTICE OF PENDING LAND USE DECISION BY THE LANE COUNTY PLANNING DIRECTOR 

Department File:
Property Owner(s):
Applicant:
Agent:
Map \& Tax Lot:
Property Address:
Acreage:
Contiguous Ownership:
Base Zone:
Comprehensive Plan:

PA10-5823
Benedick Holdings, LLC
Benedick Holdings, LLC
none
18-12-10-40-00400/401 \& 18-12-10-34-00801 (Combined)
Vacant
46 acres
None
Suburban Rural Residential (RA)
Florence Rural Comprehensive Plan (/RCP)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION
http //www LaneCounty org/PW_LMD/

You own or occupy property near the above referenced properties that is the subject of a land use application and pending decision for conditional Approval of this application by the Lane County Planning Director.

Notice to mortgagee, lien holder, vendor or seller: ORS Chapter 215 requires that if you receive this notice, it must be forwarded to the purchaser.

The purpose of this notice is to inform you about the proposal and pending decision, where you may receive more information, and the requirements if you wish to appeal the pending decision by the Director to the Lane County Hearings Official. Any person who is adversely affected or aggrieved or who is entitled to written notice may appeal the decision by filing a written appeal in the manner and within the time period as provided below. Mailing of this notice to you precludes an appeal directly to the Land Use Board of Appeals.

PROPOSAL: To obtain a Final Legal Lot decision pursuant 13.020 for tax lot 18-12-10-40-00400/401 \& 18-12-10-34-00801 (Combined). This proposal is for 1 parcel only. (See vicinity map of legal lot configuration)

## FINDINGS OF FACT AND COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS.

The information and findings submitted by the applicant in support of this application to address the applicable requirements were reviewed and found to be thorough and accurate. Therefore, the Director adopts the applicant's information and findings along with the staff report in support of the decision to approve this application and hereby incorporates the application by reference as part of the record.

The application, all documents and evidence relied upon by the applicant, the applicable criteria, and a copy of the Lane County Planning Director's report are available for inspection at the Lane County Land Management Division at no cost, and copies will be provided at reasonable cost. The name of the Lane County Land Management Division representative to contact Jeremy Sherer and the telephone number where more


This decision will become final at 5 P.M. on $3 / 28 / 4$ unless before this time a completed APPLICATION FOR AN APPEAL OF A DECISION BY THE PLANNING DIRECTOR form is submitted to and received by the Lane County Land Management Division. This form is enclosed and must be used if you wish to appeal this decision.

1. To complete this form, fill in the required information and attach to it all of the materials and information required in numbers 2,3 and 6 of the appeal form.
2. Then, submit the completed form to Lane County Planning Director so that it is received by him or her prior to the above mentioned time that the decision becomes final.
3. The Lane County Planning Director shall reject an appeal if it is not received prior to the time that the decision becomes final or if it is not complete.

Failure of an issue to be raised in a hearing, in person or in writing, or failure to provide statements of evidence sufficient to afford the Approval Authority an opportunity to respond to the issue precludes raising the issue in an appeal to the Land Use Board of Appeals.


## EXHIBITS

A. Staff Report
B. Conditions of Approval
C. Vicinity Map with Property Configuration

## Exhibit A

## Staff Report

## Report Date:

Department File:
Property Owner(s):
Applicant:
Agent:
Map \& Tax Lot:
Property Address:
Acreage:
Contiguous Ownership:
Base Zone:
Staff Planner:

## $3|14| 11$

PA10-5823
Benedick Holdings, LLC
Benedick Holdings, LLC
none
18-12-10-40-00400/401 \& 18-12-10-34-00801 (Combined)
Vacant
46 acres
None
Suburban Rural Residential (RA)
Jeremy Sherer, (541) 682-3989

## I. PROPOSAL AND DETERMINATION

To obtain a Final Legal Lot per Lane Code Chapter 13.020 for a parcel known as tax lot 18-12-10-40-00400/401 \& 18-12-10-34-00801 (Combined). The purpose of this Legal Lot Verification with Notice is to determination that the subject property was created prior to and/or in conformance with Lane Code and other applicable law. Pursuant to LC 13.020, this determination shall become final when it is made and noticed.

CONCLUSION: As defined in Lane Code 13.010, the subject property is a parcel. This staff report has preliminarily determined that the subject property is a legal lot. This preliminary legal lot becomes final at the conclusion of the Notice.

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On 11/18/2010, a Legal Lot Verification with Notice was submitted to Lane County Land Management Division. The application was reviewed and accepted as complete on 12/15/2010.

## III. SITE INFORMATION

A. Site Description

Property Descriptions:
This parcel is known as tax lot 18-12-10-40-00400/401 \& 18-12-10-34-00801 (Combined) and is described in Warranty Deed 2007-083806, dated 12/21/2007

## B. Zoning and Land Division Background

The first comprehensive Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Ordinance 3 and 4, were adopted in 1949.

The first partition regulation for these properties were adopted on May 2, 1962. Lane County adopted property line adjustment regulations on January 8, 2010.

The first zoning regulation for these properties were adopted on May 22, 1964 to RA.

## IV. APPROVAL CRITERIA AND ANALYSIS

Approval is subject to satisfaction of Lane Code 13.010, definition of a legal lot. Criteria is in italics followed by staff findings

Conformity with Definition of a Legal Lot, Pursuant to Lane Code Chapter 13.010: A lawfully created lot or parcel. A lot or parcel lawfully created shall remain a discrete lot or parcel, unless the lot or parcel lines are vacated or the lot or parcel is further divided as provided by law..

Finding 1: The parent parcel was created lawfully and reconfigured as provided by law. See definition of a parcel, the next finding s

## Parcel:

(1) Includes a unit of land created:(a) By partitioning land as defined in LC 13.010.
(b) In compliance with all applicable planning, zoning and partitioning ordinances and regulations; or(c) By deed or land sales contract if there are no applicable planning, zoning or partitioning ordinances or regulations.
(2) It does not include a unit of land created solely to establish a separate tax account.

Finding 2: This unit of land was created as a separate parcel on $7 / 14 / 1943$ by Warranty Deed Book 267, Page 391 and reconfigured by Property Line Adjustment RR\# 2012R/9479519, dated 11/07/1994 along with CSF 32321, and by Land Partition (Replat) 2001-P1501, dated 10/09/2001
VI. FINAL Based upon the above findings and the conditions as applied, the subject property is a parcel. Therefore, APPROVAL is granted for a Final Legal Lot pursuant Lane Code 13.020 for this parcel subject to conditions stated in Exhibit B of this staff report.

## EXHIBIT B

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL PA10-5823

> All of the following conditions are binding on the applicant or successive owner(s) of the parcel or successive applicant(s) who exercise this approval action.

## GENERAL CONDITIONS AND INFORMATION

1. A Final Legal Lot Determination means:
a. Ownership in this property may be conveyed with the assurance that it will not require approval by Lane County under its land division regulations; and
b. Lane County will recognize this property as a legally separate unit of land for the purposes of development. Nevertheless, development will still be subject to applicable zoning, sanitation, access, and building regulations
2. A Final Legal Lot Determination does not mean:
a. a creation of a new lot, parcel, gap or overlap,
b. a guaranty of continued recognition of prior land use approvals based on a specific location or on a particular parcel,
c. a creation or determination of written or unwritten real property rights, ownership, title, or boundary location, and a final legal lot determination does not mean
d. the parcel has been verified to have legal access as defined by LC 15.055.

It is your responsibility to work with the identified departments to assure that the conditions are satisfactorily met within the prescribed time period.

## EXHIBIT C

## VICINITY MAP WITH PROPERTY CONFIGURATION



Note: This is only a graphical representation to aid in locating the approximate location of the subject property(ies). It is not intended to depict the actual location of the boundary nor is it the result of a survey. Information shown is based upon information provided by the Applicant.


## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 Planning: 682-3807 Building: 682-3823 Sanitation: 682-3754

For Office Use Only FILE \# CODE: HOAPPEAL FEE: $\$ 250$ Crer

## Appellant

Mailıng address $\qquad$


Appellant's Representative $\qquad$
Marling address $\qquad$

Signature $\qquad$

## LOCATION (subject property)

$\overline{\text { Township }}$ Range Section $\quad$ Taxlot $\quad$ Subdivision/partition $\quad$ lot/parcel

Required submittals. Your appeal application will be rejected if it does not contain all the required information.

1. A copy of the decision being appealed, with the department file number $\qquad$
2 The $\$ 250$ appeal fee, payable to Lane County
2. The appeal deadlune, as stated in the Drector's Decision $\qquad$
3. Check one of the items below to identify your party status with the right to appeal the Director's decision
__ I am the owner or contract purchaser of the subject property,
__ I am the apphcant for the subject application,
__ Prior to the decision by the Director, I submitted written testimony into the record
_ I am not one of the persons mentioned above, but wish to appeal the Director's decision for the reasons explauned in my letter
4. A letter that addresses each of the following three standards
a. The reason(s) why the Drector's decision was made in error or why the Director should reconsider the decision,
b An identification of one or more of the following general reasons for the appeal, or request for reconsideration

- The Director exceeded his or her authority;
- The Director failed to follow the procedure applicable to the matter;
- The Director rendered a decision that is unconstitutional,
- The Director misinterpreted the Lane Code, Lane Manual, State Law, or other applicable criteria
c The Director should reconsider the decision to allow the submittal for additional evidence not in the record that addresses complance with the applicable standards or criteria

6. Any additional information in support of your appeal
(Version 4/2010)

## PA10-5823

HOLDINGS
3-14-2011

1812103403200
ABBONIZIO WAYNE A P PO BOX 188
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103106400
ADAMS BERTHAL
04966 OCEANA DR
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302800
ALTA M TAYLOR TRUST
84955 HWY 101 S
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103105400
ASHTON TRUST
4960 SANDRIFT CRT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108400
BAKER JACK H \& DORIS V
87838 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103405800
BALDI JOHN F \& MARIA C 87635 WOODMERE EAST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104001300
BALL MAY I TE
PO BOX 1018
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104000500
BATCHELDER NANCY S
PO BOX 935
YACHATS, OR 97498

1812103400100
BEACH GARY M \& CATHERINE A
87723 SALTAIRE ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103400801
1812104000400/401
BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC
27922 WARD LN
EUGENE, OR 97402
1812104000100
BOGGS PAUL DANIEL \& MONA DEE
PO BOX 387
SPRAGUE RIVER, OR 97639
1812103407200
CAMPBELL ALEXANDER J \& ELIZABETH L
87640 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100800
CAMPBELL DAVID J \& DIANE E 4985 GULLSETTLE CRT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103101100
CAPUTO RONALD A \& JUDY E
87729 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103400300
CARRUTHERS RONALD
87694 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103405600/700
CHARLES P \& DIANNE NOBLE GILMOUR TRUST
87629 WOODMERE ST E
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104001000
CLARK JAMES M \& HEIDI A
05180 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE, OR 97439

```
1812103406000
CLAUSEN ROBERT E
87630 WOODMERE EAST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
```

1812103100500
COLIN C HEIBERT TRUST 04906 GLORIA GAYLE WAY
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104000300
CONDLEY SHAWN S \& ANGIE L
PO BOX 1557
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104000800/900
COX OSCAR R
05176 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104001300
DERRICKSON THELMA MAY TE
PO BOX 1018
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108200
DOBSON RICHARD L \& DONNA M
PO BOX 1739
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103400300
DODD ELKE
87694 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103105200
DONNELLY GARY L \& SHERRI K
87740 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100200
DUKE KENT F \& CAROL G
87827 SANDRIFT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103405901

DURST WILLIAM F 87649 WOODMERE EAST FLORENCE, OR 97439

1812101302100<br>FLESHER AHL S \& CYNTHIA G 1820 MADELYNNE CRT<br>TURLOCK, CA 95382

1812103100300
FOX M JAMES \& MARTHA C 87803 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100900
GARDINER FAMILY TRUST
87737 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103405700
GILMOUR DIANNE NOBLE TE 87629 WOODMERE ST E FLORENCE, OR 97439

1812103101300
HALL WILLIAM \& CATHEY M 87701 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302200
HARRAH LINDA L \& MICHAEL R 87863 KELSIE WAY
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104001402
HAWKINS BEN \& ROSE
PO BOX 2186
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812100000101
HEAD JAMES \& EILEEN
5139 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101301400
HECETA INC
PO BOX 3467
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108100
HERSHEY CHRISTINA G
85574 GLENADA RD
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101301000HILL RICKEY L SR \& DONNA M87919 WOOD LAKE WAY SFLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100700
ISHII JOINT TRUST
87757 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302900
JOHNSON FAMILY TRUST
5046 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103408000
KENNETH L URWIN TRUST
4929 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302500/600
KING CHARLES M \& BETTY B5009 KELSIE CT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103105300
KINSLOW JANICE A
87772 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101304600/700
1812102000400, 1812104001600
LANE COUNTY LAND OWNED
125 E 8TH AVE
EUGENE, OR 97401
1812103106300
LARA ROBERT Y \& NANCY L
87786 SANDRIFT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103405901
LEHMAN MARY H
87649 WOODMERE EAST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302300
LEWIS GEORGE E
5043 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108000
LEWIS JACK \& BARBARA L EVANS TRUST
87810 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100400
LOUISE HIX TRUST
PO BOX 188
AZALEA, OR 97410
1812103408100
MCCAULEY DONNA \& JIMMY
87684 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108100
MCCONNELL MARIA
87814 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302700
MCCORD MATTHEW P \& ESTHER M
PO BOX 407
VALLEYFORD, OR 99036
1812103407900
MCDONALD LIVING TRUST
4933 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103105100
MEHURON ARLENE G TE
87730 SANDRIFT ST

FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103105100
MEHURON REX D TE
87730 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302400
MENDONCA FAMILY LIVING TRUST
5033 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103105000
MILLER MICHAEL J \& PATTI J
87720 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103407700/800
PETERSON ROBERT R \& CORREEN B 4937 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108500
PILCHER RANDALL J \& SUSAN R
87842 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103407600
POTTS CHARLES J \& EDITH M 4938 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103101200
PURSCELLEY ROBERT R \& CECELIA G
87623 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103406200
ROATH FAMILY TRUST
PO BOX 2707
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103406200
ROATH REGINA TE
PO BOX 2707
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103407100
ROBERTSON LIVING TRUST
87659 WOODMERE W
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103403300
ROGERS DONALD E \& CAREN J
87660 WOODMERE WEST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103407500
RONALD L \& SUZANNE VIERSEN-SLOAN REV TRU
87678 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104001800
SANDRA R JEREMIAH BYPASS TRUST
PO BOX 466
PLEASANT HILL, OR 97455
1812103108300
SHOYS PETER KILLIAN \& CHRISTINE MARIE
87836 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812101302000
SIKORA JAMES \& JANE
87885 KELSIE WAY
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103101000
SPIVEY WILLIAM F III \& J A
87733 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812104001500/1701
THOMPSON BETTY A
4354 SPRUCE ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103108600
TRUST DATED 06/26/03
87843 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439

1812103407400
UDT 11/02/04
PO BOX 2695
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103407300
ULMAN BEVERLY \& LOHMA
PO BOX 2570
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103406100
WADE OTIS A \& AMY C
87661 WOODMERE WEST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100600
WATKINS CARL D \& RONETTA B 1259 GREENWOOD DR NE KEIZER, OR 97303

1812104001100
WILSON MITCHELL \& LUCILLE
05190 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103100101
WILSON PAUL M \& JO ANN
87849 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE, OR 97439
1812103403100
WOODS FRANK N \& ROSEMARY R
4914 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE, OR 97439

December 15, 2010
Lane County Land Management Division
Attention: Jeremy A. Sherer, PLS
125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ Ave.
Eugene, OR 97401
RE: Legal Lot Verification PA 10-5823
Dear Jeremy:

In response to the Notice of Incomplete Land Use Application dated December 14, 2010, we request that the above referenced application be processed as submitted with the following explanation.

From the record it appears that the three tax lots combined would constitute one legal lot.
Tax Lots 400 \& 401 were one parcel in 1943 Deed Book 267, Page 391. The date of this document is sufficient to show that the combined Tax Lots constitute a legal lot.
Tax Lot 401 was separated by Contract in 1977, Reel 842R \#7721753, leaving 400 as a remainder. This division appears to create two illegal parcels. The parcels were recombined under one ownership in 1980 by Deed Reel 1085R \#8036142 and Contract Reel 1067R \#8019003.
In 1994 a property line adjustment, Reel 2012R \#9479519, was completed between Tax Lot 401 and presumably at that time Tax Lot 800. This adjustment was in preparation for Idylewood Second Addition and is depicted on CSF 32321. For some reason the adjusted portion of Tax Lot 800 was denoted as Tax Lot \#801 rather than incorporated within Tax Lot 401.

The current proposal involves subdividing the combined Tax Lots 400,401 and 801 and it is our opinion that the 1994 adjustment should be considered an adjustment between the combined legal lot of Tax Lots 400 \& 401 and the adjoining Tax Lot 800.
If you need any additional information or would like to discuss this further please feel to contact me.

Sincerely,
EGR \& Associates, Inc.


## Cc: Gene Benedick

## SHERER Jeremy A

From: SHERER Jeremy A
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 11:15 AM
To: 'Ryan Erickson'
Cc: 'ejbenedick@msn.com'
Subject: RE: Benedick Legal Lot - PA 10-5823

December 15, 2010
Benedick Holdings, LLC
27922 Ward Lane
Eugene, OR 97402

Subject: PA10-5823, DALLVRN for tax lots 400/401, tax map 18-12-10-40 \& tax lot 801, tax map 18-12-10-34, combined
Received on: 11/18/2010
Proposal: Final Legal Lot Verification with Notice
The land use application(s) referenced above has/have been deemed complete and accepted for processing pursuant to Lane Code (LC) 14050 (3) Acceptance as a complete application does not involve determining if the application is approvable based on the applicable approval criteria it is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the applicatıon meets the approval criteria The information provided by the applicant may or may not be adequate for this purpose

Staff are required by LC 14.050(3)(b)(iv) to mall this written notice to the applicant when an application is deemed complete Once assigned, staff will process your application(s) according to LC 14 050(4). Staff will process your application and evaluate whether the approval criteria are met A land use decision with findings of fact and conditions of approval will then be mailed to the applicant, parties of record and surrounding property owners. Absent an appeal and upon expiration of the 12 day appeal period, your land use decision becomes final.

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact our adminıstrative staff, Chris Rogers at (541) 682-3347.

Sincerely,
Jeremy A. Sherer, PLS
Engineering Associate
Lane County Planning Department

From: Ryan Erickson [mailto:rerickson@egrassoc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 10:39 AM
To: SHERER Jeremy A
Cc: 'Clint Beecroft'
Subject: Benedick Legal Lot - PA 10-5823
Jeremy,
Attached is the letter you requested outlining the history of the three tax lots.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Ryan Erickson, PLS
Professional Surveyor
EGR \& Associates
2535 B Prairie Rd
Eugene, OR 97402

Office: (541) 688-8322
Cell: (541) 914-0711
Fax: (541) 688-8087

# Notice of Incomplete Land Use Application 

## Owners:

Benedick Holding LLC
27922 Ward Lane
Eugene, OR 97402

Applicant:<br>Benedick Holding LLC<br>27922 Ward Lane<br>Eugene, OR 97402

Subject: PA10-5823
Received on October 20, 2010

Proposal: A request for Director Approval of a Legal Lot Verification with Notice Application pursuant to the provisions of Lane Code 13.020

Your land use application is incomplete. Please see the attached list of item(s) needed. If the materials will not be submitted within 14 days, complete and return the enclosed "Applicant Intent Form."

If you have any questions concerning this notice or your application, please contact me.
S incerely,

Jan my A. Sherer, PLS
Ehgineering Associate
Lene County Land Management Division
125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ Ave
Eugene OR 97401
(541) 682-3989
(541) 682-3947 (FAX)
jeremy.a.sherer@co.lane.or.us

## Items needed to complete application PA10-5823

The following items need to be submitted to complete the application:

1. Lane Code Chapter 14.050 (1)(d) requires each application be accompanied by the appropriate filing fee. The application is for two legal lot verifications with notice on one application. The two legal lot determinations are 18-12-10-40-00400 \& 401 (Combined), and 18-12-10-34-00801. Please apply for an additional legal lot on one of the legal lot determinations and advise which tax lot goes to each application.

Please note that it is the applicant's responsibility to provide persuasive evidence that the application complies with the decision criteria. Supplying the requested information will provide the necessary persuasive evidence to document an objective decision.

## Applicant Intent Form

Date: December 14, 2010
Department File No.: PA10-5823
Received On: November 18, 2010

In order to help us process your application, please:

1. Check one box;
2. Sign \& date at the bottom;
3. Return in enclosed self-addressed envelope.

I I intend to submit the missing or incomplete materials as identified in the Incomplete Notice. I understand that according to State law I have up to 180 days from the date the application was submitted to provide the missing information, and that, on the 181st day after first being submitted, the application is void if the I have not submitted:
(a) All of the missing information; or
(b) Some of the missing information and written notice that no other information will be provided.

I do not intend to submit the missing or incomplete materials as identified in the Incomplete Notice. I understand that Lane County will proceed to review the application materials previously submitted. I understand that incomplete applications may not provide the necessary supporting information to demonstrate compliance with applicable criteria and standards and may result in the denial of my application.

- I wish to withdraw the application. I understand that Lane County will refund any portion of the application fee that has not been expended in the review of the application.

[^2]| From: | SHERER Jeremy A |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, December 14, 2010 8:50 AM |
| To: | 'clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com' |
| Subject: | Benedick Holding Legal Lot Verification PA10-5823 |
|  |  |
| Attachments: | PA105823 Incomplete.doc |

Mr. Beecroft,
I spoke to Mr. Benedick yesterday about the legal lot verification that was submitted by Sharla Whitten and he told me to contact you.

I have just completed the "completeness review" for two legal lots verifications on two separated tax lots (tax lot 801 and tax lots 400/401). These verifications require two applications - one application per tax lot.

I have attached the word doc I sent to Benedick Holdings for your convenience. The applicant will have to respond to the letter and apply for an additional legal lot verification.

1 left a message for you yesterday, so please let me know if you have any questions w?

PA105823
zomplete.doc ( 49 KE
Sincerely,
Jeremy A. Sherer, PLS
Engineering Associate
Lane County Planning Department

## AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:

Douglas A. Nelson
Gartland, Nelson, McCleery,
Wade \& Walloch, P.C.
44 Club Road, Suite 200
Eugene, OR 97401
UNTIL A CHANOE IS RBQUESTED,
MAIL ALL TAX STATEMENTS TO:


Benedick Holdings, LLC
Sharla A. Whitten and Judith M. Southwell, Managers
27922 Ward Lane
Eugene, OR 97402

## WARRANTY DEED - STATUTORY FORM

Julius E. Benedick and E. Justine Benedick, Grantor, conveys and warrants to Benedick Holdings, LLC, an Oregon limited liability company, Grantee, the real property in Lane County, Oregon, described on the attached Exhibit A, free of encumbrances, except as specifically set forth therein.

BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON TRANSPERRING PBE TTTLE SHOULD INQUIRE ABOUT THE PERSON'S RIGHTS, IF ANY, UNDER ORS 197 352. THIS INSTRUMENT DOES NOT ALLOW USE OP THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, BEPORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING TTTLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WTTH THB APPROPRLATE CITY OR COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO VERIFY APPROVED USES TO DETERMINB ANY LIMITS ON LAWSUITS AOAINST FARMING OR FOREST PRACTICES AS DEFINED IN ORS 30.930 AND TO NQUIRE ABOUT THE RIGHTS OF NEIGHBORNG PROPERTY OWNERS, IF ANY, UNDER ORS 197.352.

This conveyance is for no consideration, as it is the initial contribution to the LLC. The liability and obligations of Grantor and Grantees and Grantees' heirs and assigns under the warranties and covenants contained herein or provided by law shall be limited to the amount, nature and terms of any right or indemnification available to Grantor under any title insurance policy, and Grantor shall have no liability or obligation except to the extent that reimbursement for such liability or obligation is available to Grantor under any such title insurance policy.

Dated: December fo, 2007.
GRANTOR:


R Lustine Revedind
E.CUSTINE BENEDICK

## STATE OF OREGON ) ) ss. <br> County of Lane )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on December 20, 2007, by Julius E. Benedick and E. Justine Benedick.


Notary Public for Oregon

EXHIBIT A
Parcel I - Idylewood Phase 4. Tax_Acct. Nos, 1675071, 1675105, 1675188, 1675196, 1675295, 167339 and 1675303:

Lots 203, 206, 214, 215, 225, 226 and 228, Idylewood Third Addition, as platted and recorded in File 75, Slides 1188 and 1189 on December 21, 2001, Reception No. 2001-086511, Official Records of Lane County, Oregon.

Parcel II - Idylewood Phase 5, Tax Acct. Nos, 1181674 and 780484:
The Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 10, Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian in Lane County, Oregon.

Parcel LIL-- Idylewood Phase 5, Tax Acct.No. 1517844:
Beginning at a point being North $1^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ East 814.70 feet from the South one-quarter corner of Section 10, Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, said point being on the North-South center section line of said Section 10; thence leaving said North-South center section line North $77^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 158.87 feet; thence South $6^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 44^{n}$ West 136.21 feet; thence along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears South $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 76.25 feet) a distance of 86.71 feet; thence South $86^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 10.39 feet; thence North $37^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 285.00 feet; North $44^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime}$ East 141.42 feet; thence along the arc of a 120.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $65^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime}$ West 115.84 feet) a distance of 120.89 feet; thence North $4^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 60.00 feet; thence North $9^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West 145.69 feet; thence North $68^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East 153.02 feet; thence North $31^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ West 126.38 feet to the Southerly line of Idylewood 1st Addition as platted and recorded in File 73, Slides 744 and 745, Lane County Oregon Plat Records, in Lane County, Oregon; thence along said Southerly line South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 221.67 feet; thence North $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime}$ East 107.08 feet; thence along the arc of a 70.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $3^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 12.50 feet) a distance of 12.52 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 164.62 feet to said North-South center section line of Section 10; thence along said line South $1^{\circ} 477^{\circ} 0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ West 188.83 feet to the Southwest corner of the Northwest one quarter of the Southeast one quarter of said Section 10; thence South $1^{\circ} 46$ 07" West 506.24 feet to the point of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

EXCEPT THEREFROM that portion lying within Land Partition Plat No. 2001-P1501, as platted and recorded 10-09-01, Reception No. 2001-066548, Official Records of Lane County, Oregon.

## PARCEL IV - Fem Ridge Tax Acct. No. 1394962:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Borer tract as described in Deed recorded in Book 260, Page 459, Lane County Oregon Deed Records, said point being marked by a 3/8 inch iron rod set on the Southerly right of way of Wildrose Lane that is North $87^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ West 565.75 feet from the East $1 / 16$ th Corner on the North line of Section 24, Township 17 South, Range 5 West of the Willamette Meridian; run thence along said right of way North $87^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ West 56.86 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence along the arc of a 120.00 foot radius curve to the left, the long chord of which bears South $79^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime}$ West 53.67 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence along the arc of a 180.00 foot radius curve to the right, the long chord of which bears South $79^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime}$ West 80.49 feet, to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence North $87^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ West 508.63 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence leaving raid right of way South 1281.38 feet to a point 19.90 chains South of the North line of said Section 24, said point being marked by a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence South $87^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ East parallel with the North line of said Section 24, 695.16 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod being the Southwest corner
of the Borer tract herein above referred to; thence North $0^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime}$ East 1313.51 feet to the place of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

Parcel Y -- Fem Ridge, Tax Acct. No. 1394954:
Beginning at a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod that is South $2^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ West 30.00 feet from the Brass Cap marking the North $1 / 4$ corner of Section 24, Township 17 South, Range 5 West of the Willamette Meridian, said point also being on the Southerly right of way of Wildrose Lane; thence along said right of way South $87^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ East 61.70 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence leaving said right of way South 1281.38 feet to a point 19.90 chains South of the North line of said Section 24 and being marked by a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence North $87^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ West parallel with the North line of said Section 24, 700.39 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence North 1278.98 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rad set on said Southerly right of way; thence along said right of way South $87^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ East 638.59 feet to the place of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

## Parcel VI - Fern Ridge, Tax Acct. No. 497642 :

Beginning at a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod set on the Southerly right of way of Wildrose Lane, said iron rod being South $2^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ West 30.00 feet and North $87^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West 638.59 feet from the Brass Cap marking the North 1/4 Corner of Section 24, Township 17 South, Range 5 West of the Willamette Meridian; run thence along said right of way North $87^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West 379.90 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence continuing along said right of way North $87^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West 305.29 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod to the West line of Government Lot 2 of said Section 24 ; thence leaving said right of way South $2^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime}$ West along the Weat line of said Lot $2,1154.73$ feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod on the Northerly edge of the Amazon Channel; run thence along the Northerly right of way of said channel South $51^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ East 76.59 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence along the arc of a 1332.39 foot radius curve to the left, the long chord of which bears South $54^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ East 147.44 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence leaving said channel right of way South $88^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ East 336.99 feet to a Brass Cap marking the Northeast Corner of the R. Basket Donation Land Claim No. 49, Township 17 South, Range 5 West of the Willamette Meridian; thence South $87^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ East 211.28 feet to a $5 / 8$ inch iron rod; thence North 1278.98 feet to the place of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

Paxcel VI - Fern Ridge, Tax Acct. No. $497645:$
The north 30 feet of the following described property:
Lot 2 of Section 24 and that part of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter and that part of the Northeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of Section 24, described as follows:

Beginning at a point where the West line of the County Road intersects the North line of the said Northeast quarter being at a point 20 chains, more or less, West of the Northeast corner of said Section, thence running South 19.90 chains on the West line of said County Road; thence West 20 chains; thence North 1.20 chains; thence West 12.65 chains; thence North 18.70 chains to the North line of said Section; thence South $89^{\circ} 48^{\prime}$ East 32.65 chains, more or less, to the place of beginning, all in Township 17 South, Range 5 West, Willamette Meridian, in Lane County, Oregon;

EXCEPT that certain tract conveyed to Mae Borer by Deed reconded January 12, 1944, at Page 459 of Volume 260, Lane County Oregon Deed Records, Lane County, Oregon.

ALSO EXCEPT 1.22 acres out of New Plat of FRV Subdivision per File 72, Slide 186, for 1979-80.

## DECLARATION OF PROPERTY LINE ADJUSTMENT

JULIUS E. BENEDICK and JUSTINE BENEDICK, husband and wife are the owner of two adjoining parcels of property referred to herein as Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. JULIUS E. BENEDICK and JUSTINE BENEDICK, husband and wife are setting forth this declaration to set an adjusted boundary line between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 to comply with Lane County Land Use Regulations and the provisions of ORS 92.190(4).

The reference to the legal description of the Parcel 1 property prior to this adjustment is contained in the deed recorded July 29, 1985, as Reception Number 8526542, Reel Number 1360;

The reference to the legal description of the Parcel 2 property prior to this adjustment is contained in the deed recorded July 23, 1980, as Reception Number 8036142, Reel Number 1085;

Following this lot line adjustment, the description of the Parcel 1 property is described on the attached Exhibit "A". Following this lot line adjustment, the description of the parcel 2 property is described on the attached Exhibit "B".

The portion of the legal description which depicts the new adjusted line between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 is described on the attached Exhibit "C".

7995904:18:94
The true consideration for this conveyance is $\$$
Dated this n day of noveunba, 199y.


AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO: WOBBE \& ASSOCIATES, INC. 510 KINGWOOD STREET POO. BOX 3093 FLORENCE, OREGON 97439 (503) 997-8411

THIS INSTRUMENT WILL NOT ALLOW USE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THIS INSTRUMENT IN VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS, BEFORE SIGNING OR ACCEPTING THIS INSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACQUIRING FEE TITLE TO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WITH THE APPROPRIATE CITY OF COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO VERIFY USES.

```
STATE OF OREGON )
) SS
    County of Lane )
```

on Novemben $\lambda$, 19 94, personally appeared the above named JULIUS E. BENEDICK and JUSTINE BENEDICK, husband and wife and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be a voluntary act and deed.


## "EXHIBIT A"

The North 60 feet of the following described property:
Beginning at a point where the East line of the Coast Guard County Road intersects the South line of the Northwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 10, Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, in Lane County, Oregon; thence Easterly along the South line of said Northwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 10,952 feet, more or less, to the Southeast corner of said Northwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 10; thence Northerly along the East line of said Northwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of said Section 10 , 990.0 feet to a point; thence West to the East line of the Coast Guard County Road; thence Southerly along the East line of said County Road, to the place of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

ALSO: The Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter and the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 10, Township 18 South, Range 12 West, of the Willamette Meridian, in Lane County, Oregon.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM: Beginning at a point which is located 390 feet South of the Northwest corner of the Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 10 , Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, Lane County, Oregon; thence Southerly 930 feet along the West line of said Northeast quarter of the Southwest quarter of Section 10; thence Easterly 120 feet to a point; thence Northerly 930 feet to a point; thence Westerly 120 feet to the place of beginning.

EXCEPT: Beginning at a point being North $1^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ East 814.70 feet from the South one-quarter corner of Section 10 , Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, said point being on the North-South center section line of said Section 10 ; thence leaving said North-South center section line North $77^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 158.87 feet; thence South $6^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ West 136.21 feet; thence along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears South $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 76.25 feet) a distance of 86.71 feet; thence South $86^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 10.39 feet; thence North $37^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 285.00 feet; North $44^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime}$ East 141.42 feet; thence along the arc of a 120.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $65^{\circ} 58^{\prime \prime} 12^{\prime \prime}$ West 115.84 feet) a distance of 120.89 feet; thence North $4^{\circ} 49^{\prime \prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 60.00 feet; thence North $9^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West 145.69 feet; thence North 68"57'42" East 153.02 feet; thence North $31^{\prime \prime} 46^{\prime \prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ West 126.38 feet to the Southerly line of IDYLEWOOD IST ADDITION as platted and recorded in File 73, Slides 744 and 745, Lane County Oregon Plat Records, in Lane County, Oregon; thence along said Southerly line South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime \prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 221.67 feet; thence North $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime 2} 8^{\prime \prime}$ East 107.08 feet; thence along the arc of a 70.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $3^{\circ} 19^{\prime \prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 12.50 feet) a distance of 12.52 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime \prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 164.62 feet to said North-South center section line of Section 10 ; thence along said line south $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ West 188.83 feet to the

Southwest corner of the Northwest one quarter of the Southeast one quarter of said Section 10 ; thence South $1^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ West 506.24 feet to the point of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

ALSO EXCEPT: IDYLEWOOD, as platted and recorded in File 73, Slides 488 and 489, Lane County Oregon plat Records, in Lane County, Oregon.

ALSO EXCEPT: IDYLEWOOD FIRST ADDITION, as platted and recorded in File 73, Slides 744 and 745 , Lane County Oregon Plat Records, in Lane County, Oregon.

## "EXHIBIT B"

The East half of the Northwest quarter of the Southeast quarter, and the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 10, Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette meridian, in Lane County, Oregon.

ALSO: Beginning at a point being North $1^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ East 814.70 feet from the South one-quarter corner of Section 10 , Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, said point being on the North-South center section line of said Section lo; thence leaving said North-South center section line North $77^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 158.87 feet; thence South $6^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ West 136.21 feet; thence along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears South $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 76.25 feet) a distance of 86.71 feet; thence south $86^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 10.39 feet; thence North $37^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 285.00 feet; North $44^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime}$ East 141.42 feet; thence along the arc of a 120.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $65^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime}$ West 115.84 feet) a distance of 120.89 feet; thence North $4^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 60.00 feet; thence North $9^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West 145.69 feet; thence North $68^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East 153.02 feet; thence North $31^{\circ} 46^{\prime \prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ West 126.38 feet to the Southerly line of IDYLEWOOD IST ADDITION as platted and recorded in File 73, Slides 744 and 745, Lane County Oregon Plat Records, in Lane County, Oregon; thence along said Southerly line South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime \prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 221.67 feet; thence North $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime 2} 8^{\prime \prime}$ East 107.08 feet; thence along the arc of a 70.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $3^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 12.50 feet) a distance of 12.52 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 164.62 feet to said North-South center section line of Section 10 ; thence along said line South $1^{\circ} 4^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ West 188.83 feet to the Southwest corner of the Northwest one quarter of the Southeast one quarter of said Section 10; thence South $1^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ West 506.24 feet to the point of beginning, in Lane County, oregon.

## "EXHIBIT C"

Beginning at a point being North $1^{\circ} 4^{\prime \prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ East 814.70 feet from the South one-quarter corner of Section 10 , Township 18 South, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, said point being on the NorthSouth center section line of said Section 10 ; thence leaving said North-South center section line North $77^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 158.87 feet; thence South $6^{\circ} 21^{\prime \prime} 44^{\prime \prime}$ West 136.21 feet; thence along the arc of a 50.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears south $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 76.25 feet) a distance of 86.71 feet; thence South $86^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime}$ West 10.39 feet; thence North $37^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ West 285.00 feet; North $44^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime}$ East 141.42 feet; thence along the arc of a 120.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North 65"58'12" West 115.84 feet) a distance of 120.89 feet; thence North $4^{\circ} 49^{\prime \prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 60.00 feet; thence North $9^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West 145.69 feet; thence North 68 ${ }^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East 153.02 feet; thence North $31^{\circ} 46^{\prime \prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ West 126.38 feet to the Southerly line of IDYLEWOOD 1ST ADDITION as platted and recorded in File 73, Slides 744 and 745, Lane County Oregon Plat Records, in Lane County, Oregon; thence along said Southerly line South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime \prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 221.67 feet; thence North $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime 2} 8^{\prime \prime}$ East 107.08 feet; thence along the arc of a 70.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $3^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 12.50 feet) a distance of 12.52 feet; thence South $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime \prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 164.62 feet to said North-South center section line of Section 10 ; thence along said line South $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ West 188.83 feet to the Southwest corner of the Northwest one quarter of the Southeast one quarter of said Section lo; thence South $1^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ West 506.24 feet to the point of beginning, in Lane County, Oregon.

The above described parcel contains 5.97 acres, more or less.
The above description is subject to title company concurrence, easements of record, questions of survey and local planning authority approval.


```
OWNERS
```

OWNERS
PARTITIONERS:
PARTITIONERS:
juuus E AND E JuSIINE benedick
juuus E AND E JuSIINE benedick
EUGENE OR 97402
EUGENE OR 97402
GARY MORRIS CONSTRUCHION INC
GARY MORRIS CONSTRUCHION INC
FORENCE, OR 97439
FORENCE, OR 97439
SURVEYOR- WOBGE \& ASSOCIATES INC

```
SURVEYOR- WOBGE & ASSOCIATES INC
```




```
PO NOX 3093/ F10 KINGWOOD ST
```

PO NOX 3093/ F10 KINGWOOD ST
FLORENCE. OREGON 97439
FLORENCE. OREGON 97439
PANO. PAOO-5552
PANO. PAOO-5552
ZONING: RA/U/BD

```
ZONING: RA/U/BD
```




```
    Ea, LANE COUNTY SURVEYOR (H)
```

```
    Ea, LANE COUNTY SURVEYOR (H)
```


## SURVEYORS CERTIFICATE:

1. EUGENE M WOBEE, REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, DO HEREEY CERIIF THAT THAVE CAUSED O BE SURVEYED
PROPER MONUENTS THE FOLOWWNG DESCRIBED PLAT


DISTANCE

## OWNERS DECLARATION

KNOW ALL MEN THAT CARY MORRIS CONSTRUCIION, INC AN OREGON CORPORATION
 PARTITIONED AND PLATTED AS SHOWN HEREON ACCORDING TO THE PROVIIION of The oregon revised statutes chapter az

GARY MORRIS CONSTRUCTION. INC


ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: ${ }_{\text {STATE OF OREGON }}^{\text {COUNTY OF LANt }}$ SS
PERSONALLY APPEARED BEFORE ME THE ABOVE NAMED GARY D MORRIS PRESIDENT OF GARY MORRIS CONSTRUCTION INC. AN OREGON CORPORATION WHO IS KNOWN TO ME T E THE INDIVIDUAL WHO EXECUED THE ABOVE NSTRUMEN AND HAS
acknowledged before methis 27 ${ }^{\text {TH }}$ day of February 200

## PARTITION PLAT

FOR JULIUS E AND E JUSTINE BENEDICK
GARY MORRIS CONSTRUCTION, INC
REPLAT OF LOT 131, IDYI. EWOOD SECOND ADDITION SW $1 / 4$. SEC 10 , T 18 S, R 12 W , W M

LANE COUNTY, OREGON
FE日RUARY 20, 2001
RECQRDED


## MARrATIVE <br> THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY WAS TO MONUMENT THE CORNERS OF LANE COUNTY PARTIION NO PA OO-5552 THE SOUTHERLY, EASTERLY AND WESTERLY BOUNDARY WAS ESTABLISHED FROM LOT 131 IDYLEWOOD SECOND ADDTIION THE NORTHERLY LINE WAS ESTABLISHED AT THE DIRECTION OF THE OWNER

- INDICETS $5 / 8^{\prime \prime} \times$ 30" IROM ROO SET MITH YELIOW PLASTIC

INDICATES MEASURED DATA SAME AS RECORD PER IDYLEWOO MONUMENTS CHECK WTHIN O 1 OF PLAT RECORD

## NOTES REQUIRED PER PA 00-5552:

ALL Development shall comply with the requirements or the beaches AND DUNES (/BD) COMBINING DISTRICT ANY DEVIATION FROM THE SITE PLAN

NOTES.
THIS SUBDIVSION IS AFFECTED BY "STATEMENT OF COMPATIBMITY/WAIVER NO 94-66156 OFFICIML RECORDS OF LANE COUNTY
THIS SUBOIVISION IS AFFEETED RY DECLARATION OF COVENANTS CONDITIONS 95-32B26 OFFICIAL RECORDS OF LANE COUNTY




LAND PARTITION PLAT NO 2001-P1501
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## 8036142

## 3RAYUSDET MEARAMYY DEED

 crantor, eonveys and warrants to Jukius E. Bratoscer and
 onemini interaat as tenante in compon, Oranters, the foliewing deacribed real property:

The Fast hale of the Northwast quarear of the goutheast guarter, and the fouthwest guarter of the Northmast quartan of the gouthadst quarter of Beotion 10. Townahip 18 gouth, मange is Wast of the fililamet, Noridian, in Lane County, Orgogon.

Grantor's coveaants only exaluda the enotufferandea ox other interests as lollows:

1. Deed of jrust, inaluding the kexme and proVisions thereof, axeouted by Lhoyd operations, Incorporatad, as grantor, to Mastarn Pioneor IHtie Co., truatea, for the bomatit of Harold P. Hiller and Daisy J. Milles, husband and wife, and Katharine 0 . geott, kenagledarys datad Eaptomber 23 , 1977, racorded Septembar 26, 1977, Rael 066 , Reception RO. 77-61093, official Booorde of fand County, oxegen, given to secure the payrant of a note for $\$ 15,000.00$.
2. Property taxea due Iane County, Oregon 11979 m 80 taxes pald in fuld, Map HO. 281210 4 402 Coda 97-11, Acoount No. 11816783.

The je Gunsideration for thit convoyanco is an exchange of proadsas whith cannot be valued in terma of dollars.

BLgned by authority of the Boand of Directorg, this lyfh day of July, 1980 .

1HOYD OPERATFONS, ENCORPORAPBG


Statutory Marranty Datd - 1



## PARTITION PLAT <br> ID E AND GARY MORR:S CONSTRUCTION, INC <br> REPLAT OF LOT 131, IDYI EWOOD SECOND ADDITION SW $1 / 4$, SEC 10 , T 18 S, R 12 W, W M LANE COUNTY, OREGON <br> FEBRUARY 202004 <br> 

## MarRATVE:

THE PURPOSC OF THIS SUAVIT WAS TO WOMUUENT THE CORNERS OF NNE OUmDAET mAS ESTABLSHED FROW LOT 131 iOLLEWOOD SECOND ADDITIC
 maRked "wobse - PLS 1093
MORATES S/8" PRON ROD FOUNT WITH YELOO PLASIIC CAN

* indicates measured data same as record per idmewood



## NOTES REOURRED PER PA 00-5552:

AL OEVELOPNENT SHALL COMPIY WITT THE RECUIREMENTS OF THE BEACHES NOD DUNES (/BD) COWAINUNG DISTRICT AM DEVATION FROM THF SITE PLAN

## NOTES.

THIS SUBOMSION IS ATFECTED BY "STATEMENT OF COMPATBLITY MAAVER

TWIT SUBODISION IS AFFECTEF DY DECLLRATION OF COVEMANTS CONDITIONS



 2001-P1501

|  |
| :---: |
|  |  |


$\frac{\text { thr }}{\text { atidn }}$
ACKNOWLEDCEMENT: STAT OF OREGON SS
mersohnily appenatio getore me the above named cary o morris presioent OF GART MORRIS CONSTRUGTON INE AN OREGON CORPORATION WHO IS «MOWN


ACKNOWLCOGCD FLFORE ME THIS 27TH OAY OF FEBRUARY Y__ 2001
MAP NO 18-12-10-3-4 TI 5900 \& 801

cancers lo JULIUS E. BENEDICK and E. JUSTINE BENEDICK, husband and wife

The true coinuderation for dids convarance is $\$$ property 1 ine adjus traent.
 LAND USE LAWS AND REGULATIONS. QEFORE SHENING OR ACCEPTING THIS ANSTRUMENT, THE PERSON ACCUIRANO FEE THLE YO THE PROPERTY SHOULD CHECK WIH THE APPROPRIATE CTY OR COUNTY PLANNINO DEPARIMENT TO VEEIFY APPROVED USES

Datar. August 26, 1994.




the Following daserlbed read property situated in
Lane
County Oregon ©Grantas, (1) page.

Dad Augustoe. 1994
 illilus_Ee Benedick and EL_ ilustine Benedick.


Uniti a change is roquatad, oll tox shatemenis chati be sent to tha following oderess: No change.

Altor recording peidurn to. Westorn Poneer Tilio Co., P.O. Box 101 46, Eugeno, Oregen 97440
$\square$ -


Florence, OH 97438
Phone (503) 997-0411
Description for Idylewood 2nd addition
property Line Adjustment
F24\8957pla.des
Beginning at a point being North 1'46'07" East 914.70 feet from the south one-quarter corner of section 20 , Township 18 south, Range 12 West of the Willamette Meridian, said point being on the Morth-8outh center section line of said section 10; thence leaving aaid North-8outh center section line North $77^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West 248.87 feet; thence south $52^{\circ} 53^{\prime 2} 25^{\prime \prime}$ West 120.00 feet; thence North $37^{\circ} 06^{\prime 3} 5^{\prime \prime}$ West 115.00 feet; thence North $44^{\prime} 45^{\prime \prime} 37^{\prime \prime}$ East 141.42 feet; thence along the aro of a 120.00 foot radius curve left (the chord of which bears North $65^{\prime} 58^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime}$ West 115.84 feet) a distance of 120.89 feet; thence North $4^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 60.00 feet; thence North $9^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West 145.69 teet; thence North $68^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East 153.02 feet; thence North $31^{\prime \prime} 46^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ Hest 126.38 feet to the southerly line of IDYLEHOOD 18T ADDIFIOM as platted and recorded in Elle 73, slides 744 and 745, Lane county oregon plat Records, in Lane county, oregon; thence along said southerly line south 88'12'32" East 221.67 feet; thence North $1^{\circ} 47^{\prime 2} 28^{\prime \prime}$ East 107.08 .feet; thence along the arc of a 70.00 foot radius curve laft (the ohord of whioh bears North $3^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ West 12.50 feet) a distance of 12.52 feet; thence Bouth $88^{\circ} 12^{\prime \prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ East 164.62 feet to said North-Bouth center section line of section 10; thence along sald line south $1^{\prime \prime} 4^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ West 188.83 feet to the southwest oorner of the Northwest one quarter of the southeast one quarter of said Section 10; thence south $1^{\prime 4} 46^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ West 506.24 feet to the point of beginning, in Lane County, oregon.

The above desoribed parcel contains 5.45 acres, more or leas.
The above description is subject to titlo company concurtence, easements of record, questions of aurvey and local planning authority approval.

Be it hereatter known and agreed that this parcel of land as desoribed above, which is adjacent to property described as the gast half of the Northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the Bouthweat quarter of the Northwest quarter of the gouthasis quarter of seotion 10, Tounshlg 18 8outh, Range 12 West of the Wlllamette Meridian, in Lane county, oregon, must be sold as one unit of land which includes the identified adjacent property, unless approved by the controlling land use governing body.







LANE COUNTY SURVCYORS OFFICE c s file no 22395 SURVEY RECEIVED $11-17-78$
FILE SIZE $14 \times 17$
fuling date $11-24-78$
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## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION



# LAND USE APPLICATION Preliminary Investigation Prime Wildlife Combining Zone 

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E 8 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 PLANNING: 682-3807

For Office Use Only. FILE \#


CODE: API
FEE: $\$ 1048.0$


Applicant (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGNE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402
Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Applicant Signature:


Agent (print name): EGR \& ASSOCIATES
Mailing address: 2535 B PRAIRIE ROAD, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-8322
Email: clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com
Agent Signature: $\qquad$

Land Owner (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402 Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Land Owner Signature: $\square$ hasa a Anita


PROPOSAL: A request for a Preliminary Investigation prior to development in the Prime Wildlife
Combining Zone, pursuant to Lane Code 16.238 . 10.245

This application is based on objective evidence and is not a land use decision; therefore, the decision is not subject to public notice and may only be appealed by the applicant.

Mr. Clint Beecroft
EGR \& Associates
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION
2535 B Prairie Rd.
Eugene, Or. 97402

Re: PA 10-5825, Prime Wildlife Shorelands Combining District (PW) Preliminary Investigation for proposed subdivision, Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition.

Dear Mr. Beecroft:

The Preliminary Investigation report for the pending Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition has been completed. It is found as the enclosed Exhibit B.

Refer to the conditions derived from this investigation, Exhibit A.

Procedurally, you have the right to appeal any or all parts of this investigation as per Lane Code 14.500. If you choose to appeal, such shall be filed no later than 5:00 pm. on May 1, 2012 using the enclosed appeal form.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions concerning this investigation.

Sincerely,


Jerry Kendall/Associate Planner (541-682-4057)

Exhibit A<br>Conditions attendant to PA 10-5825<br>Preliminary Investigation for the Prime Wildlife Combining Zone (PW) for $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition to Idylewood

1. The PW boundary is set at an elevation of 87 ' mean sea level (msl) around the seasonal lake as illustrated in Attachment D (note: 87 'msl = " 87 ' LIDAR Contour" on that attachment). Note: this boundary is independent of the wetland delineation (WD\#070747) approved by the Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL). Actions within the designated wetlands are subject to approval by the DSL.
2. No structures shall be allowed within $50^{\prime}$ upland of the above boundary (measured horizontally, LC 10.245-35).
3. No topographic modification shall occur within $50^{\prime}$ upland of $87^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$. PW boundary (measured horizontally). There is no variance option to this standard. (LC 10.245-30(5).
4. Artificial bank stabilization shall be allowed inside the PW boundary and the 50 ' buffer (described in \#2) only in unusual circumstances where natural erosion processes threaten critical wildlife habitat, provided that natural bank stabilization methods have been considered. Riprap used for bank stabilization must meet Army Corps of Engineers strength, size and design criteria unless the County Public Works Engineer, in coordination with the Planning Director determines this to be unnecessary and inadvisable. (Derived from Coastal Resources Management Plan (revised 1991), PW policy \#2, p.34)

Exhibit B

# Preliminary Investigation in the Prime Wildlife zone Staff Report 

Report Date:<br>Department File:<br>Property Owner/Applicant:<br>Agent:<br>Property Address:<br>Assessor's Map:<br>Acreage:<br>Base Zone:<br>Combining Zone:<br>Comprehensive Plan:<br>Site Visit Date:<br>Staff Planner:

April 19, 2012
PA 10-5825
Benedick Holdings LLC
Clint Beecroff/EGR \& Associates
None issued
18-12-10.4 Tax Lot: 400, 401 \& 801
46+ acres
Suburban Residential (RA, LC 10.135
Prime Wildlife (/PW) \& Beaches \& Dunes (/BD)
City of Florence Comprehensive Plan (1988 version)
March 29, 2012
Jerry Kendall, 541-682-4057

## I. PROPOSAL

Preliminary Investigation for a proposed $4^{\text {th }}$ addition to the Idylewood subdivision, located within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Florence, regarding the Prime Wildlife combining zone pursuant to the requirements of Lane Code 10.245-45. See proposed site plan, Attachment $A^{1}$.

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A preliminary investigation for the proposed development was conducted by staff in March of 2012, with an earlier field visit in 2011. The subject property is located within the UGB of Florence, and is situated east of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ addition to the Idylewood subdivision and south of the Heceta South subdivision. The property consists of $46+$ acres, with the PW district confined to the approximate area of the seasonal wetland lake found on the east side of the subject property. This lake, together with four others to the south (and not within the subject property) is known as one of the "South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes", according to the Coastal Resources Management Plan (revised, 1991).

Per that plan, the subject property is within the PW district as described on p. 86 of that plan. The rationale for this designation:

## 1. Area is subject to considerable standing water in winter months;

[^3]
## 2. Brush thickets, blueberry bushes, snags and seasonal water provide natural habitat.

The plan further describes the management unit, stating that [T]he majority of this management unit is on public land and is contained within a large open area. The northern portion is private property (being "Common Area Parcel B" within the subject property, as shown on Attachment A). In addition to the natural values present, the lack of adequate drainage in the area would pose problems for development. Any fill or other alteration of drainage patterns could cause flooding on adjacent lands.

It is noted that this seasonal lake is also inventoried by the State as a designated wetland. The property owner has had this wetland lake delineated by a wetland consultant, and the delineation was accepted by the Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL wetland delineation \# 07-0747, valid until 10-21-13). That delineation is also comprised of several small wetlands, which are outside of the PW district. Refer to the file record of PA 10-5821, exhibit 59F for a large scale copy of the subdivision plan. It shows the delineated wetland areas. The seasonal lake and the delineated wetlands are not identical.

Page 86 of the CSMP refers us to "the 1,000 scale map" for location of these five seasonal lakes. That map is found as Attachment $B$ to this report.

It is worth noting that this seasonal lake extends beyond the subject property of the proposed Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition, and into the Heceta South Subdivision to the north, as well as beyond the subject property to the east, and also to the south, onto county owned land and beyond.

It is also noted that LC 10.245-30(5) states:
(5) No topographic modification is permitted within the 50-foot setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below.

The applicable portion of LC 10.245-35 reads:
(1) Structures shall be setback 50 feet from coastal lakes... measured at right angles to the high water line. Use of this 50 feet shall be as specified in LC 10.245-30(5)-(8) above.

Basically stated, these two provisions mean that once the extent of the PW zone is established, there is an upland 50' buffer within which no structures or topographic modification can occur.

A comparison of Attachments A and D show that the majority of the seasonal lake along with the $50^{\prime}$ buffer will have no consequence to proposed development of the property, except for two areas.

The first area is at lot \#285. Lane Code Chapter 15/Roads requires that Kelsie Way be extended southward to connect with Oceana Drive. During the review of the Heceta South subdivision, the extent of the PW zone was set at the "approximate high water line" as so marked on that plat, Attachment C to this report. The 50' buffer required by LC 10.245-30(5) was also established accordingly, and no development was permitted to occur inside that buffer. The outer perimeter of lots 30, 31, 33-43 of Heceta South were set accordingly to be outside that buffer. In addition, Kelsie Way was also set enough to the west to be outside the buffer and allow for its construction. According to documents submitted by the agent for this investigation, the "approximate high water line" on the Heceta plat equates to a calculated elevation of 87 ' msl.

The second area is found proximate to lots 275,276 , and 277 of the proposed Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ addition, an area where an arm of the seasonal lake extends towards those lots. Refer to Attachment D. This attachment shows an extended "pond" area (in red) which is detached from the main arm and covers
portions of lots 276 and 277. This "pond" raises the question as to whether or not it should also be considered part of the PW zone (it is noted that in any event the pond is part of the DSL accepted wetland delineation, WD 07-0747). A photo of the "pond" is found as Attachment E. The photo was taken from the north end of this feature, looking southward. The water in the pond was observed to be approximately 6 " deep on that date. While staff did not traverse to the southern extent of the pond, small trees and brush could be observed at the southern end, verifying that the pond is somewhat separated by the main arm of the seasonal lake, at least during portions of the year, enabling such growth. The photo was taken on 3-29-12, the end of the month of March, which was the $5^{\text {th }}$ wettest on record for Eugene at 9.94 "(records for Florence were not available, but is generally greater than Eugene). Source: http://www.kval.com/news/local/5th-wettest-March-on-record-for-Eugene-145700645.html). See Attachment $F$.

## III. PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION RESULTS

Lane Code 16.238(9) Preliminary Investigation. Any proposal for development within the /PWRCP Zone shall require a Preliminary Investigation by the Planning Director to determine the specific area to which the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply. The requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply in an area in which the Planning Director determines that one or more or the criteria specified below apply:
(a) Lands which limit control or are directly affected by the hydraulic action of the coastal waterways. These lands are composed of the following:
(i) Floodways and floodway fringe.
(ii) Land lying between the mean high, high water and mean low watermark of coastal water bodies.
(iii) Dikes, dams, levees or steep embankments which control the coastal water body.
(iv) Lands along the ocean coast at or below the 26-foot elevation line.

Response and Findings:
None of the subject property is within the FEMA regulated floodhazard area, so (i) is not technically applicable. It is noted however, that the area around the intersection of Sandrift Street and Gullsettle Court were subject to extremely high water tables and flooding in 1996. Also, on the date of the site visit for this investigation, 3-29-12, portions of the Heceta South subdivision, specifically the cul-de-sac at Windjammer North was flooded to the point where portions of the lots closest to Heceta Beach Road were under 1-2 feet of water. The wetland areas along Heceta Beach Road lying between Highway 101 and the Heceta South Subdivision were high and close to the county road. The purpose statement of the PW zone includes serving "...to protect wildlife habitat, water quality, bank stability and provide flood control" (emphasis added, see LC 10.245-05).

In consideration of the above comments, and regarding (ii), staff first considered setting the PW boundary at the elevation level of high water during the 1996 flooding. This was estimated by the applicant to be at $89^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$ (see Attachment G). However, in order to stay consistent with the PW line established in 1993 for the Heceta South subdivision, and in order to allow connectivity to Kelsie Way (which was constructed based on the PW line set during the review of the Heceta South subdivision), a lesser elevation of 87 'msl is accepted. To do so otherwise would be nonsensical for the same water body, and seriously hamper road connectivity. This will be the boundary line for the PW zone for the seasonal lake.

The question arises as to whether or not the aforementioned "pond" which is found near proposed lots 276, 277 should be included in the PW zone. As seen on Attachment $D$, it connects to the main lake body
when water is at 87 ' msl but not when the water level is at 85 ' msl. Unlike the portion of the lake near the border with Heceta South subdivision, there are no steep embankments at this location. However, at the (accepted) 87 ' msl, this "pond" is contiguous with the main body of the lake. In addition, at the 87 ' msl level this "pond" qualifies as land lying between the mean high, high water and mean low watermark of coastal water body.

Aside from the above rationale, the "pond" is shown (Attachment A) to be contiguous with the remainder of the seasonal lake in the DSL delineation, WD\# 07-0747. Wetlands share three primary characteristics: hydric soils, hydrophytic plants, and prolonged water saturation. The fact that DSL has designated the "pond" as contiguous with the remainder of the designated wetland lake adds reason to also include it into the PW zone.

Regarding (iii), the steep embankment proximate to lots 281-286 control the water body during high water. This effect is less so in the more southerly portion of the lake.

Regarding (iv), the property is above $26^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$ and is not at the coast.
Conclusion: Subsections (ii) and (iii) apply. The PW zone boundary is established by the Planning Director at 87 ' msl. Lane Code $10.245-35$ requires a 50' structural setback from the $87 \prime \mathrm{msl}$ level. No topographic modifications are allowed within this setback area. There is no variance option to this standard. This will require a redesign of lots 276, 277, and perhaps 275, along with a portion of the sidewalk/road north of 276 and 277. Lots 279 and 280 are nominally within the "no touch" buffer, but this can be so listed within the approved CC \& R's to properly advise future owners.
(b) Adjacent areas of geologic instability which are composed of;
(i) Areas of geologic instability in which the instability is attributable to the hydraulic action of the water body.
(ii) Areas of geologic instability which have a direct impact on water quality, water temperature or on shoreline stability.
(iii) Shorelands in dunal areas in which the enforcement of the use restrictions of the /BD-RCP Zone, LC 16.243, would be inadequate to protect water quality, water temperature or shoreline stability.

Response and Findings:
Regarding (i) and (ii) the lake is not inventoried as geologically unstable.
Regarding (iii), the PW affords ample protection with the boundary set at $87^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$. The BD zone requirements will be evaluated at a later date under pending Hazards Check PA 10-5822.
(c) Natural or human-made riparian resources. These lands are as follows:
(i) Extend from 10 to 65 feet landward from the mean high water, within which area the existing vegetation serves one or more of the following functions:
(aa) Shading of coastal water body.
(bb) Stabilization of shoreline.
(cc) Habitat for rare or endangered wildlife species.
(dd) Significant riparian vegetation areas as identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

## Response and Findings:

The high water line and the PW boundary has been established as 87 ' msl . The mean high water line by definition will be lower in elevation, but is currently undetermined. It is noted that this seasonal lake is fed through precipitation and its effects on the water table. During the dry summer months, the seasonal lake recedes dramatically. The "no topographic modification" buffer will be 50 ' horizontal upland from the 87 ' msl. Area within the PW boundary will remain basically untouchable. The 50 ' buffer should more than encompass all remaining natural riparian resources (there is no "human-made" vegetation on this undeveloped property) which serve to shade the seasonal lake and stabilize the shoreline. It is noted that the pending Hazards Checklist for the Beaches \& Dunes Combining Zone, PA 10-5822, will most likely not allow any vegetative removal within 50 ' of the PW boundary, excepting hazardous trees.

The provisions of (cc) and (dd) do not apply, as the property is not so inventoried.
(d) Areas of significant shoreland and wetland biological habitat, composed of:
(i) Freshwater marshes identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
(ii) Areas currently identified by Nature Conservancy and included in the Lane County Coastal Inventory as significant natural areas or other areas which the Lane County Board of Commissioners may deem significant natural areas based on new inventory information.
(iii) Habitat, other than that listed in LC 16.238(9)(c)(i)(cc) above, which supports rare or endangered species.

Response and Findings:

None of the above features or habitat is on inventory for the subject property.
(e) Areas necessary for water dependent and water related uses, including areas of recreational importance, which utilize coastal water or riparian resources, areas appropriate for navigation and port facilities and areas having characteristics suitable for aquaculture. These are as identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.

Response and Findings:

Of the uses listed above, only minor recreational use (largely hiking) occurs within the subject area. Such activity will occur within the PW boundary (at or below 87 ' msl ). This standard applies and is accommodated with the PW zone.
(f) Areas identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan as having exceptional aesthetic or scenic quality derived from or related to the association with coastal water areas.

Response and Findings:

The Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan does not identify this site as such.
(g) Coastal headlands identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

Response and Findings:

The site is not identified as a coastal headland in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

## IV. SUMMARY

The PW boundary has been established at 87 ' mss around the seasonal lake as illustrated in Attachment D. Conditions safeguarding this resource are listed in Exhibit A.

## V. ATTACHMENTS

A. Preliminary Subdivision Plan (revised 12-1-11)
B. "South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes"
C. Portion of Heceta South Plat
D. Coastal Overlay Setbacks (3-14-12)
E. Photo of "pond" area (3-29-12)
F. Rainfall stats, March 2012
G. Coastal Overlay Setbacks (3-7-12)-2p.
H. Appeal Form


Authorized by: Kent Howe, Planning Director
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$$



(1)

SOUTH HECETA JUNCTION SEASONAL LAKES
SCACE 1:1,000




| PT | CHORD |  | Radius | GTH | Elta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00 | (s39'35'40"E | 4204 | 4500 | 4374 | $55^{\prime 2} 1{ }^{124}$ |
| PP | 51039958"E | 11500 | 9198 | 115.0 | $2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 09 | si | 160 | 91 | 16020 |  |
| RR | S1100 | 3500 | 4500 | 359 | 45'46'15" |
| SS | S56" | 3500 | 4500 | 3595 | 45'48'15" |
| $\pi$ | $54^{\circ}$ | 6500 | 918 | 6508 | -02'57" |
| UU | s $1 \cdot 3$ | 116 | 919 | 11616 | r1405" |
| vV | N70'21'20 | 44 | 4500 | 4689 |  |
| Ww | $N$ | 5127 | 4500 | 5454 | 69'26'48" |
| xx | N89'42'10' | 23049 | 43000 | 233 | 3* |
| $r$ | N80'40'24 | 8398 | 37 | 84 | *02'03" |
| z2 | 588 | 4996 | 37000 | 5000 |  |
| AA | $5{ }^{1} 3712$ | 11807 | 77000 | 118 |  |
| AB | 5 4.13.15"W | 1895 | 31500 | 1895 | 1" |
| AC | 5 | 12000 | 315 | 120 | 21'57'40" |
| AD | \$29'20'06 | 1080 | 315 | 10854 | 19944'30" |
| AE | 544*3411 | 5889 | 31500 | Sass | 10\%43'38" |
| AF | 545 $15^{\prime} 344$ | 6111 | 375 | 6118 | $20 \cdot 51 "$ |
| AG | S32016.40"E | 108 | 375 | 10875 | 16'38'57" |
| AH | S1 | 84.27 | 375 | 9452 |  |
| A) | $52^{\prime \prime} 15^{\prime} 0$ | 9500 | 375 | 9526 | 4" |
| AJ | S15 | 131 | 37500 | 13214 |  |
| AK | N 710'19" | 24825 | 315.00 | 255 |  |
| AL | 562'20'58 | 6857 | 32000 | 68 | $12^{\circ} 18^{\circ} 05^{\prime \prime}$ |
| AM | 55765303"W | 1500 | 255 | 15 | ${ }^{*}$ |
| AN | 57203'25 | 11 | 255 | 111 | 24*58'30" |
| AO | N84*08'10' | 100 | 255 | 100 | 0" |
| AP | N7 | 797 | 255 | 7.67 | $147^{127}$ |
| AO | N51 | 3089 | 4500 | 3153 | 44* |
| AR | N 0005'55 | 4593 | 4500 | 482 | $17{ }^{17}$ |
| AS | nse'52'12 | 43.50 | 4500 | 4540 | 5748108" |
| AT | S49'18'57 | 6128 | 45.00 | 67. | $85.48 \cdot 34{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| AU | N78'3408 | 135.7 | 19500 | 138.6 | $40^{\circ}$ |
| AV | N62'20'58 | 8143 | 38000 | ${ }^{18} 59$ | 12*18'05" |
| AW | N36*48'43 | 10774 | 3150 | 10827 | $19^{\circ} 41 \cdot 38^{\prime \prime}$ |
| AX | N489 $177^{\prime} 46^{\circ}$ | 1800 | 315 | 1800 | '16'28" |
| AY | N39'59'25"W | 1295 | 375.00 | 130 | 19'53'10" |
| AZ | N21.4729" | 1077 | 1750 | 1080 | $6 \cdot 3$ |
| BA | N $6.39 \cdot 38$ | 10068 | 37500 | 10088 | 5'25'45" |
| BB | N 7\%or'34" | 26.81 | 37500 | 26 | "0547" |
| BC | N 2'58'40 | 7349 | 71000 | ${ }^{73.33}$ | $5^{+56.01 "}$ |
| BD | N 4*02'14' | 100.2 | 71000 | 1003 | '05'48 |
| CLB | $5{ }^{5}$ | 14028 | 74000 | 14049 | 10'52'39 |
| CL9 | S21'59'40'E | 32329 | 34500 | 33648 | 55'52'40' |
| CL | S3 | 75 | 34500 | 17121 | $29^{6} 28^{1000}$ |
| CL1 | S62 2015 | 750 |  |  |  |
| CL12 | S82'35'1 | 20000 | 22500 | 20725 | 32'46'32' |
| CL13 |  | 28551 | 345.00 | 29438 | $49^{4} 53^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ |
| CL14 | N80*15'12"W | 7918 | 40000 | 79 | 8" |
| CL | N78*51'34** | 6567 | 40000 | 6574 |  |
|  | NB | 24118 | 40000 | 24500 | 505'35" |
| CL18 | N68'45'00"E | 27 | 400 | 2793 | 400 |
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5th wettest March on record for Eugene
By Katie Boer KVAL News Published: Apr 1, 2012 at 4:45 PM PDT Last Updated: Apr 1, 2012 at 4:51 PM PDT
Share this story


KVAL YouNewser 'Amminancy' wrote: "Street Flood: Due to recent heavy rain and poor drainage, Lawnridge Ave. is over a foot deep."
It's no April Fools joke--Eugene tipped the rain gauge at 9.94 " for the month of March-making this year the 5th wettest March of all time for the city. Normal March rainfall for Eugene is 4.99".
Eugene's Top 10 Rainiest Month's of March:

1) 12.46 (1974)
2) 10.93 (1989)
3) 10.58 (1983)
4) 10.49 (1904)
5) 9.94 (2012) *** 5TH WETTEST MARCH
6) 9.93 (1916)
7) 9.81 (1960)
8) 9.79 (1991)
9) 9.45 (1894)
10) 8.66 (1957)

Portland had their wettest recorded month of March since 1940, with 7.89" of rain.
The second wettest March for Salem with 9.98" of rain. The record for wettest March for the state capital is 10.13 " a record set in 1894.
Astoria really took top seed on the coast, their 4th wettest March all time with $14.13^{\prime \prime}$ of rain.

## Source:

http://www.kval.com/news/local/5th-wettest-March-on-record-for-Eugene145700645.html


KENDALL Jerry

From: Clint Beecroft [clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com]<br>Sent: $\quad$ Wednesday, March 07, 2012 12:26 PM<br>To: KENDALL Jerry<br>Subject: Idylewood<br>Follow Up Flag: Follow up<br>Flag Status: Red<br>Attachments: 070256-b LIDAR Kelsie Connection Regrade COASTAL OVERLAYS .pdf

Jerry,

This email is a follow up to our conversation yesterday regarding the geographic boundary of the PW district on the Idylewood site. Attached is a PDF showing a map of the area near the Kelsie Way connection on the north side of the Idylewood property. The Heceta South subdivision is situated to the north.

We have digitized the approximate high water line from the Heceta South plat which is shown as the green line on the attached PDF. The southerly and easterly sides of Lot 43 of Heceta South follows the 50 -foot setback line from this approximate high water line. As shown, the 50 -foot setback from the high water line on Heceta South lies outside the current Kelsie Way right-of-way.

With respect to the boundary of the PW district on the Idylewood property, you have indicated that the boundary should correspond to a high water lake level. We show two possible water levels shown as the $8 \mathbf{7}^{\prime}$ LIDAR contour (blue line) and the $89^{\prime}$ LIDAR contour (red line) with associated 50 -foot setback lines.

As we have discussed, the lake does not appear to have a surface outlet until the water level reaches approximate elevation $87^{\prime}$ msl, at which elevation a surface outlet forms to the south on the County property. This elevation will regulate the seasonal high water level to a maximum elevation of $87^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$. As shown, the $50-$ foot setback line (also shown as blue) from the $87^{\prime}$ contour line lies outside the proposed Kelsie Way right-ofway on the Idylewood property. Note that the 87 ' contour and associated 50 -foot setback line correlates well with the high water line and setback shown on the Heceta South subdivision. An extension of Kelsie Way road to the north will not result in any grading occurring within this 50-foot setback area.

The $89^{\prime}$ LIDAR contour (shown as red) corresponds to the approximate high lake level that occurred during the February 1996 flood event based on visual observations. This high lake level was temporary due to rising groundwater and surface water from heavy rainfall that occurred over several weeks and represents a flood condition, not a seasonal high water level. As shown, a 50 -foot setback (also shown as red) from the $89{ }^{\prime}$ contour extends into the Kelsie Way right-of-way on the Idylewood property. An extension of Kelsie Way road to the north will result in a cut slope occurring within this 50 -foot setback area. The 89 contour and associated 50 -foot setback line does not correlate as well with the high water line and setback shown on the Heceta South subdivision as the 87 ' contour and setback.

I hope this helps. Please give me a call if you have any questions.
Clint



## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

## APPEAL OF A DIRECTOR'S DECISION

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 Planning: 682-3807 Building: 682-3823 Sanitation: 682-3754

| For Office Use Only | FILE \# CODE: HOAPPEAL | FEE: $\$ 250$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appellant: $\qquad$
Mailing address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$
Signature: $\qquad$
Appellant's Representative : $\qquad$
Mailing address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$
Signature: $\qquad$

## LOCATION (subject property)

| Township | Range | Section | Taxlot | Subdivision/partition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Required submittals. Your appeal application will be rejected if it does not contain all the required information.

1. A copy of the decision being appealed, with the department file number: $\qquad$
2. The $\$ 250$ appeal fee, payable to Lane County.
3. The appeal deadline, as stated in the Director's Decision: $\qquad$
4. Check one of the items below to identify your party status with the right to appeal the Director's decision:
_ I am the owner or contract purchaser of the subject property;
_ I I am the applicant for the subject application;
__ Prior to the decision by the Director, I submitted written testimony into the record
__ I am not one of the persons mentioned above, but wish to appeal the Director's decision for the reasons explained in my letter.
5. A letter that addresses each of the following three standards:
a. The reasons) why the Director's decision was made in error or why the Director should reconsider the decision;
b. An identification of one or more of the following general reasons for the appeal, or request for reconsideration:

- The Director exceeded his or her authority;
- The Director failed to follow the procedure applicable to the matter;
- The Director rendered a decision that is unconstitutional;
- The Director misinterpreted the Lane Code, Lane Manual, State Law, or other applicable criteria.
c. The Director should reconsider the decision to allow the submittal for additional evidence not in the record that addresses compliance with the applicable standards or criteria.

6. Any additional information in support of your appeal.
(Version 4/2010)

> INSTRUCTIONS: Completely fill out this application form. Attach additional pages if necessary. Failure to submit a complete application or answer every question will result in a delay or rejection of your application.
> The Preliminary Investigation will determine the presence of any hazards to the proposed development and the appropriate mitigation measures.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION What are you proposing? What are you going to build?
THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF A 62 -LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION OF 3 TAX LOTS.
TAX LOT 401 HAS A PW COMBINING DISTRICT OVERLAY. ROADS, UTILITIES, AND
ASSOCIATED GRADING ACTIVITY WILL BE CONSTRUCTED TO SERVE THE SUBDIVISION.
SITE PLAN A site plan must be included. Refer to the handout entitled "How to prepare your site plan".

ZONING: RA, BD, U, PW
ACREAGE: 46.06

LOCATION Describe how to find the property. Is the address visible? Are there any identifying features?

FROM RHODODENDRON DRIVE TURN EAST ONTO OCEANA DRIVE. CONTINUE THROUGH
THE INTERSECTION WITH SANDRIFT STREET TO THE END OF OCEANA DRIVE. THE PROPERTY ABUTS THE END OF OCEANA DRIVE. THE SITE IS VACANT AND HAS NO ADDRESS.

EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS Does the property contain any roads, structures, etc.? NONE, EXCEPT FOR A STORMWATER PUMP STATION AND PIPE LOCATED ON TAX LOT 801 WHICH WILL REMAIN.

STAKE OUT THE DEVELOPMENT AREA. The location of the structure(s) must be staked out on the site and identified with colored ribbon or a similar item.

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Generally describe the vegetation. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features.

SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

## APPLICABILITY

16.238 PRIME WILDLIFE SHORELANDS COMBINING ZONE (PW-RCP).
(9) Preliminary Investigation. Any proposal for development within the /PW-RCP Zone shall require a Preliminary Investigation by the Planning Director to determine the specific area to which the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply. The requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply in an area in which the Planning Director determines that one or more of the criteria specified below apply.

To the best of your knowledge, do any of the following conditions exist at the site? Check all that apply:
X (a) Lands which limit control or are directly affected by the hydraulic action of the coastal waterways. These lands are composed of the following:
(i) Floodways and the floodway fringe.
(ii) Land lying between the mean high, high water and mean low water mark of coastal water bodies.
(iii) Dikes, dams, levees or steep embankments which control the coastal water body.
(iv) Lands along the ocean coast at or below the $\mathbf{2 6}$-foot elevation line.
___(b) Adjacent areas of geologic instability which are composed of:
(i) Areas of geologic instability in which the instability is attributable to the hydraulic action of the water body.
(ii) Areas of geologic instability which have a direct impact on water quality, water temperature or on shoreline stability.
(iii) Shorelands in dunal areas in which the enforcement of the use restrictions of the /BD-RCP Zone (LC 16.243) would be inadequate to protect water quality, water temperature or shoreland stability.

X (c) Natural or human-made riparian resources. These lands are as follows:
(i) Extend from 10 to 65 feet landward from the mean high water, within which area the existing vegetation serves one or more of the following functions:
(aa) Shading of coastal water body.
(bb) Stabilization of shoreline.
(cc) Habitat for rare or endangered wildlife species.
(dd) Significant riparian vegetation areas as identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.
X (d) Areas of significant shoreland and wetland biological habitat, composed of:
(i) Freshwater marshes identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
(ii) Areas currently identified by Nature Conservancy and included in the Lane County Coastal Inventory as significant natural areas or other areas which the Lane County Board of Commissioners may deem significant natural areas based on new inventory information.
(iii) Habitat, other than that listed in LC 16.238(9)(c)(i)(cc) above, which supports rare or endangered species.
_(e) Areas necessary for water dependent and water related uses, including areas of recreational importance which utilize coastal water or riparian resources, areas appropriate for navigation and port facilities and areas having characteristics suitable for aquaculture. These are as identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
__(f) Areas identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan as having exceptional aesthetic or scenic quality derived from or related to the association with coastal water areas.
__(g) Coastal headlands identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

Answer every question. Attach additional pages if necessary.
(5) Prohibited Uses. If found subject to the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone, based on the results of the Preliminary Investigations specified by LC 16.238(9), the following uses are specifically prohibited:
(a) Fill in coastal lakes.
(b) Fill in freshwater marsh areas as identified in Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
(c) New piling-type piers of any descriptions when adjacent to a Natural Estuary Zone (NERCP).
(d) Dredged material disposal.

Does your project include any of these activities?
Yes


If yes, explain: $\qquad$
(6) Site and Development Requirements. If found subject to the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone, based on the results of the Preliminary Investigation specified by LC 16.238(9), the below-specified development requirements shall be in addition to those provided by the respective zone or zones with which the/PW-RCP Zone is combined. These requirements shall not apply to timber harvesting activities. Timber harvesting activities, where permitted by the respective zone with which the/PWRCP Zone is combined, shall conform to Oregon Forest Practices Act rules.
(a) No more of a parcel's existing vegetation shall be cleared than is necessary for the permitted use, accessory buildings, necessary access, septic requirements and fire safety requirements.
Footprint of the proposed structure(s):__ NONE sf
Total area of vegetation clearance: __ NONE sf
Explain why your proposed vegetation clearance is not excessive: NO DEVELOPMENT IS
PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF THE PW SHORELAND.
ALL DEVELOPMENT AND VEGETATION REMOVAL WILL OCCUR ON PORTIONS OF
THE SITE EXTRANEOUS TO THE PW-RCP ZONE AND ITS SETBACK AREA.
(b) To the maximum degree possible, building sites shall be located on portions of the site which exhibit the least vegetative cover.
Does the property contain any vegetation-free areas?


If you are not using the vegetation-free area, explain why: NOT APPLICABLE .
NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF
THE PW SHORELAND.
(c) Construction activities occur in such a manner so as to avoid unnecessary excavation and/or removal or existing vegetation beyond that area required for the facilities indicated in LC $16.238(6)(a)$. Where vegetation removal beyond that allowed in LC $16.238(6)(a)$ cannot be avoided, the site shall be replanted during the next replanting season to avoid sedimentation of coastal waters. The vegetation shall be of indigenous species in order to maintain the natural character of the area.

Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE.
NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF
THE PW SHORELAND.
(d) The requirements for parking and vision clearance shall be as provided by the respective zone or zones with which the/PW-RCP Zone is combined.
This will be a condition of approval.
(e) No topographic modification is permitted within the $\mathbf{5 0}$-foot setback area specified by LC 16.238(7).

This will be a condition of approval.
(f) The shoreward half of the setback area specified by LC 16.238(8) must be left in indigenous vegetation, except where un-surfaced trails are provided.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: YES. INDIGENOUS VEGETATION LOCATED ON PROPOSED LOTS AND WITHIN THE SETBACK AREA WILL NOT BE

DISTURBED EXCEPT FOR UNSURFACED TRAILS CREATED BY LOT PURCHASERS.
(g) Cornices, canopies and eaves may extend two feet into the setback area specified by LC 16.238(7).

Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NONE PROPOSED AT THIS TIME
(h) Decks, uncovered porches, stairways and fire escapes may extend a distance of $\mathbf{1 0}$ feet into the setback area specified by LC 16.238(7).
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NONE PROPOSED AT THIS TIME
(i) All trees must be retained within the setback area specified by LC 16.238(7), except where removal is subject to requirements of the Oregon Forest Practices Act.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NO TREE REMOVAL IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE SETBACK AREA.
(j) Structures shall be sited and/or screened with natural vegetation so as not to impair the aesthetic quality of the site.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: STRUCTURES ARE NOT
PROPOSED AT THIS TIME, BUT WILL BE REVIEWED AT THE TIME OF
INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT.
(k) The exterior building materials shall blend in color, hue and texture to the maximum amount feasible with the surrounding vegetation and landscape.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: STRUCTURES ARE NOT
PROPOSED AT THIS TIME, BUT WILL BE REVIEWED AT THE TIME OF
INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT.
(l) Where public ownerships in the form of existing rights-of-way which provide access to coastal waters are involved in development subject to the regulations of this section, those ownerships shall be retained where possible, or replaced where not possible, upon the sale or disposal of the rights-of-way. Rights-of-way may be vacated to permit redevelopment of shoreland areas provided public access across the affected site is retained.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE.
NO PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY IS PROPOSED TO ABUT THE PW SHORELAND.
(7) Additional Setback Requirements. Setbacks shall be as required in the zone or zones with which the/PW-RCP Zone is combined, except for the additional below-specified setback requirements.
(a) Structures shall be set back 50 feet from coastal lakes and the estuary measured at right angles to the high waterline. Use of this 50 feet shall be as specified in LC 16.238(6)(e)-(h).
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: YES. THE SETBACK AREA IS
SHOWN ON THE SUBDIVISION PLAN. THE PROPOSED LOTS HAVE BEEN SIZED
TO ACCOMMODATE BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENCROACHING THE SETBACK AREA.
(b) Building setbacks on oceanfront parcels are determined in accord with the rate of erosion in the area to provide reasonable protection to the site through the expected lifetime of the structure. Setback shall be determined by doubling the estimated average annual erosion rate and multiplying that by the expected life of the structure.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE. THERE ARE
NO OCEANFRONT PARCELS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL.
(8) Special Land Division Requirements. The following criteria shall be met for land divisions on property within the /PW-RCP Zone, based on the Preliminary Investigation in LC 16.238(9) below. These criteria are in addition to minimum area requirements of any zone combined with the /PWRCP Zone.
(a) For lands within urban or urbanizable areas or lands developed or committed to development:
(i) Land divisions must be consistent with shoreland values as identified in the Coastal Resources Management Plan, not adversely impact water quality, and not increase hazard to life or property.
(ii) The use will not result in loss of significant wildlife habitat or aesthetic values as identified in the Coastal Resources Management Plan.
(iii) Minimum area requirements for the division of land shall be based on the minimum parcel size in the zone with which the /PW-RCP Zone is combined, or five acres, whichever is greater.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: YES, BECAUSE NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF THE PW SHORELAND OR ITS SETBACK AREA.
(b) For lands outside urban or urbanizable areas or lands developed or committed to development, the above criteria, plus the following:
(i) There is a need which cannot adequately be accommodated on non-shoreland locations.
(ii) There is a lack of suitable shoreland areas within urban or urbanizable areas or within areas developed or committed to development.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE BECAUSE THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED WITHIN THE FLORENCE UGB.

## Prime Wildlife Combining Zone <br> Preliminary Investigation Application for Idylewood Fourth Addition <br> Additional Information

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features. Include additional pages if necessary.

The developable easterly portion of this site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies across the site from an elevation of less than 82 feet MSL in the lowest areas of the site to a high of approximately 123 feet MSL (contours were interpreted from City of Florence 100-foot topographic maps). The site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood Subdivision, on the north by the Heceta South Subdivision, and on the east and south by vacant land owned by Lane County.

The geology of the site suggests that this is a classically formed transverse dune/deflation plain formation with relict incisions formed by the interplay between historic wind and water movements across the formation. These topographic incisions and the associated remnant sand between them are close together and steeply inclined where forces of erosion removed the sand placed by seasonal winds. Similar relict incisions can be observed across the Heceta South Subdivision to the north of the subject property. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development.

Much of the eastern (undevelopable) portion of the site is characterized as a frequently inundated bog/water body that in most years displays some water in the lower elevations but in some years is completely dry. Water levels within this area and across the site are driven by seasonal groundwater. No defined or channelized outlet exists to this low-lying area. Water levels rise and fall as a reflection of the groundwater table. Wetlands are present on this portion of the site as shown on the subdivision plan. High and low water levels rise and fall in conjunction with both the seasonal precipitation and cyclical weather patterns. On years, such as in 1996, when precipitation is substantially higher than average, seasonal high water tables at the intersection of Oceana Drive and Sandrift Street reached an elevation of between 85 and 86 feet MSL. The groundwater gradient across the site slopes from east to west (toward the Siuslaw River approximately one mile away) at a gradient of approximately one foot in 400 feet. Thus, the seasonal/cyclical high groundwater tables across the site vary from an estimated 89 feet MSL more or less at the eastern fringe of the proposed development to an elevation of 85 to 86 feet MSL more or less along the eastern fringe of the existing Idylewood Subdivision.

At the northwestern portion of the site, near proposed Lots 17 and 18, there is an abrupt 40 foot drop in elevation at the lee side of the dune formation. Further north, where Kelsie Way was terminated in the Heceta South Subdivision, the leeward drop is less pronounced (about 30 feet) but close enough to Kelsie Way to render this possible transportation connection very difficult at best. Further south, this leeward drop declines to insignificance in the vicinity of proposed Lots 23,24 , and 25.

## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION



# LAND USE APPLICATION Preliminary Investigation Prime Wildlife Combining Zone 

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E 8 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 PLANNING: 682-3807

For Office Use Only. FILE \#


CODE: API
FEE: $\$ 1048.0$


Applicant (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGNE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402
Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Applicant Signature:


Agent (print name): EGR \& ASSOCIATES
Mailing address: 2535 B PRAIRIE ROAD, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-8322
Email: clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com
Agent Signature: $\qquad$

Land Owner (print name): BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC.
Mailing address: 27922 WARD LANE, EUGENE, OREGON 97402
Phone: (541)688-6402 Email: ejbenedick@msn.com
Land Owner Signature: $\square$ carla a Thither


PROPOSAL: A request for a Preliminary Investigation prior to development in the Prime Wildlife
Combining Zone, pursuant to Lane Code 16.238 . 10.245

This application is based on objective evidence and is not a land use decision; therefore, the decision is not subject to public notice and may only be appealed by the applicant.

Mr. Clint Beecroft
EGR \& Associates
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION
2535 B Prairie Rd.
Eugene, Or. 97402

Re: PA 10-5825, Prime Wildlife Shorelands Combining District (PW) Preliminary Investigation for proposed subdivision, Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition.

Dear Mr. Beecroft:

The Preliminary Investigation report for the pending Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition has been completed. It is found as the enclosed Exhibit B.

Refer to the conditions derived from this investigation, Exhibit A.

Procedurally, you have the right to appeal any or all parts of this investigation as per Lane Code 14.500. If you choose to appeal, such shall be filed no later than 5:00 pm. on May 1, 2012 using the enclosed appeal form.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions concerning this investigation.

Sincerely,


Jerry Kendall/Associate Planner (541-682-4057)

Exhibit A<br>Conditions attendant to PA 10-5825<br>Preliminary Investigation for the Prime Wildlife Combining Zone (PW) for $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition to Idylewood

1. The PW boundary is set at an elevation of 87 ' mean sea level (msl) around the seasonal lake as illustrated in Attachment D (note: 87 'msl = " 87 ' LIDAR Contour" on that attachment). Note: this boundary is independent of the wetland delineation (WD\#070747) approved by the Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL). Actions within the designated wetlands are subject to approval by the DSL.
2. No structures shall be allowed within $50^{\prime}$ upland of the above boundary (measured horizontally, LC 10.245-35).
3. No topographic modification shall occur within $50^{\prime}$ upland of $87^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$. PW boundary (measured horizontally). There is no variance option to this standard. (LC 10.245-30(5).
4. Artificial bank stabilization shall be allowed inside the PW boundary and the 50 ' buffer (described in \#2) only in unusual circumstances where natural erosion processes threaten critical wildlife habitat, provided that natural bank stabilization methods have been considered. Riprap used for bank stabilization must meet Army Corps of Engineers strength, size and design criteria unless the County Public Works Engineer, in coordination with the Planning Director determines this to be unnecessary and inadvisable. (Derived from Coastal Resources Management Plan (revised 1991), PW policy \#2, p.34)

Exhibit B

# Preliminary Investigation in the Prime Wildlife zone Staff Report 

Report Date:<br>Department File:<br>Property Owner/Applicant:<br>Agent:<br>Property Address:<br>Assessor's Map:<br>Acreage:<br>Base Zone:<br>Combining Zone:<br>Comprehensive Plan:<br>Site Visit Date:<br>Staff Planner:

April 19, 2012
PA 10-5825
Benedick Holdings LLC
Clint Beecroff/EGR \& Associates
None issued
18-12-10.4 Tax Lot: 400, 401 \& 801
46+ acres
Suburban Residential (RA, LC 10.135
Prime Wildlife (/PW) \& Beaches \& Dunes (/BD)
City of Florence Comprehensive Plan (1988 version)
March 29, 2012
Jerry Kendall, 541-682-4057

## I. PROPOSAL

Preliminary Investigation for a proposed $4^{\text {th }}$ addition to the Idylewood subdivision, located within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Florence, regarding the Prime Wildlife combining zone pursuant to the requirements of Lane Code 10.245-45. See proposed site plan, Attachment $A^{1}$.

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A preliminary investigation for the proposed development was conducted by staff in March of 2012, with an earlier field visit in 2011. The subject property is located within the UGB of Florence, and is situated east of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ addition to the Idylewood subdivision and south of the Heceta South subdivision. The property consists of $46+$ acres, with the PW district confined to the approximate area of the seasonal wetland lake found on the east side of the subject property. This lake, together with four others to the south (and not within the subject property) is known as one of the "South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes", according to the Coastal Resources Management Plan (revised, 1991).

Per that plan, the subject property is within the PW district as described on p. 86 of that plan. The rationale for this designation:

## 1. Area is subject to considerable standing water in winter months;

[^4]
## 2. Brush thickets, blueberry bushes, snags and seasonal water provide natural habitat.

The plan further describes the management unit, stating that [T]he majority of this management unit is on public land and is contained within a large open area. The northern portion is private property (being "Common Area Parcel B" within the subject property, as shown on Attachment A). In addition to the natural values present, the lack of adequate drainage in the area would pose problems for development. Any fill or other alteration of drainage patterns could cause flooding on adjacent lands.

It is noted that this seasonal lake is also inventoried by the State as a designated wetland. The property owner has had this wetland lake delineated by a wetland consultant, and the delineation was accepted by the Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL wetland delineation \# 07-0747, valid until 10-21-13). That delineation is also comprised of several small wetlands, which are outside of the PW district. Refer to the file record of PA 10-5821, exhibit 59F for a large scale copy of the subdivision plan. It shows the delineated wetland areas. The seasonal lake and the delineated wetlands are not identical.

Page 86 of the CSMP refers us to "the 1,000 scale map" for location of these five seasonal lakes. That map is found as Attachment $B$ to this report.

It is worth noting that this seasonal lake extends beyond the subject property of the proposed Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition, and into the Heceta South Subdivision to the north, as well as beyond the subject property to the east, and also to the south, onto county owned land and beyond.

It is also noted that LC 10.245-30(5) states:
(5) No topographic modification is permitted within the 50-foot setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below.

The applicable portion of LC 10.245-35 reads:
(1) Structures shall be setback 50 feet from coastal lakes... measured at right angles to the high water line. Use of this 50 feet shall be as specified in LC 10.245-30(5)-(8) above.

Basically stated, these two provisions mean that once the extent of the PW zone is established, there is an upland 50' buffer within which no structures or topographic modification can occur.

A comparison of Attachments A and D show that the majority of the seasonal lake along with the $50^{\prime}$ buffer will have no consequence to proposed development of the property, except for two areas.

The first area is at lot \#285. Lane Code Chapter 15/Roads requires that Kelsie Way be extended southward to connect with Oceana Drive. During the review of the Heceta South subdivision, the extent of the PW zone was set at the "approximate high water line" as so marked on that plat, Attachment C to this report. The 50' buffer required by LC 10.245-30(5) was also established accordingly, and no development was permitted to occur inside that buffer. The outer perimeter of lots 30, 31, 33-43 of Heceta South were set accordingly to be outside that buffer. In addition, Kelsie Way was also set enough to the west to be outside the buffer and allow for its construction. According to documents submitted by the agent for this investigation, the "approximate high water line" on the Heceta plat equates to a calculated elevation of 87 ' msl.

The second area is found proximate to lots 275,276 , and 277 of the proposed Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ addition, an area where an arm of the seasonal lake extends towards those lots. Refer to Attachment D. This attachment shows an extended "pond" area (in red) which is detached from the main arm and covers
portions of lots 276 and 277. This "pond" raises the question as to whether or not it should also be considered part of the PW zone (it is noted that in any event the pond is part of the DSL accepted wetland delineation, WD 07-0747). A photo of the "pond" is found as Attachment E. The photo was taken from the north end of this feature, looking southward. The water in the pond was observed to be approximately 6 " deep on that date. While staff did not traverse to the southern extent of the pond, small trees and brush could be observed at the southern end, verifying that the pond is somewhat separated by the main arm of the seasonal lake, at least during portions of the year, enabling such growth. The photo was taken on 3-29-12, the end of the month of March, which was the $5^{\text {th }}$ wettest on record for Eugene at 9.94 "(records for Florence were not available, but is generally greater than Eugene). Source: http://www.kval.com/news/local/5th-wettest-March-on-record-for-Eugene-145700645.html). See Attachment $F$.

## III. PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION RESULTS

Lane Code 16.238(9) Preliminary Investigation. Any proposal for development within the /PWRCP Zone shall require a Preliminary Investigation by the Planning Director to determine the specific area to which the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply. The requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply in an area in which the Planning Director determines that one or more or the criteria specified below apply:
(a) Lands which limit control or are directly affected by the hydraulic action of the coastal waterways. These lands are composed of the following:
(i) Floodways and floodway fringe.
(ii) Land lying between the mean high, high water and mean low watermark of coastal water bodies.
(iii) Dikes, dams, levees or steep embankments which control the coastal water body.
(iv) Lands along the ocean coast at or below the 26-foot elevation line.

Response and Findings:
None of the subject property is within the FEMA regulated floodhazard area, so (i) is not technically applicable. It is noted however, that the area around the intersection of Sandrift Street and Gullsettle Court were subject to extremely high water tables and flooding in 1996. Also, on the date of the site visit for this investigation, 3-29-12, portions of the Heceta South subdivision, specifically the cul-de-sac at Windjammer North was flooded to the point where portions of the lots closest to Heceta Beach Road were under 1-2 feet of water. The wetland areas along Heceta Beach Road lying between Highway 101 and the Heceta South Subdivision were high and close to the county road. The purpose statement of the PW zone includes serving "...to protect wildlife habitat, water quality, bank stability and provide flood control" (emphasis added, see LC 10.245-05).

In consideration of the above comments, and regarding (ii), staff first considered setting the PW boundary at the elevation level of high water during the 1996 flooding. This was estimated by the applicant to be at $89^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$ (see Attachment G). However, in order to stay consistent with the PW line established in 1993 for the Heceta South subdivision, and in order to allow connectivity to Kelsie Way (which was constructed based on the PW line set during the review of the Heceta South subdivision), a lesser elevation of 87 'msl is accepted. To do so otherwise would be nonsensical for the same water body, and seriously hamper road connectivity. This will be the boundary line for the PW zone for the seasonal lake.

The question arises as to whether or not the aforementioned "pond" which is found near proposed lots 276, 277 should be included in the PW zone. As seen on Attachment $D$, it connects to the main lake body
when water is at 87 ' msl but not when the water level is at 85 ' msl. Unlike the portion of the lake near the border with Heceta South subdivision, there are no steep embankments at this location. However, at the (accepted) 87 ' msl, this "pond" is contiguous with the main body of the lake. In addition, at the 87 ' msl level this "pond" qualifies as land lying between the mean high, high water and mean low watermark of coastal water body.

Aside from the above rationale, the "pond" is shown (Attachment A) to be contiguous with the remainder of the seasonal lake in the DSL delineation, WD\# 07-0747. Wetlands share three primary characteristics: hydric soils, hydrophytic plants, and prolonged water saturation. The fact that DSL has designated the "pond" as contiguous with the remainder of the designated wetland lake adds reason to also include it into the PW zone.

Regarding (iii), the steep embankment proximate to lots 281-286 control the water body during high water. This effect is less so in the more southerly portion of the lake.

Regarding (iv), the property is above $26^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$ and is not at the coast.
Conclusion: Subsections (ii) and (iii) apply. The PW zone boundary is established by the Planning Director at 87 ' msl. Lane Code $10.245-35$ requires a 50' structural setback from the $87 \prime \mathrm{msl}$ level. No topographic modifications are allowed within this setback area. There is no variance option to this standard. This will require a redesign of lots 276, 277, and perhaps 275, along with a portion of the sidewalk/road north of 276 and 277. Lots 279 and 280 are nominally within the "no touch" buffer, but this can be so listed within the approved CC \& R's to properly advise future owners.
(b) Adjacent areas of geologic instability which are composed of;
(i) Areas of geologic instability in which the instability is attributable to the hydraulic action of the water body.
(ii) Areas of geologic instability which have a direct impact on water quality, water temperature or on shoreline stability.
(iii) Shorelands in dunal areas in which the enforcement of the use restrictions of the /BD-RCP Zone, LC 16.243, would be inadequate to protect water quality, water temperature or shoreline stability.

Response and Findings:
Regarding (i) and (ii) the lake is not inventoried as geologically unstable.
Regarding (iii), the PW affords ample protection with the boundary set at $87^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$. The BD zone requirements will be evaluated at a later date under pending Hazards Check PA 10-5822.
(c) Natural or human-made riparian resources. These lands are as follows:
(i) Extend from 10 to 65 feet landward from the mean high water, within which area the existing vegetation serves one or more of the following functions:
(aa) Shading of coastal water body.
(bb) Stabilization of shoreline.
(cc) Habitat for rare or endangered wildlife species.
(dd) Significant riparian vegetation areas as identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

## Response and Findings:

The high water line and the PW boundary has been established as 87 ' msl . The mean high water line by definition will be lower in elevation, but is currently undetermined. It is noted that this seasonal lake is fed through precipitation and its effects on the water table. During the dry summer months, the seasonal lake recedes dramatically. The "no topographic modification" buffer will be 50 ' horizontal upland from the 87 ' msl. Area within the PW boundary will remain basically untouchable. The 50 ' buffer should more than encompass all remaining natural riparian resources (there is no "human-made" vegetation on this undeveloped property) which serve to shade the seasonal lake and stabilize the shoreline. It is noted that the pending Hazards Checklist for the Beaches \& Dunes Combining Zone, PA 10-5822, will most likely not allow any vegetative removal within 50 ' of the PW boundary, excepting hazardous trees.

The provisions of (cc) and (dd) do not apply, as the property is not so inventoried.
(d) Areas of significant shoreland and wetland biological habitat, composed of:
(i) Freshwater marshes identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
(ii) Areas currently identified by Nature Conservancy and included in the Lane County Coastal Inventory as significant natural areas or other areas which the Lane County Board of Commissioners may deem significant natural areas based on new inventory information.
(iii) Habitat, other than that listed in LC 16.238(9)(c)(i)(cc) above, which supports rare or endangered species.

Response and Findings:

None of the above features or habitat is on inventory for the subject property.
(e) Areas necessary for water dependent and water related uses, including areas of recreational importance, which utilize coastal water or riparian resources, areas appropriate for navigation and port facilities and areas having characteristics suitable for aquaculture. These are as identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.

Response and Findings:

Of the uses listed above, only minor recreational use (largely hiking) occurs within the subject area. Such activity will occur within the PW boundary (at or below 87 ' msl ). This standard applies and is accommodated with the PW zone.
(f) Areas identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan as having exceptional aesthetic or scenic quality derived from or related to the association with coastal water areas.

Response and Findings:

The Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan does not identify this site as such.
(g) Coastal headlands identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

Response and Findings:

The site is not identified as a coastal headland in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

## IV. SUMMARY

The PW boundary has been established at 87 ' mss around the seasonal lake as illustrated in Attachment D. Conditions safeguarding this resource are listed in Exhibit A.

## V. ATTACHMENTS

A. Preliminary Subdivision Plan (revised 12-1-11)
B. "South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes"
C. Portion of Heceta South Plat
D. Coastal Overlay Setbacks (3-14-12)
E. Photo of "pond" area (3-29-12)
F. Rainfall stats, March 2012
G. Coastal Overlay Setbacks (3-7-12)-2p.
H. Appeal Form


Authorized by: Kent Howe, Planning Director

$$
\frac{4-19-12}{\text { Date }}
$$



(1)

SOUTH HECETA JUNCTION SEASONAL LAKES
SCACE 1:1,000




| PT | CHORD |  | Radius | GTH | Elta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00 | (s39'35'40"E | 4204 | 4500 | 4374 | $55^{\prime 2} 1{ }^{124}$ |
| PP | 51039958"E | 11500 | 9198 | 115.0 | $2^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 09 | si | 160 | 91 | 16020 |  |
| RR | S1100 | 3500 | 4500 | 359 | 45'46'15" |
| SS | S56" | 3500 | 4500 | 3595 | 45'48'15" |
| $\pi$ | $54^{\circ}$ | 6500 | 918 | 6508 | -02'57" |
| UU | s $1 \cdot 3$ | 116 | 919 | 11616 | r1405" |
| vV | N70'21'20 | 44 | 4500 | 4689 |  |
| Ww | $N$ | 5127 | 4500 | 5454 | 69'26'48" |
| xx | N89'42'10' | 23049 | 43000 | 233 | 3* |
| $r$ | N80'40'24 | 8398 | 37 | 84 | *02'03" |
| z2 | 588 | 4996 | 37000 | 5000 |  |
| AA | $5{ }^{1} 3712$ | 11807 | 77000 | 118 |  |
| AB | 5 4.13.15"W | 1895 | 31500 | 1895 | 1" |
| AC | 5 | 12000 | 315 | 120 | 21'57'40" |
| AD | \$29'20'06 | 1080 | 315 | 10854 | 19944'30" |
| AE | 544*3411 | 5889 | 31500 | Sass | 10\%43'38" |
| AF | 545 $15^{\prime} 344$ | 6111 | 375 | 6118 | $20 \cdot 51 "$ |
| AG | S32016.40"E | 108 | 375 | 10875 | 16'38'57" |
| AH | S1 | 84.27 | 375 | 9452 |  |
| A) | $52^{\prime \prime} 15^{\prime} 0$ | 9500 | 375 | 9526 | 4" |
| AJ | S15 | 131 | 37500 | 13214 |  |
| AK | N 710'19" | 24825 | 315.00 | 255 |  |
| AL | 562'20'58 | 6857 | 32000 | 68 | $12^{\circ} 18^{\circ} 05^{\prime \prime}$ |
| AM | 55765303"W | 1500 | 255 | 15 | ${ }^{*}$ |
| AN | 57203'25 | 11 | 255 | 111 | 24*58'30" |
| AO | N84*08'10' | 100 | 255 | 100 | 0" |
| AP | N7 | 797 | 255 | 7.67 | $147^{127}$ |
| AO | N51 | 3089 | 4500 | 3153 | 44* |
| AR | N 0005'55 | 4593 | 4500 | 482 | $17{ }^{17}$ |
| AS | nse'52'12 | 43.50 | 4500 | 4540 | 5748108" |
| AT | S49'18'57 | 6128 | 45.00 | 67. | $85.48 \cdot 34{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| AU | N78'3408 | 135.7 | 19500 | 138.6 | $40^{\circ}$ |
| AV | N62'20'58 | 8143 | 38000 | ${ }^{18} 59$ | 12*18'05" |
| AW | N36*48'43 | 10774 | 3150 | 10827 | $19^{\circ} 41 \cdot 38^{\prime \prime}$ |
| AX | N489 $177^{\prime} 46^{\circ}$ | 1800 | 315 | 1800 | '16'28" |
| AY | N39'59'25"W | 1295 | 375.00 | 130 | 19'53'10" |
| AZ | N21.4729" | 1077 | 1750 | 1080 | $6 \cdot 3$ |
| BA | N $6.39 \cdot 38$ | 10068 | 37500 | 10088 | 5'25'45" |
| BB | N 7\%or'34" | 26.81 | 37500 | 26 | "0547" |
| BC | N 2'58'40 | 7349 | 71000 | ${ }^{73.33}$ | $5^{+56.01 "}$ |
| BD | N 4*02'14' | 100.2 | 71000 | 1003 | '05'48 |
| CLB | $5{ }^{5}$ | 14028 | 74000 | 14049 | 10'52'39 |
| CL9 | S21'59'40'E | 32329 | 34500 | 33648 | 55'52'40' |
| CL | S3 | 75 | 34500 | 17121 | $29^{6} 28^{1000}$ |
| CL1 | S62 2015 | 750 |  |  |  |
| CL12 | S82'35'1 | 20000 | 22500 | 20725 | 32'46'32' |
| CL13 |  | 28551 | 345.00 | 29438 | $49^{4} 53^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ |
| CL14 | N80*15'12"W | 7918 | 40000 | 79 | 8" |
| CL | N78*51'34** | 6567 | 40000 | 6574 |  |
|  | NB | 24118 | 40000 | 24500 | 505'35" |
| CL18 | N68'45'00"E | 27 | 400 | 2793 | 400 |
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5th wettest March on record for Eugene
By Katie Boer KVAL News Published: Apr 1, 2012 at 4:45 PM PDT Last Updated: Apr 1, 2012 at 4:51 PM PDT
Share this story


KVAL YouNewser 'Amminancy' wrote: "Street Flood: Due to recent heavy rain and poor drainage, Lawnridge Ave. is over a foot deep."
It's no April Fools joke--Eugene tipped the rain gauge at 9.94 " for the month of March-making this year the 5th wettest March of all time for the city. Normal March rainfall for Eugene is 4.99".
Eugene's Top 10 Rainiest Month's of March:

1) 12.46 (1974)
2) 10.93 (1989)
3) 10.58 (1983)
4) 10.49 (1904)
5) 9.94 (2012) *** 5TH WETTEST MARCH
6) 9.93 (1916)
7) 9.81 (1960)
8) 9.79 (1991)
9) 9.45 (1894)
10) 8.66 (1957)

Portland had their wettest recorded month of March since 1940, with 7.89" of rain.
The second wettest March for Salem with 9.98" of rain. The record for wettest March for the state capital is 10.13 " a record set in 1894.
Astoria really took top seed on the coast, their 4th wettest March all time with $14.13^{\prime \prime}$ of rain.

## Source:

http://www.kval.com/news/local/5th-wettest-March-on-record-for-Eugene145700645.html


KENDALL Jerry

From: Clint Beecroft [clintbeecroft@egrassoc.com]<br>Sent: $\quad$ Wednesday, March 07, 2012 12:26 PM<br>To: KENDALL Jerry<br>Subject: Idylewood<br>Follow Up Flag: Follow up<br>Flag Status: Red<br>Attachments: 070256-b LIDAR Kelsie Connection Regrade COASTAL OVERLAYS .pdf

Jerry,

This email is a follow up to our conversation yesterday regarding the geographic boundary of the PW district on the Idylewood site. Attached is a PDF showing a map of the area near the Kelsie Way connection on the north side of the Idylewood property. The Heceta South subdivision is situated to the north.

We have digitized the approximate high water line from the Heceta South plat which is shown as the green line on the attached PDF. The southerly and easterly sides of Lot 43 of Heceta South follows the 50 -foot setback line from this approximate high water line. As shown, the 50 -foot setback from the high water line on Heceta South lies outside the current Kelsie Way right-of-way.

With respect to the boundary of the PW district on the Idylewood property, you have indicated that the boundary should correspond to a high water lake level. We show two possible water levels shown as the $8 \mathbf{7}^{\prime}$ LIDAR contour (blue line) and the $89^{\prime}$ LIDAR contour (red line) with associated 50 -foot setback lines.

As we have discussed, the lake does not appear to have a surface outlet until the water level reaches approximate elevation $87^{\prime}$ msl, at which elevation a surface outlet forms to the south on the County property. This elevation will regulate the seasonal high water level to a maximum elevation of $87^{\prime} \mathrm{msl}$. As shown, the $50-$ foot setback line (also shown as blue) from the $87^{\prime}$ contour line lies outside the proposed Kelsie Way right-ofway on the Idylewood property. Note that the 87 ' contour and associated 50 -foot setback line correlates well with the high water line and setback shown on the Heceta South subdivision. An extension of Kelsie Way road to the north will not result in any grading occurring within this 50-foot setback area.

The $89^{\prime}$ LIDAR contour (shown as red) corresponds to the approximate high lake level that occurred during the February 1996 flood event based on visual observations. This high lake level was temporary due to rising groundwater and surface water from heavy rainfall that occurred over several weeks and represents a flood condition, not a seasonal high water level. As shown, a 50 -foot setback (also shown as red) from the $89{ }^{\prime}$ contour extends into the Kelsie Way right-of-way on the Idylewood property. An extension of Kelsie Way road to the north will result in a cut slope occurring within this 50 -foot setback area. The 89 contour and associated 50 -foot setback line does not correlate as well with the high water line and setback shown on the Heceta South subdivision as the 87 ' contour and setback.

I hope this helps. Please give me a call if you have any questions.
Clint



## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

## APPEAL OF A DIRECTOR'S DECISION

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 125 E $8^{\text {th }}$ AVENUE, EUGENE OR 97401 Planning: 682-3807 Building: 682-3823 Sanitation: 682-3754

| For Office Use Only | FILE \# CODE: HOAPPEAL | FEE: $\$ 250$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appellant: $\qquad$
Mailing address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$
Signature: $\qquad$
Appellant's Representative : $\qquad$
Mailing address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$
Signature: $\qquad$

## LOCATION (subject property)

| Township | Range | Section | Taxlot | Subdivision/partition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Required submittals. Your appeal application will be rejected if it does not contain all the required information.

1. A copy of the decision being appealed, with the department file number: $\qquad$
2. The $\$ 250$ appeal fee, payable to Lane County.
3. The appeal deadline, as stated in the Director's Decision: $\qquad$
4. Check one of the items below to identify your party status with the right to appeal the Director's decision:
_ I am the owner or contract purchaser of the subject property;
_ I I am the applicant for the subject application;
__ Prior to the decision by the Director, I submitted written testimony into the record
__ I am not one of the persons mentioned above, but wish to appeal the Director's decision for the reasons explained in my letter.
5. A letter that addresses each of the following three standards:
a. The reasons) why the Director's decision was made in error or why the Director should reconsider the decision;
b. An identification of one or more of the following general reasons for the appeal, or request for reconsideration:

- The Director exceeded his or her authority;
- The Director failed to follow the procedure applicable to the matter;
- The Director rendered a decision that is unconstitutional;
- The Director misinterpreted the Lane Code, Lane Manual, State Law, or other applicable criteria.
c. The Director should reconsider the decision to allow the submittal for additional evidence not in the record that addresses compliance with the applicable standards or criteria.

6. Any additional information in support of your appeal.
(Version 4/2010)

> INSTRUCTIONS: Completely fill out this application form. Attach additional pages if necessary. Failure to submit a complete application or answer every question will result in a delay or rejection of your application.
> The Preliminary Investigation will determine the presence of any hazards to the proposed development and the appropriate mitigation measures.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION What are you proposing? What are you going to build?
THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF A 62 -LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION OF 3 TAX LOTS.
TAX LOT 401 HAS A PW COMBINING DISTRICT OVERLAY. ROADS, UTILITIES, AND
ASSOCIATED GRADING ACTIVITY WILL BE CONSTRUCTED TO SERVE THE SUBDIVISION.
SITE PLAN A site plan must be included. Refer to the handout entitled "How to prepare your site plan".

ZONING: RA, BD, U, PW
ACREAGE: 46.06

LOCATION Describe how to find the property. Is the address visible? Are there any identifying features?

FROM RHODODENDRON DRIVE TURN EAST ONTO OCEANA DRIVE. CONTINUE THROUGH
THE INTERSECTION WITH SANDRIFT STREET TO THE END OF OCEANA DRIVE. THE PROPERTY ABUTS THE END OF OCEANA DRIVE. THE SITE IS VACANT AND HAS NO ADDRESS.

EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS Does the property contain any roads, structures, etc.? NONE, EXCEPT FOR A STORMWATER PUMP STATION AND PIPE LOCATED ON TAX LOT 801 WHICH WILL REMAIN.

STAKE OUT THE DEVELOPMENT AREA. The location of the structure(s) must be staked out on the site and identified with colored ribbon or a similar item.

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Generally describe the vegetation. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features.

SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

## APPLICABILITY

16.238 PRIME WILDLIFE SHORELANDS COMBINING ZONE (PW-RCP).
(9) Preliminary Investigation. Any proposal for development within the /PW-RCP Zone shall require a Preliminary Investigation by the Planning Director to determine the specific area to which the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply. The requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone shall apply in an area in which the Planning Director determines that one or more of the criteria specified below apply.

To the best of your knowledge, do any of the following conditions exist at the site? Check all that apply:
X (a) Lands which limit control or are directly affected by the hydraulic action of the coastal waterways. These lands are composed of the following:
(i) Floodways and the floodway fringe.
(ii) Land lying between the mean high, high water and mean low water mark of coastal water bodies.
(iii) Dikes, dams, levees or steep embankments which control the coastal water body.
(iv) Lands along the ocean coast at or below the $\mathbf{2 6}$-foot elevation line.
___(b) Adjacent areas of geologic instability which are composed of:
(i) Areas of geologic instability in which the instability is attributable to the hydraulic action of the water body.
(ii) Areas of geologic instability which have a direct impact on water quality, water temperature or on shoreline stability.
(iii) Shorelands in dunal areas in which the enforcement of the use restrictions of the /BD-RCP Zone (LC 16.243) would be inadequate to protect water quality, water temperature or shoreland stability.

X (c) Natural or human-made riparian resources. These lands are as follows:
(i) Extend from 10 to 65 feet landward from the mean high water, within which area the existing vegetation serves one or more of the following functions:
(aa) Shading of coastal water body.
(bb) Stabilization of shoreline.
(cc) Habitat for rare or endangered wildlife species.
(dd) Significant riparian vegetation areas as identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.
X (d) Areas of significant shoreland and wetland biological habitat, composed of:
(i) Freshwater marshes identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
(ii) Areas currently identified by Nature Conservancy and included in the Lane County Coastal Inventory as significant natural areas or other areas which the Lane County Board of Commissioners may deem significant natural areas based on new inventory information.
(iii) Habitat, other than that listed in LC 16.238(9)(c)(i)(cc) above, which supports rare or endangered species.
_(e) Areas necessary for water dependent and water related uses, including areas of recreational importance which utilize coastal water or riparian resources, areas appropriate for navigation and port facilities and areas having characteristics suitable for aquaculture. These are as identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
__(f) Areas identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan as having exceptional aesthetic or scenic quality derived from or related to the association with coastal water areas.
__(g) Coastal headlands identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory.

## APPROVAL CRITERIA

Answer every question. Attach additional pages if necessary.
(5) Prohibited Uses. If found subject to the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone, based on the results of the Preliminary Investigations specified by LC 16.238(9), the following uses are specifically prohibited:
(a) Fill in coastal lakes.
(b) Fill in freshwater marsh areas as identified in Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
(c) New piling-type piers of any descriptions when adjacent to a Natural Estuary Zone (NERCP).
(d) Dredged material disposal.

Does your project include any of these activities?
Yes


If yes, explain: $\qquad$
(6) Site and Development Requirements. If found subject to the requirements of the /PW-RCP Zone, based on the results of the Preliminary Investigation specified by LC 16.238(9), the below-specified development requirements shall be in addition to those provided by the respective zone or zones with which the/PW-RCP Zone is combined. These requirements shall not apply to timber harvesting activities. Timber harvesting activities, where permitted by the respective zone with which the/PWRCP Zone is combined, shall conform to Oregon Forest Practices Act rules.
(a) No more of a parcel's existing vegetation shall be cleared than is necessary for the permitted use, accessory buildings, necessary access, septic requirements and fire safety requirements.
Footprint of the proposed structure(s):__ NONE sf
Total area of vegetation clearance: __ NONE sf
Explain why your proposed vegetation clearance is not excessive: NO DEVELOPMENT IS
PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF THE PW SHORELAND.
ALL DEVELOPMENT AND VEGETATION REMOVAL WILL OCCUR ON PORTIONS OF
THE SITE EXTRANEOUS TO THE PW-RCP ZONE AND ITS SETBACK AREA.
(b) To the maximum degree possible, building sites shall be located on portions of the site which exhibit the least vegetative cover.
Does the property contain any vegetation-free areas?


If you are not using the vegetation-free area, explain why: NOT APPLICABLE .
NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF
THE PW SHORELAND.
(c) Construction activities occur in such a manner so as to avoid unnecessary excavation and/or removal or existing vegetation beyond that area required for the facilities indicated in LC $16.238(6)(a)$. Where vegetation removal beyond that allowed in LC $16.238(6)(a)$ cannot be avoided, the site shall be replanted during the next replanting season to avoid sedimentation of coastal waters. The vegetation shall be of indigenous species in order to maintain the natural character of the area.

Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE.
NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF
THE PW SHORELAND.
(d) The requirements for parking and vision clearance shall be as provided by the respective zone or zones with which the/PW-RCP Zone is combined.
This will be a condition of approval.
(e) No topographic modification is permitted within the $\mathbf{5 0}$-foot setback area specified by LC 16.238(7).

This will be a condition of approval.
(f) The shoreward half of the setback area specified by LC 16.238(8) must be left in indigenous vegetation, except where un-surfaced trails are provided.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: YES. INDIGENOUS VEGETATION LOCATED ON PROPOSED LOTS AND WITHIN THE SETBACK AREA WILL NOT BE

DISTURBED EXCEPT FOR UNSURFACED TRAILS CREATED BY LOT PURCHASERS.
(g) Cornices, canopies and eaves may extend two feet into the setback area specified by LC 16.238(7).

Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NONE PROPOSED AT THIS TIME
(h) Decks, uncovered porches, stairways and fire escapes may extend a distance of $\mathbf{1 0}$ feet into the setback area specified by LC 16.238(7).
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NONE PROPOSED AT THIS TIME
(i) All trees must be retained within the setback area specified by LC 16.238(7), except where removal is subject to requirements of the Oregon Forest Practices Act.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NO TREE REMOVAL IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE SETBACK AREA.
(j) Structures shall be sited and/or screened with natural vegetation so as not to impair the aesthetic quality of the site.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: STRUCTURES ARE NOT
PROPOSED AT THIS TIME, BUT WILL BE REVIEWED AT THE TIME OF
INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT.
(k) The exterior building materials shall blend in color, hue and texture to the maximum amount feasible with the surrounding vegetation and landscape.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: STRUCTURES ARE NOT
PROPOSED AT THIS TIME, BUT WILL BE REVIEWED AT THE TIME OF
INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT.
(l) Where public ownerships in the form of existing rights-of-way which provide access to coastal waters are involved in development subject to the regulations of this section, those ownerships shall be retained where possible, or replaced where not possible, upon the sale or disposal of the rights-of-way. Rights-of-way may be vacated to permit redevelopment of shoreland areas provided public access across the affected site is retained.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE.
NO PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY IS PROPOSED TO ABUT THE PW SHORELAND.
(7) Additional Setback Requirements. Setbacks shall be as required in the zone or zones with which the/PW-RCP Zone is combined, except for the additional below-specified setback requirements.
(a) Structures shall be set back 50 feet from coastal lakes and the estuary measured at right angles to the high waterline. Use of this 50 feet shall be as specified in LC 16.238(6)(e)-(h).
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: YES. THE SETBACK AREA IS
SHOWN ON THE SUBDIVISION PLAN. THE PROPOSED LOTS HAVE BEEN SIZED
TO ACCOMMODATE BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENCROACHING THE SETBACK AREA.
(b) Building setbacks on oceanfront parcels are determined in accord with the rate of erosion in the area to provide reasonable protection to the site through the expected lifetime of the structure. Setback shall be determined by doubling the estimated average annual erosion rate and multiplying that by the expected life of the structure.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE. THERE ARE
NO OCEANFRONT PARCELS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL.
(8) Special Land Division Requirements. The following criteria shall be met for land divisions on property within the /PW-RCP Zone, based on the Preliminary Investigation in LC 16.238(9) below. These criteria are in addition to minimum area requirements of any zone combined with the /PWRCP Zone.
(a) For lands within urban or urbanizable areas or lands developed or committed to development:
(i) Land divisions must be consistent with shoreland values as identified in the Coastal Resources Management Plan, not adversely impact water quality, and not increase hazard to life or property.
(ii) The use will not result in loss of significant wildlife habitat or aesthetic values as identified in the Coastal Resources Management Plan.
(iii) Minimum area requirements for the division of land shall be based on the minimum parcel size in the zone with which the /PW-RCP Zone is combined, or five acres, whichever is greater.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: YES, BECAUSE NO DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY OF THE PW SHORELAND OR ITS SETBACK AREA.
(b) For lands outside urban or urbanizable areas or lands developed or committed to development, the above criteria, plus the following:
(i) There is a need which cannot adequately be accommodated on non-shoreland locations.
(ii) There is a lack of suitable shoreland areas within urban or urbanizable areas or within areas developed or committed to development.
Does your plan comply with this requirement? Explain: NOT APPLICABLE BECAUSE THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED WITHIN THE FLORENCE UGB.

## Prime Wildlife Combining Zone <br> Preliminary Investigation Application for Idylewood Fourth Addition <br> Additional Information

PHYSICAL FEATURES: Describe the site. Identify any steep slopes, water bodies (creeks, ponds, etc.) or other significant features. Include additional pages if necessary.

The developable easterly portion of this site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies across the site from an elevation of less than 82 feet MSL in the lowest areas of the site to a high of approximately 123 feet MSL (contours were interpreted from City of Florence 100-foot topographic maps). The site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood Subdivision, on the north by the Heceta South Subdivision, and on the east and south by vacant land owned by Lane County.

The geology of the site suggests that this is a classically formed transverse dune/deflation plain formation with relict incisions formed by the interplay between historic wind and water movements across the formation. These topographic incisions and the associated remnant sand between them are close together and steeply inclined where forces of erosion removed the sand placed by seasonal winds. Similar relict incisions can be observed across the Heceta South Subdivision to the north of the subject property. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development.

Much of the eastern (undevelopable) portion of the site is characterized as a frequently inundated bog/water body that in most years displays some water in the lower elevations but in some years is completely dry. Water levels within this area and across the site are driven by seasonal groundwater. No defined or channelized outlet exists to this low-lying area. Water levels rise and fall as a reflection of the groundwater table. Wetlands are present on this portion of the site as shown on the subdivision plan. High and low water levels rise and fall in conjunction with both the seasonal precipitation and cyclical weather patterns. On years, such as in 1996, when precipitation is substantially higher than average, seasonal high water tables at the intersection of Oceana Drive and Sandrift Street reached an elevation of between 85 and 86 feet MSL. The groundwater gradient across the site slopes from east to west (toward the Siuslaw River approximately one mile away) at a gradient of approximately one foot in 400 feet. Thus, the seasonal/cyclical high groundwater tables across the site vary from an estimated 89 feet MSL more or less at the eastern fringe of the proposed development to an elevation of 85 to 86 feet MSL more or less along the eastern fringe of the existing Idylewood Subdivision.

At the northwestern portion of the site, near proposed Lots 17 and 18, there is an abrupt 40 foot drop in elevation at the lee side of the dune formation. Further north, where Kelsie Way was terminated in the Heceta South Subdivision, the leeward drop is less pronounced (about 30 feet) but close enough to Kelsie Way to render this possible transportation connection very difficult at best. Further south, this leeward drop declines to insignificance in the vicinity of proposed Lots 23,24 , and 25.

## LAND USE APPLICATION - DIRECTOR General Application Form

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 3050 N. DELTA HWY, EUGENE OR 97408 Planning: 541-682-3577
For Office Use Only: FILE\# S09-PAlLOSGL FEE: 2600


Through applying for this application I authorize the Lane County Planning Director, designee, or hearings official to enter upon the property subject of the application to conduct a site visit necessary for processing the requested application. Lane County shall contact the Land Owner prior to the site visit to arrange an appropriate time for the site visit.

Land Owner Signature:
 MANAGER

## LOCATION

$\frac{\text { 18-12-10-40 \#400, 401; Map 18-12-10-34 \#801 }}{\text { Township }- \text { Range }- \text { Section }}$

None assigned
Site address

PROPOSAL. In one sentence, identify what you are proposing.
Request for Planning Director Approval to Lane Code 10.270-35(6) to allow grading of slopes in excess of $25 \%$ within the Beaches and Dunes Combining District as provided by Lane Code 10.330.

# CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 

509-PA16-05618<br>BENEDICK/LANFEAR<br>9-2-2016

This is to certify that I, Chris Rogers, mailed Notification of

## Referral

To the persons) shown on the attached copy of mailing labels \&/or attached letter, and delivered said information to the authorized agent for the us Post Office in Eugene, Oregon on

DATE MAILED: $\qquad$
AOL
END OF COMMENT PERIOD: $\qquad$ 9-22-2016

APPEAL DEADLINE: $\qquad$


NOTE: Surrounding property owners listed are "the owners of record of all property on the most recent property tax assessment rolls" on RLID as per Lane Code $14.300(3)(\mathrm{d})$. If a tax lot appears on the notice list \& there are no corresponding addresses then the tax records have not been updated; therefore, these property owners were not notified.

# Referral Notice and Opportunity to Comment On a Land Use Application for a Development 

## Date:

Department File:
Applicant:
Owner:
Agent:
Assessor's Map \& Taxlot: 18-12-10-34-00801;18-12-10-40-00400;18-12-10-40-00401
Address: VACANT
Base Zone: SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL (RA)
Combining Zone: BEACHES AND DUNES (IBD) \& PRIME WILDLIFE (IPW)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION http://www.lanecounty.org

Proposal: A request for Planning Director Review and Approval to allow a variance to the grading standards of the Beaches and Dunes Combining District. The applicant requests allowance to grade of slopes in excess of the $25 \%$ prohibition found in10.270-35(6). The variance provisions are pursuant to Lane Code 10.330.

The purpose of this notice is to acquaint you with the proposed development, to gather information you may have about the project, and provide an opportunity to comment and express concerns related to the approval criteria, prior to the Planning Director's decision to approve or deny the proposal.

The application and related materials are available for inspection at the Lane County Land Management Division at no cost and copies will be provided at reasonable cost. The name of the Lane County Land Management Division representative to contact concerning this application is Erik Forsell, (541) 682-4054.

Approval criteria are found in the section(s) of Lane Code cited above. The criteria may be obtained or viewed at the Land Management Division or at the internet address below. You may submit information in the spaces provided on the last page and return this document to the attention of Erik Forsell, Lane County Land Management Division, 3050 N. Delta Hwy., Eugene, OR 97408, or Fax to ATTN: Erik Forsell, (541) 682-3947. Please be sure to reference the PA file number shown above, and submit your comments by 4:00 P.M. on $\qquad$ -

Concerns/comments submitted in writing will be considered in making the decision as they relate to the criteria under which the proposal must be evaluated.

Your comments are important and will greatly improve the decision making process, but please note that you will not receive an individual response to information submitted. By law, comments received that are not related to the approval criteria may not be considered. General planning information is available by calling $541 / 682-3577$, or by visiting the Public Works Customer Service Center at 3050 N. Delta Hwy. weekdays between 9 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

Links to applicable law are available through our Planning homepage:
http://www.lanecounty.org/Departments/PW/LMD/LandUse/Pages/default.aspx
Mailed copies of the approval criteria are also available, at cost, by calling Land Management Division Staff at 541/682-3347. Please allow one week for mailing.

## Referral Notice and Opportunity to Comment On a Land Use Application for a Development

Date:<br>9-2-2016<br>Department File:<br>Applicant:<br>Owner:<br>Agent:<br>Address:<br>Base Zone:<br>Combining Zone:<br>Assessor's Map \& Taxlot: 18-12-10-34-00801;18-12-10-40-00400;18-12-10-40-00401<br>509-PA16-05618<br>SHARLA MANAGER WHITTEN - BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC<br>BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC<br>THOM LANFEAR - LANFEAR CONSULTING LLC<br>VACANT<br>SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL (RA)<br>BEACHES AND DUNES (/BD) \& PRIME WILDLIFE (/PW)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION http://www.lanecounty.org


#### Abstract

Proposal: A request for Planning Director Review and Approval to allow a variance to the grading standards of the Beaches and Dunes Combining District. The applicant requests allowance to grade of slopes in excess of the $25 \%$ prohibition found in10.270-35(6). The variance provisions are pursuant to Lane Code 10.330.


The purpose of this notice is to acquaint you with the proposed development, to gather information you may have about the project, and provide an opportunity to comment and express concerns related to the approval criteria, prior to the Planning Director's decision to approve or deny the proposal.

The application and related materials are available for inspection at the Lane County Land Management Division at no cost and copies will be provided at reasonable cost. The name of the Lane County Land Management Division representative to contact concerning this application is Erik Forsell, (541) 682-4054.

Approval criteria are found in the section(s) of Lane Code cited above. The criteria may be obtained or viewed at the Land Management Division or at the internet address below. You may submit information in the spaces provided on the last page and return this document to the attention of Erik Forsell, Lane County Land Management Division, 3050 N. Delta Hwy., Eugene, OR 97408, or Fax to ATTN: Erik Forsell, (541) 682-3947. Please be sure to reference the PA file number shown above, and submit your comments by 4:00 P.M. on $\qquad$ -

## Concerns/comments submitted in writing will be considered in making the decision as they relate to the criteria under which the proposal must be evaluated.

Your comments are important and will greatly improve the decision making process, but please note that you will not receive an individual response to information submitted. By law, comments received that are not related to the approval criteria may not be considered. General planning information is available by calling 541/682-3577, or by visiting the Public Works Customer Service Center at 3050 N. Delta Hwy. weekdays between 9 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

Links to applicable law are available through our Planning homepage:
http://www.lanecounty.org/Departments/PW/LMD/LandUse/Pages/default.aspx
Mailed copies of the approval criteria are also available, at cost, by calling Land Management Division Staff at 541/682-3347.
Please allow one week for mailing.

From: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Regarding Department File: 509-PA16-05618
Applicant: SHARLA MANAGER WHITTEN - BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC
Staff: Erik Forsell

## Comments:

Return to: Erik Forsell, Planner
LANE COUNTY LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION 3050 N. Delta Hwy
Eugene, OR 97408




NOTES:

1. ELEVATIONS BASED ON $5 / 8^{\circ}$ ROD ATINTERSECTION OF OCEANA DRIVE AND SANDRIFT STREET. ELEVATION 84.37 FERT. CONTOUR SOURCE-2009 DOGAMI LIDAR, OREGON NORTH COAST
2. EXISTING CONTOUR LINES ARE SHOWN AT S-FOOT CONTOUR intierval.


DENOTES EXISTING SLOPES OVER 25\% RETAINED

DENOTES EXISTING SLOPES OVER $25 \%$ IMPACTED

EXISTING CONTOUR LINES

PROPERTY BOUNDARY


```
509-PA16-05618
BENEDICK/LANFEAR
9-2-2016
1812101304600 & 4700 / 1812102000400 & 1812104001600
LANE COUNTY
3 0 4 0 ~ N ~ D E L T A ~ H W Y ~
EUGENE,OR 97408
1812103403200
ABBONIZIO WAYNE A P
PO BOX }18
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812104001800
ARP FLORENCE LLC
4 0 8 0 \text { COMMERCIAL AVE}
SPRINGFIELD OR }9747
1812103105400
ASHTON TRUST
4 9 6 0 ~ S A N D R I F T ~ C R T ~
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103108400
BAKER JACK H
87838 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812101302300
BARRETT TERRY R & KATHY M
5043 KELSIE CT
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812104000500
BATCHELDER NANCY S
PO BOX 935
YACHATS OR 97498
1812103400801 & 1812104000400 & 401
BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC / SHARLA MANAGER
27922 WARD LN
EUGENE OR }9740
1812104000100
BOGGS PAUL DANIEL & MONA DEE
PO BOX }38
```

```
SPRAGUE RIVER OR 97639
1812103100800
CAMPBELL DAVID J & DIANE E
4985 GULLSETTLE CRT
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103101100
CAPUTO RONALD A & JUDY E
8 7 7 2 9 \text { SANDRIFT ST}
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103400300
CARRUTHERS RONALD
87694 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812104001000
CLARK JAMES M & HEIDI A
05180 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103406000
CLAUSEN ROBERT E & MCBRIDE MAGGIE
87630 WOODMERE EAST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103100500
COLIN C HIEBERT TRUST
87791 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812104000800 & 900
COX OSCAR R
0 5 1 7 6 ~ H E C E T A ~ B E A C H ~ R D ~
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103108200
DOBSON RICHARD L & DONNA M
PO BOX }173
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103400300
DODD ELKE
87694 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE OR }9743
1 8 1 2 1 0 3 1 0 0 2 0 0
```

```
DUKE KENT F & CAROL G
87827 SANDRIFT
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812101302800
DUNLAP JOANNE & JOHN
5014 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103407700 & 7800
DYKES BARRY J & SUSAN L
4937 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812104000300
FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION
5000 PLANO PKWY
CARROLLTON TX 75010-4902
1812103100400
GARDINER BRIAN C
87797 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103100900
GARDINER FAMILY TRUST
87737 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103105200
GARY L & SHERRI K DONNELLY FAMILY TRUST
87740 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812101302100
HAL & CYNTHIA FLESHER LIVING TRUST
1820 MADELYNNE CRT
TURLOCK CA }9538
1812103101300
HALL WILLIAM & CATHEY M
87701 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812101302200
HARRAH LINDA L & MICHAEL R
87863 KELSIE WAY
FLORENCE OR }9743
```

1812104001402
HAWKINS BEN ALLAN \& ROSE E
PO BOX 2186
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812100000101
HEAD JAMES \& EILEEN
5139 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812101301400
HECETA INC
PO BOX 3467
FLORENCE OR 97439

1812101301000
HILL RICKEY L SR \& DONNA M 87919 WOOD LAKE WAY S FLORENCE OR 97439

1812103407100
HUDSPETH VIRGINIA L
87659 WOODMERE W
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103100700
ISHII JOINT TRUST
87757 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812101302900
JOHNSON FAMILY TRUST
5046 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103408000
KENNETH L URWIN TRUST
4929 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812101302500 \& 2600
KING CHARLES M \& BETTY B
5009 KELSIE CT
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103105300
KINSLOW JANICE A

87772 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439

1812104001500 \& 01701
KNIGHT ANDREW J \& HEATH J \& IAN A
87719 SALTAIRE ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103106300
LARA ROBERT Y \& NANCY L
87786 SANDRIFT
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812104001300
MARION L CASTLEMAN \& JOAN A CARR REV LIV TR
5202 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103405901
MARY LEHMAN \& WILLIAM DURST REVOCABLE TRUST
87649 WOODMERE E
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103407200
MCBRIDE JOHN E
87640 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439

1812103408100
MCCAULEY DONNA R \& JIMMY K
87684 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439

1812103108100
MCCONNELL MARIA
87814 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103407900
MCDONALD CHRISTOPHER M
4933 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103405800
MCDOUGLE BILL R
87635 WOODMERE EAST
FLORENCE OR 97439

```
1812103105100
MEHURON ARLENE G TE
87730 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103105100
MEHURON REX D TE
87730 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812101302400
MENDONCA FAMILY LIVING TRUST
5033 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103105000
MILLER MICHAEL J & PATTI J
87720 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103100300
NEWMAN GARY C
87803 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103108500
PILCHER RANDALL J & SUSAN R
87842 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103407600
POTTS CHARLES J & EDITH M
4938 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103405800
REEP CHRISTINE E
215 PANARAMA DR
BAKERSFIELD CA }9330
1812101302700
REHDER WILLIAM & CYNTHIA
5011 KELSIE CRT
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103106400
SAPIENZA JOSEPH M & JANETTE
4966 OCEANA DR
```

FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103108300
SHOYS PETER KILLIAN \& CHRISTINE MARIE 87836 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812101302000
SIKORA JAMES ALLEN \& JANE MARIE
87885 KELSIE WAY
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103101200
SIMMONS JAMES R JR \& LINDA G
87623 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103400100
SMITH ERICK J \& ROBYN N
87723 SALTAIRE ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103101000
SPIVEY WILLIAM F III \& J A
87733 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103108000
TROMBLEY BRUCE J \& DONNA R
87810 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103108600
TRUST DATED 06/26/03
87843 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103407400
UDT 11/02/04
PO BOX 2695
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103407300
ULMAN BEVERLY J \& LOHMA L
PO BOX 2570
FLORENCE OR 97439

```
VASQUEZ LIVING TRUST
87678 LIMPIT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439
1812103100600
WATKINS CARL D & RONETTA B
1259 GREENWOOD DR NE
KEIZER OR 97303
1812103403300
WILLIAMS BRUCE G & MARY E
87660 WOODMERE WEST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103100101
WILSON FAMILY REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST
87849 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812104001100
WILSON MITCHELL & LUCILLE
5 1 9 0 \text { HECETA BEACH RD}
FLORENCE OR }9743
1812103403100
WOODS FRANK N & ROSEMARY R
4914 CLOUDCROFT LN
FLORENCE OR 97439
LANFEAR CONSULTING LLC
THOM LANFEAR
541 WILLAMETTE ST #402
EUGENE,OR 97401
OREGON STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION
725 SUMMERS ST NE SUITE C
SALEM OR 97301
US FISH & WILDLIFE
KEMFER MCMASTER
2600 SE 98 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\mathrm{ TH }}\mathrm{ AVE, SUITE }10
PORTLAND, OR }9726
US FISH & WILDLIFE (COASTAL)
ATTN: ROY LOWE
2127 SE MARINE SCIENCE DR.
NEWPORT,OR }9736
```

```
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
KAT BEAL
26275 CLEAR LAKE RD
JUNCTION CITY,OR }9744
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
EUGENE REGULATORY FIELD OFFICE
211 E. SEVENTH AVE., SUITE }10
EUGENE, OR 97401
CENTRAL LINCOLN PUD
966 HWY }10
FLORENCE OR }9743
DEQ
165 E 7 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\mathrm{ TH AVE. #100}
EUGENE,OR }9740
DEPT GEOLOGY & MINERAL IND - MLR
ATTN FRANK SCHNITZER
229 BROADALBIN ST SW
ALBANY OR 97321-2246
OR STATE FISH & WILDLIFE
(COASTAL)
2040 SE MARINE SCIENCE DR
NEWPORT OR 97365-5229
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR *
CITY OF FLORENCE ATTN: MICHELLE
250 HWY 101
FLORENCE OR }9743
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR *
MIKE MILLER - PUBLIC WORKS
9 8 9 ~ S P R U C E ~ S T R E E T
FLORENCE,OR }9743
SIUSLAW VALLEY FIRE
2625 HWY }10
FLORENCE OR 97439-9702
SIUSLAW SCHOOL DIST #97J
2111 OAK STREET
```


## FLORENCE OR97439-9805

```
SIUSLAW WATERSHED COUNCIL
ATTN: LIZ VOLMER-BUHL
PO BOX 422
MAPLETON,OR 97453
SIUSLAW WATERSHED COUNCIL
ATTN: WRIN WELLS
PO BOX 422
MAPLETON, OR 97453
EUGENE WATER & ELECTRIC BOARD
ATTN: KARL MORGENSTERN
500 E 4 'TH AVE
EUGENE,OR 97401
KRISTINA DESCHAINE
FIRE MARSHALL
3620 GATEWAY STREET
SPRINGFIELD, OR 97477
LANDWATCH LANE COUNTY
ROBERT EMMONS
4 0 0 9 3 \text { LITTLE FALL CRK RD}
FALL CREEK, OR 97438
LANDWATCH LANE COUNTY
P.O. BOX 5347
EUGENE,OR 97405
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
WATER QUANTITY/QUALITY
MICHAEL MATTICK
COUNTY ROAD MAINTENANCE
JENNIFER PAUGH
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
LORI GREEN
```


## MAPPING \& REFERRAL INSTRUCTIONS

## 509-PA16-05618

MAP NO. 18-12-10-34-00801;18-12-10-40-00 ADDITIONAL OWNERSHIP: 400;18-12-10-40-00401

APPLICANT:
SHARLA MANAGER WHITTEN -
BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC
27922 WARD LN
EUGENE, OR 97402
BASE ZONE:
COMBINING ZONE:

## OWNER:

BENEDICK HOLDINGS LLC
27922 WARD LN
EUGENE, OR 97402

AGENT:
THOM LANFEAR - LANFEAR
CONSULTING LLC
541 WILLAMETTE ST \#402
EUGENE, OR 97401

Clerical:
Please prepare a notice list of surrounding property owners and send a copy of the Referral Notice and the attached materials to each of those owners and the Agencies identified below.
$\qquad$

Building
Sanitation
Final Legal Lot Rural Addressing Flood Management Easement Review
Compliance
Surveyors
Transportation Planning
County Road Maintenance
Water Quantity/Quality
Assessment \&Taxation
State Fire Marshal
Community Organization NONE
Watershed Council Siuslaw Watershed
Land Watch
School District SIUSLAW
Water District $\qquad$
Fire District Sluslaw Valley Fire \& Rescue City Area of Interest (20-day notice) Florene METRO Area of Interest NONE Environmental Health

Referral


State Fish \& Wildlife (ODFW): Coast
State Highway (ODOT)
State Forestry:
Dept. Geology \& Mineral Industries (DOGAMI)
Dept. Land Conservation \& Development (DLCD)
Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA)
Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ) 1200-C
Oregon Health Division
Water Master
Division of State Lands (DSL)
State Parks (Certified mail)
Dept. of Aeronautics
CenturyLink
Northwest Natural Gas
Port of Siuslaw
Power Company CLPUD
US Army Corps. of Engineers (ACOE)
US Fish \& Wildlife (USF\&W)
Confederated Tribes
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
Other

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTACHED MATERIALS

## Copy and attach to all Referral Notices: $\quad$ Vicinity Map <br> 区 Site Plan <br> $\square$ Flagged Applicant's Material

Copy and Attach Materials to Referral Notices as Instructed Above and Below:

## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Date Received:
REC:

## LAND USE APPLICATION - DIRECTOR General Application Form

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 3050 N. DELTA HWY, EUGENE OR 97408 Planning: 541-682-3577
For once use only, FLIE\# S09-PA16-05618 FEE: 2600

Applicant (print name): Benedick Holdings
Mailing address: $\quad 27922$ Ward Lane, Eugene, OR 97402
Phone: $\qquad$ Email: $\qquad$
Applicant Signature: $\qquad$
Agent (print name): $\quad$ Thom Lanfear / Lanfear Consulting LLC
Mailing address: $\quad 541$ Willamette St. Ste 402, Eugene, OR 97401
Phone: 541-345-8139
Email:
tlanfear@pacinfo.com
Agent Signature: $\qquad$


Land Owner (print name): $\qquad$ Benedick Holdings
Mailing address: 27922 Ward Lane, Eugene, OR 97402

Phone: $\qquad$ Email: ejbenedick@msn.com

Through applying for this application I authorize the Lane County Planning Director, designee, or hearings official to enter upon the property subject of the application to conduct a site visit necessary for processing the requested application. Lane County shall contact the Land Owner prior to the site visit to arrange an appropriate time for the site visit.

Land Owner Signature: $\qquad$ MANAGER

## LOCATION

18-12-10-40 \#400, 401; Мар 18-12-10-34 \#801
Township - Range - Section - Tax lot
None assigned
Site address

PROPOSAL. In one sentence, identify what you are proposing.
Request for Planning Director Approval to Lane Code 10.270-35(6) to allow grading of slopes in excess of $25 \%$ within the Beaches and Dunes Combining District as provided by Lane Code 10.330.

## Business Registry Business Name Search

New Search

|  | BusinesS Entity Data | 07-23-2016 <br> $13: 12$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Registry Nbr | $\frac{\text { Entity }}{\text { Type }}$ | Entity <br> Status | Jurisdiction | Registry <br> Date | Next <br> Renewal <br> Date | Renewal <br> Due? |
| $476820-91$ | DLLC | ACT | OREGON | $11-13-2007$ | $11-13-2016$ |  |
| Entity Name | BENEDICK HOLDINGS, LLC |  |  |  |  |  |
| Foreign <br> Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## New Search <br> Associated Names

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Type } & \text { PPB } & \text { PRINCIPAL PLACE OF } & & \\ \hline \text { BUSINESS }\end{array}\right]$

Please click here for general information about registered agents and service of process.


| Type | MALMAILING ADDRESS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Addr $\mathbf{1}$ | 27922 WARD LANE |  |  |  |  |
| Addr 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSZ | EUGENE | OR | 97402 |  |  |
|  | Country | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |  |  |  |


| Type | MGR | MANAGER |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Name | SHARLA |  | WHITTEN |  | Resign Date |  |  |
| Addr 1 | 27922 WARD LN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Addr 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSZ | EUGENE | OR | 97402 |  | Country | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |  |

New Search
Name History

| Business Entity Name | Name Type | Name Status | Start Date | End Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

```
Request for a Variance to allow grading of slopes exceeding 25\% in the Beaches and Dunes Combining District
```

| Applicant |  | Property |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benedick Holdings L |  | Benedick |
| 27922 Ward Ln. |  | 27922 Ward |
| Eugene, OR 97402 |  | Eugene, OR |
| Applicant's Representative |  |  |
| Thom Lanfear / Lanfear Consulting LLC |  |  |
| 541 Willamette St., Suite 402 |  |  |
| Eugene, OR 97401 |  |  |
| Location: Oceana Drive, Cloudcroft Ln. |  |  |
| Assessor's Map: $\quad 18-12-10-34$ \#801, 18-12-10-40 \#400, 4 |  |  |
| Acreage: $\quad 45.80$ acres |  |  |
| Base Zone: <br> Combining Zones: | Suburban Residential (RA) |  |
|  | Beaches and Dunes Combining District (/ |  |
|  | Interim Urbanizing Combining District (/U) |  |
|  | Prime Wildlife Shorelands Combining Dis | trict (/PW) |
| Comprehensive Pla | City of Florence Comprehensive Plan July | 1988 |

Comprehensive Plan: City of Florence Comprehensive Plan July 1988

## I. PROPOSAL

Request for Planning Director Approval for a variance to Lane Code 10.270-35(6) to allow grading of slopes in excess of $25 \%$ within the Beaches and Dunes Combining District as provided by Lane Code 10.330.

## A. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The developable westerly portion of this site is characterized by multiple well-stabilized inactive sand dune formations and dense vegetation. Topography varies across the site from an elevation of less than 84 feet MSL in the lowest areas of the site to a high of approximately 156 feet MSL (contours were interpreted from 2009 DOGAMI LiDAR data, Oregon North Coast). The site is bordered on the west by the Idylewood Subdivision, on the north by the Heceta South Subdivision, and on the east and south by vacant land owned by Lane County.

The geology of the site suggests that this is a classically formed transverse dune/deflation plain formation with relict incisions formed by the interplay between historic wind and water
movements across the formation. These topographic incisions and the associated remnant sand between them are close together and steeply inclined where forces of erosion removed the sand placed by seasonal winds. Similar relict incisions can be observed across the Heceta South Subdivision to the north of the subject property. These relict features are neither active nor considered to be significant geologic features and are proposed to be graded and stabilized in conjunction with the development.

Much of the eastern (undevelopable) portion of the site is characterized as a frequently inundated bog/water body that in most years displays some water in the lower elevations but in some years is completely dry. Water levels within this area and across the site are driven by seasonal groundwater. No defined or channelized outlet exists to this low-lying area. Water levels rise and fall as a reflection of the groundwater table. Wetlands are present on this portion of the site as shown on the subdivision plan. High and low water levels rise and fall in conjunction with both the seasonal precipitation and cyclical weather patterns. On years, such as in 1996, when precipitation was substantially higher than average, seasonal high water tables at the intersection of Oceana Drive and Sandrift Street reached an elevation of between 85 and 86 feet MSL. The groundwater gradient across the site slopes from east to west (toward the Siuslaw River approximately one mile away) at a gradient of approximately one foot in 400 feet. Thus, the seasonal/cyclical + $\backslash$ - high groundwater tables across the site vary from an estimated 89 feet MSL more or less at the eastern fringe of the proposed development to an elevation of 85 to 86 feet MSL more or less along the eastern fringe of the existing Idylewood Subdivision.

## B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Request is made to grade some areas of steep slopes found within the proposed right-of-way alignment for the road that will connect Cloudcroft Lane to Bear Run Road. Additional grading of scattered steep slopes is also necessary to provide adequate cul-de-sac access to the lot arrangements in the northern part of the property. The steep areas in the northern and southern portions of the property will also be graded to maximize the number of building sites developed within the Urban Growth Boundary of Florence. The proposed lots that will have some amount of grading of steep slopes are identified as lots $254-264,276-282,285-291$, and 298 - 299. Grading of the site is limited to that area necessary to provide for the construction of the proposed road to the required public road standards, the creation of one building site per lot, and the provision of an adequate access from the public road to the building site.

## II. APPROVAL CRITERIA \& PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

The Site and Development Requirements of the Beaches and Dunes Combining District are found in Lane Code 10.270-35.

Lane Code 10.270-35 Additional Site and Development Requirements.
The following requirements apply to all development except the harvesting of timber as allowed by the District with which the /BD District is combined. Timber harvesting activities shall conform to Oregon Forest Practices Act rules regulating logging practices in dune areas. (6) Slopes in excess of $\mathbf{2 5}$ percent shall be prohibited from development.

Lane Code 10.020 Development. The division of a parcel of land into two or more parcels, the construction, reconstruction, conversion, structural alteration, relocation or enlargement of any structure; any mining, excavation, landfill or grading.

This request to allow "development" (grading) on slopes greater than $25 \%$ is subject to the criteria found in Lane Code 10.330-20. The approval criteria and development standards are in boldface type, followed by the proposed Findings of Fact.

## Lane Code 10.330-20 Criteria.

(1) Variances to a requirement of this chapter with respect to lot area and dimensions, setbacks, yard area, lot coverage, height of structures, vision clearance, fences and walls, and other quantitative requirements may be granted only if, on the basis of the application, investigation, and evidence submitted, the following expressly written findings are made:

The applicant requests a variance to the quantitative requirement of Lane Code 10.270-35(6): Slopes in excess of 25 percent shall be prohibited from development. The applicant proposes to conduct grading to reduce some areas of $25 \%$ slopes to a lesser grade for the development of roads and home sites within the proposed subdivision submitted in application PA10-05821. The subject parcel does not contain any landforms that are specifically prohibited from all development by 10.270-20 Prohibited Development Areas. No development, with the exception of minimal development, shall be permitted on the following dune landforms:
(1) Beaches, except as provided for in LC 10.270-15 above.
(2) Foredunes if subject to wave overtopping or ocean undercutting.
(3) Active dune forms.
(4) Nearshore deflation plain.
10.330-20(1)(a): A strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specified requirement would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship and would be inconsistent with the objectives of this chapter, or

A strict enforcement of the grading restriction would result in a practical difficulty by preventing the connection to existing roads in the adjoining subdivisions, efficient circulation pattern through the proposed subdivision, and the provision of adequate access to the more level buildable areas in the middle and northern part of the subdivision. There is no possible way to provide public roads that meet standard engineering design parameters without impacts to some slopes over $25 \%$ because of the narrow width of the subject property ( $175^{\prime}$ )
between the northeast corner of proposed lot 254 and the northeast corner of proposed lot 265. The alignment chosen for the connecting road from Cloudcroft Lane to Sanddrift Street and Oceana Drive is the one with the least impact to the steep slopes found in the southern part of the subdivision proposal. The steep slopes in the northern part of the property are intermittent making it extremely difficult to design buildable lots that have both access to the public roads and an adequate home site on each lot.

A strict enforcement of the requirements would be inconsistent with the objectives of Lane Code Chapter 10. This is the section of Lane Code that applies only to lands within an urban growth boundary in Lane County.

Lane Code 10.015 lists nine objectives of Chapter 10. They are:
(1) To encourage the most appropriate use of land and resources throughout the County.
(2) To facilitate the adequate and efficient provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, and other public requirements.
(3) To avoid undue concentration of population.
(4) To secure safety from fire, panic, flood, and other dangers.
(5) To prevent the overcrowding of land.
(6) To provide adequate light and air.
(7) To lessen congestion in the streets, roads, and highways.
(8) To provide an environment of character in harmony with existing and proposed neighboring use of land.
(9) To preserve and enhance the quality of Lane County's environment.

Enforcement of the provision to restrict grading of slopes in excess of $25 \%$ would be inconsistent with objective \#1. The subject property is located within the Urban Growth Boundary of the City of Florence. This is the area adjacent to the City Limits that is planned for the expansion and concentration of the City's population. As such it is expected that the property will be developed at an urban level of density in order to prevent urban sprawl from encroaching onto rural farm and forest lands. The appropriate use of this property is urban development as directed by Statewide Planning Goal 14 guidelines below:

## GUIDELINES

A. PLANNING

1. Plans should designate sufficient amounts of urbanizable land to accommodate the need for further urban expansion, taking into account (1) the growth policy of the area;(2) the needs of the forecast population; (3) the carrying capacity of the planning area; and (4) open space and recreational needs.
2. The size of the parcels of urbanizable land that are converted to urban land should be of adequate dimension so as to maximize the utility of the land resource and enable the logical and efficient extension of services to such parcels.
3. Plans providing for the transition from rural to urban land use should take into consideration as to a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and
water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.
4. Comprehensive plans and implementing measures for land inside urban growth boundaries should encourage the efficient use of land and the development of livable communities.

The proposal is consistent with the direction provided by guideline A. 2 above by maximizing the number of parcels to be created within the subject property in consideration of the carrying capacity of the land while at the same time providing for the logical extension of roads through the property. Approval of the proposal would allow for the efficient use of the property consistent with guideline A. 4 above. The strict enforcement of the provision would result in the inability to create an efficient road system that connects existing public roads into adjacent subdivision and the elimination of 27 of the proposed 54 lots.

Enforcement of the provision to restrict grading of slopes in excess of $25 \%$ would also be inconsistent with Lane Code 10.015 objective \#2. The grading is necessary to provide an orderly transportation route that connects the proposed subdivision roads to the existing roads (Cloudcroft Lane, Oceana Drive, and Sanddrift Street) in the adjacent subdivision to the west and north.
10.330-20(1)(b): Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district, or

Not applicable.
10.330-20(1)(c): Strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specified regulation would deprive the applicant of privileges legally enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning district.

Not applicable.
$10.330-20(1)(\mathrm{d})$ : The granting of the Variance will not be detrimental to the public
health, safety, or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the
near vicinity.

The grading of steep slopes to provide for stable roads and home sites within the proposed subdivision does not result in impacts to the public health, safety, or welfare. The road alignments have been selected to allow the development of public roads that conform to standard road designs for safety of the travelling public through the subdivision. A registered engineer has found that it is feasible to grade the site in accordance with the submitted grading plan and stabilize the final slopes. All areas subject to grading will be stabilized during
construction and upon completion to assure no impacts to adjacent properties or improvements. A stabilization Plan is attached for consideration with the proposal as Exhibit 6.

The applicant recommends imposition two conditions of approval:

1. Final road and drainage plans shall be submitted prior to construction of the roads as part of an approved facility permit. Any final slopes created in the road construction in excess of $25 \%$ shall be certified by a registered professional engineer that they are stable prior to final plat approval.
2. A note shall be required on the final plat stating: "Prior to issuance of a building permit for lots $254-264,276-282,285-291,298$, and 299, a grading plan is required to be submitted to the government agency having jurisdiction over issuance of the building permits. Any final slopes created in the individual lot grading in excess of $25 \%$ shall be certified by a registered professional engineer that they are stable prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for a residence." This requirement shall also be included in any CC\&R's developed for the subdivision.

## III. SUMMARY

The information provided in this application demonstrates that a variance to the quantitative requirement restricting development on slopes in excess of $25 \%$ is warranted. Imposition of the restriction results in a practical difficulty for development of residential lots within the City of Florence Urban Growth Boundary that are accessed by public roads with connectivity to existing roads in adjoining subdivisions. The grading can occur in a manner that keeps all slopes stable during and after construction of the roads and dwellings.

## IV. EXHIBITS

1. Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition Slopes over $25 \%$
2. Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition Site Plan North - Slopes over $25 \%$ Retained
3. Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition Site Plan South - Slopes over $25 \%$ Retained
4. Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition Preliminary Grading - North
5. Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition Preliminary Grading - South
6. Idylewood $4^{\text {th }}$ Addition Sand Stabilization Plan
7. Vicinity Map
8. Aerial Photo




9. ELEVATIONS BASED ON $5 / 8$ " ROD AT INTERSECTION OF OCEANA DRIVE AND SANDRIFT STREET. ELEVATION 84.37 FEET CONTOUR SOURCE-2009 DOGAMI LIDAR, OREGON NORTH COAST.
10. EXISTING CONTOUR LINES ARE SHOWN AT 5 -FOOT CONTOUR INTERVALS.

MATCH LINE $\quad-\quad-1+| |-\quad 11,868 \mathrm{SF}-11$
 $-$

DENOTES EXISTING SLOPES OVER $25 \%$ RETAINED

DENOTES EXISTING SLOPES OVER $25 \%$ IMPACTED

## EXISTING CONTOUR LINES

PROPERTY BOUNDARY


RENEWS: 01/01/18

## 4

2535E Praicie Road
Euseno.
Oregon 97402
$E G R$ \& Associates, Inc. Engineers, Geologists, and Suneyors
(541) $688 .-8322$
Fax (541) $688-8087$



Sand STABILIZATION PLAN NOTES
. SITE GRADING WILL OCCUR IN PHASES CONSISTING OF INITIAL MASS GRADING DURING STREET AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRUCTIO OLLOWED BY INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMENT. INITIAL, MASS RADING MAY NOT INCLUDE INDIVIDUAL LOTS THAT COULD GRADED INDEPENDENT OF ADJACENT LOTS AT TIME OF LOT CREPMENT. ALL CONSTRUCTED OR DISTURBED SLOPES CREATED DURING INITIAL MASS GRADING AND INDIVIDUAL LOT DEVELOPMEN WILL BE STABILIZED FROM WIND AND WATER EROSION AS SPECIFIED IN this sand stabilization plan and in conformance with erosion CONTROL PLANS THAT MAY BE PREPARED DURING SITE DEVELOPMENT.
TEMPORARY STABILIZATION METHODS WILL BE USED DURING THE onstruction phase where the inttal planting will not OCCUR WITHIN A SIX MONTH PERIOD FOLLOWING SOIL DISTURBANCE EMPORARY STABILIZATION METHODS WILL CONSIST OF
A. ON STEEP SLOPES (GREATER THAN $25 \%$ ) APPLY A 4-INCH THICK

LAYER OF STRAW DIRECTLY ON TOP OF DISTURBED AREAS AND SECURE TO THE SLOPE WITH STAPLED JUTE NETTING OR CHCKEN WIRE NETTING. NETTING MATERIAL MUST BE LACED TOGETHER AND STAKED AT 10 -FOOT INTERVALS.
B. ON ALL OTHER SLOPES APPLY EITHER A 4-INCH LAYER OF STRAW MATTING PUNCHED INTO THE SOIL, OR A LAYER OF BARK PLACED DIRECTLY ON TOP OF THE SOIL.
3. REPLANTING PHASE
A. PLANTING ON DUNE LAND FORMS SHOULD OCCUR BETWEEN

NOVEMBER 15 AND MARCH 15. ALL OTHER PLANTINGS SHOULD TYPICAL Y OCCUR IN THE FALL
3 PERFORM ALL FINAL GRADING OF THE TREATMENT AREA PRIOR TO PLANTING. ON LONG STEEP SLOPES (SLOPES LONGER THAN 20 FEET ND OVER 25 -PERCENT) CONSTRUCT NARROW ONE-FOOT WID BENCHES OR TERRACES 10 FEET APART TO RETAIN STORMWATER and create flow divergence.
C. INITIAL PLANTING ON STEEP SAND SLOPES SHOULD CONSIST OF A Native beach grass or dune grass. In areas where topsoil HAS BEEN APPLIED AND ADEQUATE PROTECTION FROM WIND IS PROVIDED, PERMANENT NATIVE GRASSES, NATIVE SHRUBS OR ORNAMENTALS MAY BE USED
D. LARGE DISTURBED AREAS MAY BE PLANTED BY TRACTOR. APPROXIMATELY 58,000 CULMS OF BEACH OR DUNE GRASS PER ACRE ARE REQUIRED
E. InItiAL PLANTINGS ON STEEP SLOPES SHOULD BE FERTILIZED WITH A 21-0.0 (AMMONIUM SULFATE) COARSE GRAIN FERTILIZER AT A RATE OF 400 POUNDS PER ACRE. ALL OTHER SLOPES SHOULD BE FERTILIZED AT A RATE OF 200 POUNDS PER ACRE. FERTILIZATION SHOULD OCCUR WHEN WIND SPEEDS ARE LESS THAN 5 MPH AND preferentially during rainfall.
F. SECONDARY (PERMANENT) PLANTING SHOULD OCCUR FOLLOWING THE SECOND GROWING SEASON. SECONDARY PLANTINGS SHOULD CONSIST OF EITHER WOODY SPECIES OR PERMANENT GRASSES AND LEGUMES.
4. CONTINUED MAINTENANCE OF THE STABILIZING VEGETATION IS REQUIRED.


## EXHIBIT 6

AND STABILIZATION PLAN
IDYLEWOOD 4TH ADDITION FLORENCE, OREGON

JULY 19, 2016

EGR \& Associates, Inc. Engineers, Geologists, and Surveyors
25358 Praine Road
Eugene, Oregon 97402 $\quad \begin{array}{r}\text { Fax } \\ \text { Fa4 (541) } 6888-838087\end{array}$

## Lane Use Application



JCATION IPEAESEPAMT

 applicrition ase evdenced by the flaneave of the owner below.

## An accurate plot Plan mist be attrched. Askfor a sample Plot Plan




GEVATED PRamil

## 



Reason for refund/cancellation: CANSELCED, BO APPCJCANT AFTEA CHASE LN PIANS. DAG STAFF HOURS STENT (VA ALONE) RESOUREND ZENO REFUND CANEELASD
ONE WEEK AFTER FINAL DART. Signature:


Date: $4-21-97$

## -The following will be completed by county staff-


$24-0674 / 42125$
$24-0674 / 42150$
$24-0674 / 46202$
$24-0674 / 46211$
010
010
010
110
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88275 TERRITORIAL ROAD
P.O.: BOX 1420

VENETA, OR 97487
541-935-6202
541-935-4918 (FAX)

March 21, 1997

Mr. Jerry Kendall, Associate Planner Lane County Land Management Division 125 East 8th Avenue Eugene, OR . 97401

RE: Benedick Waiver PA 4223-96
Dear Jerry;
This letter, on behalf of the applicant Gene Benedick, constitutes the applicant's waiver of any county and state statutory time frames required for the processing of land use applications.. The project engineè is evaluating an alternative on-site location for the outfall of storm water which would not require use of the seasonal lake, thus eliminating the need for this /PW application.

Please hold issuance of any county decision on the above referenced application for 30 days. Should 30 days elapse without further direction from, the applicant or myself, please contact me for an extension to this request. Thank you.
Sincerely,

Harry $A$ Taylor
Land use Consultant
cc: Gene Benedick

## FECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

 MA: 211997 1

```
HARRY A. TAYLOR
L_AND USE CONSULTANT
P:O. BOX 1420
VENETA, OR 97487
(541) 935-6202
(541) 935-4918 FAX
```

December 30, 1996

Mr. Jerry Kendall, Associate Planner
Lane County Land Management Division
125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401
Re: Benedick Storm Water Drainage Plan
Dear Jerry,
Attached please find a Special Use Permit application for a storm water drainage plan to serve a portion of the Idylewood subdivision located north of Florence. A complete copy of this application has been forwarded to Doug Cottam, ODFW Wildife Biologist, for his review and comment.

Given the current high-water condition that is again affecting part of the subdivision, your immediate attention to this matter is appreciated. Do not hesitate to contact me if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

Harry A Taylor
Land Use Consultant
cc: Gene Benedick


HARRY A. TAYLOR


LAND USE CONSULTANT
P.O. BOX 1420

VENETA, OR 97487
(541) 935-6202
(541) 935-4918 FAX

December 30, 1996

Mr. Doug Cottam, Wildlife Biologist Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 7118 NE Vandenberg Avenue
Corvallis, OR 97330-9446
Re: Benedick Storm Water Drainage Plan, Florence, Oregon
Dear Doug,
Regarding the proposed storm water drainage plan for the Idylewood subdivision that we discussed on December 9, 1996, I am enclosing $a$ set of the engineered plans prepared by Branch Engineering and a copy of the /PW Prime Wildlife Special Use Permit filed today with Lane County.

The plans incorporate your suggestion of adding an oil separator within the storage tank, on the off-chance of any road oil being discharged into the seasonal lake. I believe your other comments regarding sedimentation, erosion and lake side vegetation have also been addressed. On page 2 of my report, I attempted to summarize your initial comments. Let me know if I did not properly state your position.

Please review these materials and forward any comments or questions as soon as possible, as the affected part of the subdivision has started to experience some minor ponding. At this time it is not serious; however, with the apparent "unending" rains recently, it has the owner, Gene Benedick, and subdivision residents concerned. They hope to avoid a second flood in the same year.

Mr. Benedick is desirous of constructing the drainage system as soon as possible, thus your review and sign-off is necessary to expedite and satisfy county application requirements. If you find the proposed system is acceptable, please forward your response directly to Jerry Kendall, Associate Planner, Lane County Land Management Division, 125 East 8th Avenue, Eugene, OR 97401 . Jerry can be reached at 541-687-4057. Please copy your response to me.

Given my discussions with Will Bidler and George Westfall at the Florence ODFW office, I did not forward these materials to
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Cotta letter
December 30, 1996
them. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance. Thanks for your comments and help.


Enclosure
cc: Gene Benedick (w/enc)
Very Kendall (w/enc)

## APPLICANT'S STATEMENT

## SPECIFIC APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT BY THE DIRECTOR TO ALLOW A DRAINAGE PIPELINE IN A /PW PRIME WILDLIFE SHORELANDS COMBINING DISTRICT

DATE: December 28, 1996

## I. PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

A. APPLICANT/OWNER: Gene Benedick 27962 Ward Lane Eugene, OR 97402
541-688-6402
B. AGENT:

Harry A. Taylor
Land Use Consultant
P.O. Box 1420

Veneta,- OR - 97487
541-935-6202
C. ENGINEER :

Branch Engineering
c/o Jay Bozievich; P.E.
310 5th Street
Springfield, OR 97477
541-746-0637
D. PROPOSAL: Approval of a Special Use Permit to allow installation of a storm water drainage pipeline in a /PW Prime Wildlife Shorelands Combining District to serve a portion of an adjacent residential subdivision, pursuant to the provisions of Lane Code 10.245-15(4)(a). See Exhibit "B", Idylewood Subdivision Storm Drainage Pump/Storm Pipe Plan and Profile, dated December 13, 1996.
II. GENERAL INFORMATION
A. LOCATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION:

The proposed storm drainage pump and pipeline encompasses the following contiguous parcels:

Assessor's Map No.: 18-12-10-34 tax lot 801 and 18-12-10-40 tax lots 400 and 401
Zoning: RA/U/BD/PW
Area :
45.97 acres (*all parcels)

The /PW parcel subject to this request, the subject property, (tax lot 401) is located approximately three fourths of a mile north of the corporate limits of Florence, 2300 feet east of Rhododendron Drive and 105 feet east of Sandrift Street. The subject property is located within the Florence Urban Growth Boundary.
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The subject property is an unimproved 30 acre parcel. It consists of an older stabilized sand dune formation with generally level to gradual sloping topography with dense coastal vegetation that includes shorepine, native rhododendron, salal, huckleberry, wax myrtle and kinnikinnic, typical to the area. Portions of three small shallow coastal lakes, known as the South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes, occupy the eastern $20+$ acres of the property. Each lake is separated by a narrow sand dune that effectively dams and separates each lake. See Plot Plan attached as Exhibit "A".

Wetlands: The National Wetlands Inventory, Mercer Lake 3, attached as Exhibit "C", identifies the seasonal lakes as a jurisdictional wetland classified as a PUBF (Palustrine/Unconsolidated Bottom/Semipermenently Flooded) wetland.

Wildlife: The Lane County Wildlife Inventory, attached as Exhibit "D", indicates the subject property is within an Impacted Big Game Range.

The Lane County Coastal Resources Management Plan, attached as Exhibit "E", identifies a 50 foot strip of vegetation surrounding the South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes as a Prime Wildlife Area. The general inventory is supplemented by a 1: 400 scale aerial photograph of the area, Exhibit "F", that identifies a significant wildlife area approximately 150 feet west of the shoreline.

The Applicant has contacted the Oregon Department of Fish Wildife (ODFW) offices in Florence and Corvallis to explain the proposed use and solicit comments. ODFW specialists, Will Bidler and George Westfall (Florence) indicated the proposed use will have no affect on fish habitat. ODFW biologist, Doug Cottam, (Corvallis) indicated the seasonal lakes and surrounding area is a limited resource that supports a diverse wildlife habitat. The area is inhabited and/or. used by numerous species including: amphibians, some reptiles, shorebirds, waterfowl, Great Blue Herons, osprey, hawks, bear and various small mammals. The isolated location and heavy vegetative cover of the area make it highly suited for foraging. Mr. Cottam identified possible concerns with: water quality, disruption of vegetation and erosion control. Provided these concerns are adequately addressed, Mr. Cottam suggested occasional use of the proposed drainage system use would not appear to impact the wildlife area.

## B. SURROUNDING AREA AND ZONING:

The subject property is bounded to the north by Heceta South Subdivision, a developed residential subdivision zoned RA. To the east are a series of small residentially improved parcels zoned RA. To the west is the Idylewood Subdivision, a residentially developed
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subdivision and the First and Second Additions to Idylewood, improved for residential development with asphalt streets and utilities, and zoned RA. To the south is a vacant 40 acre Lane County parcel that contains other seasonal lakes, zoned RA.

## C. SERVICES:

Fire:
Police:
School:
Sewer:
Water:
Access:
Electricity:
Telephone:

Siuslaw Rural Fire Protection District \#1
Lane County Sheriff
Siuslaw School District \#97J
Individual sewage disposal systems
Heceta Public Water District
Sandrift Street (public)
Central Lincoln Peoples Utility District
U.S. West Communications
III. BACKGROUND

The proposed storm water drainage plan is intended to alleviate occasional seasonal ponding that floods up to 13 lots in the Idylewood Subdivision and First Addition to Idylewood and a 800 foot section of Sandrift Street, and portions of Sandrift Court and Gullsettle Court. It is anticipated the drainage system will operate, at most, only once or twice a year.

Prior to filing this application the Applicant, Gene Benedick, met April 17, 1996, on-site with representatives from the Oregon Division of State Lands, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, City of Florence, Oregon Department of Water Resources and Lane County, and local residents. In summary, the group concluded: 1) there was little evidence suggesting the lakes are causing flooding, 2) an extremely complex wetland/drainage environment is present around the seasonal lakes, and 3) before lowering lake levels by control channels between lakes, other measures should be considered.

The proposed storm drainage pump and pipeline system was given conceptual approval by the various agencies subject to further evaluation. Subsequently, county staff conducted a Preliminary Investigation and concluded further analysis was necessary regarding possible affects on water quality and temperature, wildife habitat area and destabilization of the shoreline surrounding the seasonal lake. This application addresses those issues.

The most significant flood event occurred in February 1996, when over two feet of water covered an approximate 4 acre area improved
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with dwellings, sanitation drainfields and roads. This same area also flooded to a similar degree in 1981, and to a lesser extent in other years during periods of high winter rainfall. This situation creates more than an inconvenience. Ponded water for periods up to three weeks has damaged floor insulation, yards, landscaping, and rendered septic drainfields unusable. Flooded streets have been impassable for residents and emergency vehicles, isolating the area from normal use and services.

Flooding appears to be due to a combination of a high winter groundwater table, periods of extreme rainfall, saturated soils, runoff from impervious surfaces and a lack of a natural drainage outlet. As a result, this small depression retains water as opposed to higher elevations that properly drain. The blockage or lack of natural outlets between the seasonal lakes to the east suggests each individual lake basin retains run-off and precipitation which contributes to a higher groundwater table in the immediate area. During periods of normal rainfall, sandy soils and clean roadside ditches allow rapid water percolation and minimal ponding occurs. This proposal seeks to alleviate only occasional high-water events created by extreme amounts of rainfall combined with a high water table.

## IV. PROPOSAL

The Applicant proposes to construct a storm pump and pipe system that will collect excess surface water from the affected area and pump it 850 feet east to outfall into a seasonal lake located on the subject property and partially on the county parcel to the south. The pipeline will follow the south property boundary of the subject property across relatively level terrain, except for the last 120 +- feet that slopes at 3 to 5 percent.

Water will be collected at a grated infiltration inlet basin located at a low point in the roadside ditch at the southwest corner of the intersection of Sandrift Street and Gullsettle Court. The inlet will be connected to 110 feet of 12 inch PVC inlet pipe connected to a buried 3000 gallon concrete two chambered storm tank. Storm water will accumulate in the first chamber where silt is allowed to settle out and any oil or fluids are trapped. Preset mercury water level sensors in the second tank activate a 5 horsepower 200 gallon a minute pump. Storm water is then pumped 820 feet east through a 4 inch PVC pressure main that discharges at a 24 square foot ( 3 feet wide by 8 feet in length) rip-rapped area approximately one foot above a 86.2 foot lake elevation.

The storm storage tank will be buried except for a locked access and pump enclosure hatch. Manholes will be locked for security. All piping and mechanicals are proposed to be buried approximately
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two feet below grade (except for an air release valve located near the outlet) for aesthetic and security purposes. An existing electrical vault within Sandrift Street will supply electrical power to the storm pump. An electrical meter pedestal will be located next to the storm tank. Only an air release valve, outfall pipe end and the rip-rapped area will be exposed within the wildlife area.

## V. APPROVAL CRITERIA AND ANALYSIS

Uses and improvements allowed as permitted uses in the respective District or Districts with which the /PW is combined are subject to the following criteria of Lane Code 10.245-15(4)(b):

## (i) Maintain the natural quality of surface and subsurface waters.

The storm water drainage system is designed to function only during high-volume storms that pond the affected area. The system will not operate during periods of normal rainfall. During these periods run-off flows into roadside ditches and percolates through sandy soils with rapid permeability characteristics. Lane County Public Works recently cleaned the roadside ditches in the area which removed an accumulated "mat" of debris that contributed to reduced percolation.

During high-water periods it is expected potential contaminates (fertilizer, oil and fluids) will not be present or will be significantly diluted by large water volumes associated with major events. It is estimated over 90 percent of any surface contaminates are absorbed into the soil or flushed into roadside ditches during the first rains of the season. This "first flush" affect is credited with removing most surface oils prior to late season ponding caused by a combination of a high groundwater table and extended periods of high rainfall.

The infiltration basin or inlet is surrounded by sand and will provide a pre-treatment to the first storm water to enter the system. An oil separator has been designed into the first tank chamber to trap any oil. Water that flows into the second chamber will be drawn through a vertical siphon "T" 18 inches below the liquid surface level, trapping any oil on the surface of the first chamber.

The storage tank will be serviced yearly or as required to skim and remove oils and clean-out any sediment. All residue will be disposed of at the local sewage treatment plant or at an appropriate facility. After cleaning the first chamber will be
filled with clean water to provide oil separation at the next event.

These measures are expected to maintain the water quality of the seasonal lake. The system is expected to pump essentially clean storm water. The amount of oil that may escape the system is considered virtually inconsequential given the significant dilution provided by the volume of water pumped and lake surface size.
(ii) Maintain bank stability.

The outlet end of the 4 inch pipe will be back filled with clay to prevent erosion of the trench during high lake levels. Twenty-four (24). square feet of Class 100 rip-rap ( 3 feet wide by 8 feet long) approximately 2 feet in depth will be placed at the pipe outlet to dissipate water velocity and also act like a dry well. Rip-rap will be delivered by a backhoe bucket and set by hand for minimal disruption to the shoreline. As engineered, the proposed pipeline will maintain stability of the lake bank.

## (iii) Avoid sedimentation of coastal waters.

As previously described, any sediment picked up at the inlet basin will settle out in the storage tank. Storm water will outlet across rip-rap to reduce water velocity and prevent erosion and sedimentation. The proposed storm drainage system is not expected to cause any sedimentation or affect water quality of the seasonal lake.
(iv) Maintain a shorefront zone of riparian vegetation at least comparable to that required in LC 10.245-30, -35, and -40 below or greater if necessary to provide flood control and preserve important riparian wildife habitat.

The above Lane Code provisions are primarily oriented to residential uses, specifically, LC 10.245-35(1) which requires a 50 foot setback from coastal lakes for structures. The Preliminary Investigation did not identify maintenance of shoreline vegetation, as a condition or prohibit same; however, the Applicant intends to minimize any disruption of vegetation in wildlife zone near the lake. The amount of vegetation that will be disturbed is minimal and is not expected to have any significant impact on the wildlife habitat. The pipeline will be installed by a tractor mounted backhoe within an approximate 10 foot wide construction path. Native vegetation will be replanted in the disturbed area within 50 feet of the shoreline.
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(v) Avoid disturbance of the remainder of the vegetation cover beyond a point where the disturbance would be a detriment to the wildife community which utilizes this area.

As previously indicated, only vegetation necessary to allow construction will be disturbed. The minimal amount of disruption required to construct the storm drainage system is not expected to be detrimental or significantly impact the wildlife area.

## (vi) Any other applicable criteria provided within the respective District within which the /PW District is combined.

Any other applicable criteria have been identified and are addressed herein.
(vii) All requirements set forth in LC 10.245-30, -35 , and -40 below are met.

The above referenced requirements are addressed below.

LC 10.245-30: SITE AND DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS
If found subject to the requirements of the /PW District based on the results of the Preliminary Investigation specified by LC 10.245-45 below, the below-specified development requirements shall be in addition to those provided by the respective District or Districts with which the /PW District is combined.

The Preliminary Investigation did not identify any requirements of the parent RA Suburban Residential zone district or the /BD beaches and Dunes or /U Interim Urbanizing combining districts that are applicable to this request.

Staff letter by Thom Lanfear, dated September 17, 1996, and attached as Exhibit "G", states the proposed drainage pipeline to remove water from an existing subdivision represents an accessory use with minimal development and is a use permitted by the respective parent and combining zones.

A majority of the following criteria are oriented to above ground development (i.e: dwellings), thus the Applicant finds those criterion are not applicable to this request.
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(1) No more of a parcel's existing vegetation shall be cleared than is necessary for the permitted use, accessory buildings, necessary access, septic requirements and fire safety requirements.

Installation of the proposed pipeline will require clearing a strip of vegetation approximately 10 feet in width by 850 feet in length from the infiltration basin to outlet. Only vegetation necessary to install the storage tank and pipeline will be removed.
(2) To the maximum degree possible, building sites shall be located on portions of the site which exhibit the least vegetative cover.

Not applicable. This application proposes no structures or building sites. The proposed pipeline alignment is the shortest most direct route to the outfall location.
(3) Construction activities occur in such a manner so as to avoid unnecessary excavation and/or removal of existing vegetation beyond that area required for the facilities indicated in LC 10.245-30(1) above. Where vegetation removal beyond that allowed in LC 10.245-30(1) above cannot be avoided, the site shall be replanted during the next replanting season to avoid sedimentation of coastal waters. the vegetation shall be of indigenous species in order to maintain there natural character of the area.

As indicated by the Storm Drainage Plan Cross-Section Detail, the proposed pipeline will be trenched and buried an average of three feet below the surface. The plan indicates the amount of disruption necessary to accommodate this installation is minimal and will not substantially alter the surrounding topography or vegetation community. As previously identified, vegetation within 50 feet of the shoreline will be replanted with indigenous species.
(4) The requirements for parking and vision clearance shall be as provided by the respective District or Districts with which the /PW District is combined.

Not applicable. No parking is proposed or required by this application.
(5) No topographic modification is permitted within the 50-foot setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below.
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LC 10.245-35 requires special setbacks for structures. This application neither proposes or requires any structures and is therefore not applicable to this request. Except for construction necessary to trench and bury the 4 inch PVC line, install an air release valve and rip-rap the outlet, there will be minimal topographic modification of the site. Small depressions and hummocks will require crossing. Only the pipeline trench will affect these features.
(6) The shoreward half of the setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below must be left in indigenous vegetation, except where unsurfaced trails are provided.

As previously indicated, this application neither proposes nor requires any above ground structures. Replanting the 50 foot zone near the shoreline and will maintain the natural values of the area.
(7) Cornices, canopies and eaves may extend two feet into the setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below.

Not applicable. This application proposes no structures.
(8) Decks, uncovered porches, stairways and fire escapes may extend a distance of 10 feet into the setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below.

Not applicable. This application proposes no structures.
(9) All trees must be retained within the setback area specified by LC 10.245-35 below, except where removal is subject to requirements of the Oregon Forest Practices Act.

The drainage pipeline will be constructed within a 20 foot wide easement across the subject property. Any trees within the 50 foot shoreline area will be maintained.
(10) Structures shall be sited and/or screened with natural vegetation so as not to impair the aesthetic quality of the site.

Not applicable. This application proposes no structures.

Page 10
Benedick Special Use Permit
(11) The exterior building materials shall blend in color, hue, and texture to the maximum amount feasible with the surrounding vegetation and landscape.

Not applicable. This application proposes no structures.

LC 10.245-35: ADDITIONAL SETBACK REQUIREMENTS
This provision applies to the setback of structures from coastal lakes, estuary and ocean front parcels. The subject application does not propose any structure located near a coastal lake, estuary or ocean front parcel.

LC 10.245-40: SPECIAL LAND DIVISION REQUIREMENTS
This provision requires special standards for the division of land within an urbanizable area. The subject application neither proposes nor requires any land division, and is therefore not applicable to this request.

## VI. OTHER FACTORS

The Preliminary Investigation identified the following factors that would impact the Prime Wildlife area: 1) Increased water.flows will affect shoreline stability and drainage patterns of the seasonal lakes; 2) Run-off associated with residential development and infrastructure will have a significant impact on water quality and temperature of the seasonal lake; 3) Alteration of the drainage patterns could cause flooding on adjacent properties; 4) The size and seasonal duration of the lake would likely increase with significant water inputs; 5) Destabilization of the shoreline is likely from significant increases of water; 6) A decreased area for ranging wildlife and possible increase of human-wildlife conflicts would result, and 7) Residential/storm water run-off is likely to have a negative impact on habitat for wildife.

Any proposed land use within a /PW Prime Wildlife Shorelands Combining District requires a Preliminary Investigation by staff to determine if specific requirements of the /PW are applicable and specifically which factors may require additional evaluation. When the PI was submitted the Applicant did not know if additional information would be required. Conversely, without these details, the Applicant believes some of the staff findings are premature and unsupported to support the conclusions reached.
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The Applicant submits the following response to each of the above referenced impacts:

1) The amount of water pumped to the seasonal lake will vary with events. Shoreline stability has been identified and addressed by placement of rip-rap at the outlet. The seasonal lake is surrounded by vegetated banks approximately 3 to 5 feet higher than adjacent lands. The engineer indicates a major event, similar to February 1996, may increase the lake elevation approximately one foot. This increased volume is expected to be retained within the lake basin, similar to the existing topography that prevents drainage between lakes. Sandy soils allow lake water to naturally migrate southerly into adjacent lake basins. The proposed system will not change the drainage pattern of the area.
2) Water quality has been previously addressed. No increase or change of water temperature is expected. The ambient water temperature at the subdivision inlet will be the same at discharge.
3) As indicated in \#1 above, water is expected to be retained within the seasonal lake basin. Any overflow will be dispersed throughout a large area containing other seasonal lakes and depressions located over 800 feet from the closest improved lots or parcels.
4) The attached topographic map indicates additional storm water can be retained in the seasonal lake basin. The lake is expected to increase in elevation and not spread out or flood adjacent lands.
5) Bank destabilization has been previously addressed.
6) For the reasons previously cited, the storm drainage system would appear to cause only a minimal decrease of wildife habitat. The system is expected to be used sparingly and for relatively short periods. Any loss of wildlife range will be temporary.
7) As proposed, the storm drainage system is not expected to have any significant or substantial adverse impact to the wildlife area.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The proposed storm water drainage system is proposed to alleviate flooding of a small portion of an existing subdivision. . The system will operate only during major events when lots and streets are ponded. Storm water will be pumped 820 from a buried tank to a seasonal lake located on the subject property. The lake is surrounded by topography that will retain the increased volume. No significant change to the drainage pattern of the area is anticipated. The lake is located in a remote area, a considerable
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distance from the closest development. The storm drainage system is not expected to adversely impact any residentially developed lots or parcels.

The system will employ an oil separator and will allow sediment to be collected before discharge to protect water quality. Rip-rap will be placed at the outlet to provide bank stabilization, reduce water velocity and prevent erosion or sedimentation of the lake. Vegetation will be replanted within 50 feet of the shoreline.

Any disruption to the wildlife area caused by construction of the outlet pipeline will be minimal. No significant conditions or natural features have been identified which would be adversely impacted by the proposed storm water drainage system.

The Building Official, Roger McGuckin, indicates the proposed system does not require any building permits. The Applicant will make application for a Facility Permit for any construction located within the public road right-of-way.

## VIII. ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit "A" Plot Plan
Exhibit "B" Engineer's Storm Drainage Plan
Exhibit "C" Wetlands Inventory, Mercer Lake 3
Exhibit "D" Wildlife Inventory, Heceta Head
Exhibit "E" Coastal Resource Management Plan Map and Text
Exhibit "F" Supplemental Coastal Inventory
Exhibit "G" Staff letter
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## South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes

(1) Prime Wildlife Area:
A. Extent: The exact location is shown on the 1,000 scale map. This management unit includes the area covered by seasonal standing water identified on soil conservation service maps or, if available, photogrametric maps and a fifty (50) foot strip of surrounding vegetation.
B. Rationale:

1. Area is subject to considerable standing water in winter months;
2. Brush thickets, blueberry bushes, snags and seasonal water provide natural habitat.
C. Discussion: This area is identified in the Lane County Coastal Inventory as an area of brush thickets, blueberry bushes and snags. According to the Soil Conservation Service, this is an area which
floods during the winter. The majority of this management unit is on public land and is contained within a large open area. The northern portion is private property. In addition to the natural values present, the lack of adequate drainage in the area would pose problems for development. Any fill or other alteration of drainage patterns could cause flooding on adjacent properties.

## (1) Prime Wildlife Area:

A. Extent: A band measured horizontally from the high water line of the lake 500 feet in width on the north, west and south shoreland artas but extending to the western boundary of the platted area of 18-12-9 on the east which corresponds to the ridge of a stabilized dune
B. Rationale

1. Resting drea for waterfowl;
2. Frequent wldiffe use including beaver, otter, mink and muskrat;
3. Extensive frestwater bog area;
4. Tule bog at north end;
5. Recently stabilizgd dunes with dense shoreland vegetation;
6. Old Siuslaw River dhannel;
7. Traditional low intenpity recreational use.
C. Discussion: The nature of the surrounding shorelands (wet deflation plain to large extent) renders this land unsuitable for development. The traditional ldw-intensity recreational use of the area, and the value as wildife habitat makes this land a valuable natural asset within the Florence Urban Growth Boundary.

Bear Lake
(1) Natural Resources Conservation:
A. Extent: A band measured horizontally 500 feed from the high water shoreline of the lake except on the east side where the management unit abuts Cleawox MU 1 .
B. Rationale:

1. Site Class III timber soils (Bullards-Fellero seried on eastern shorelands.
2. Older stabilized dunes, recently stabilized dunes and active dune forms surround the lake, with associated erosion hazards'.

## SOUTH HECETA JUNCTION SEASONAL LAKES



September 17, 1996
Gene Benedict
27962 Ward Lane:

Eugene, Oregon 97402
Re: Idylewood Subdivision
I have reviewed the pipeline proposal (dated July 24, 1996) to drain excess surface water from Idylewood Subdivision to the nearby South Heceta Junction Seasonal Lakes. The subject properties are identified as Map 18-12-10-34 Taxlot 801 and Map 18-12-10-40 Taxlot 401. These properties are zoned RA/BD and RA/BD/PW respectively. The requirements for each applicable zone are as follows:

1. RA - Suburban Residential Zone - The installation of a drainage pipe to remove water from the existing subdivision is an accessory use permitted under Lane Code 10.135-10(3).
2. /B D-Beaches and Dunes Combining District - The Beaches and Dunes requirements do not apply to Minimal Development as defined under Lane Code 10.020. This use falls within the parameters of that definition as a use similar to a septic drainfield.
3. IPW-- Prime Wildlife Shorelands Combining District - A Preliminary Investigation is required by Lane Code $10.245-45$. The fee for this Investigation is $\$ 189$., An application form is enclosed for your convenience. It is likely that the Preliminary Investigation will require a Special Use Permit under Lane Code $10.245-15(4)($ a). This permit is subject to Director Approval.
4. A facility permit is required for that part of the project that falls within the right-of-way of the public road.

I believe that a copy of the applicable zoning ordinances were provided to you in March of this year. If you did not receive them, or need additional copies, please let me know.

Sincerely,


Thom Lanfear
Associate Planner
(503) 687-4054
cc. John Cole
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Public Works LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Your Plot Plan has been reviewed and found to lack the following items of information. This information is REQUIRED to process your permit application. Please revise your plot plan within one week and return it to our office. Your attention to these details. will keep your permit moving through the processing steps.


## SEPTIC SYSTEM

18. $\square \therefore \square$
19. $\square$
20. $\square$

Location of septic tank, drainfield and replacement drainfield
Distances of septic tank, drainfield and replacement drainfield from structures and property lines
Location of wells and distances to drainfield and dwellings

Reviewed by: trédéliqke Date: $\qquad$

This Checklist is not a permit application and represents no express or implied approval for any anticipated development activity.



310 5ith Street
Springfield. Oregan 97077
(541)746.0637

Decemilua 17, 1996

Fax (541) 746-0389

Rip Rap) Sipecilication and Oil/Waler Separator (in Pump Vault) Amenducne lo Plans lor Gene Bencdick Storm Drain Pump:

(all exhibits 1p. unless stated otherwise.)

Date submitted

1-8-97
1-14-97
1-15-97
1-17-97
1-23-97
1-24-97
1-24-97
1-27-97,
2-3-97
2-3-97
2-3-97:
2-6-97
2-6-97
2-10-97
2-10-97
2-10-97
2-10-97
2-11-97
2-11-97
2-11-97
2-11-97,
2-11-97
2-11-97
2-12-97
2-12-97

## Exhibit \# \& Description

1.Applicant's submittal
A. Gen. Land Use Application
B. Cover letter,
C. Letter to ODFW--2pp.
D. Main submittal, w/attach.--22pp.
E. Receipt
2. Completeness letter
3. Staff memo to DSL
4. ODF\& W response/D. Cottam
5. Letter to Taylor by JK-2pp.
6. Staff memo Re: ownership list
7. Letter/J. Burgess to 4 neighbors
8. Copy of letter to DSL by H.Taylor/2pp.
9. Letter,JK to H.Taylor on ownership list
10.File generated materials (notice lise/map, etc.) $/ 9 \mathrm{pp}$.
11.Referral Notice/3pp.
12.Flood response (not within)
13.Letter in favor/Borges
14.DSL response
15.Letter in favor/Silva
16. Letter opposed/Reinhard/2pp.
17.Staff letter to DSL
18. Letter in favor/L.Hix

19:Letter in favor/Bush
20.Letter in favor/McCreesh
21.Letter in favor/Pilcher

22:Letter in favor/Pearce
23.Letter in favor/Pishioneri
24.Letter in favor/Boutry
25.Letter in favor/Toro
26.Letter from Army Corps, t.Monical/2pp.

2-12-97
2-12-97
2-13-97
2-13-97
2-14-97
2-14-97
2-14-97
2-18-97
2-20-97
2-24-97
3-1-97
3-10-97
$3-21-97$
27.Letter in favor/Leger-Jeffrey 28.Letter in favor/Malagamba/2pp.
29.Letter opposed/Jeremiah
30.(FAX)Letter opposed/N.Hill
31.Exhibit \#30, hard copy
32.Lêtter in favor/Ishii
33. Wetland referral (note:DSL responded per Exhibit\#14 \& \#17)
34.Transportation Planning response 35.Staff FAX to N.Hill/3pp.
36.Letter in favor/Duke
37.Letter in favor/L.Hix
38.Letter in favor/Ishii/2pp. 39. Cancelestion letter by H. Tajglor.

HARRY A. TAYLOR
LAND USE CONSULTANT

88275 TERRITORIAL ROAD
P.O. BOX 1420

VENETA, OR 97487
541-935-6202
541-935-4918 (FAX)

March 21, 1997

Mr. Jerry Kendall, Associate Planner , Lane County Land Management Division 125 East 8th Avenue Eugene, OR 97401

RE: Benedick Waiver PA 4223-96
Dear Jerry,
This letter, on behalf of the applicant Gene Benedick, constitutes the applicant's waiver of any county and state statutory time frames required for the processing of land use applications. The project engineer is evaluating an alternative on-site location for the outfall of storm water which would not require use of the seasonal lake, thus eliminating the need for this /PW application.

Please hold issuance of any county decision on the above referenced application for 30 days. Should 30 days elapse without further direction from the applicant or myself, please contact me for an extension to this request. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Harry $A$. Tayldr
Land Use Consultant

CC: Gene Benedick

## fECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT



Tharah 7,1997
Dear Mi tendaee
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$\qquad$
EXHBIT : 38

Date: $2-8-97$ $\qquad$
From: KENT DUKE $\qquad$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 87827 \text { SANORIF ST } \\
& \text { FlORENCE, ORE } \quad 99439
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { FEB } 21997
$$

Regarding Department File No:: $P A<223-96$
Comments:
THIS PROTECT IS CRITICALLY NEEDED NOW!
APPROX MATEY 20 HOMES IN TVUCEWOOD OEVESORIENT ARE IN IMINENT DANGER OF REIN 6 FLOODED DURING THE WINTER RA IN PERIODS. THE OWNERS OF PROPERTY. AFFECTED HAVE BEEN PUMPING WATER FROM OUR FCCOOCO STREET FOR THE PASS 2 MONTHS, $7 D A Y S$ A WEER, MR, BENEDICT, THE DEVELOPER HAS RENTED THE PUMPS AND PAID THE GASOLINE BILL FOE THIS 2 MONTHS AND LAS T WINTERS L LOCO PROALEM. WITHOUT THIS PUIDNING ACTIVITY OVER 2 MIL RON DOLLARS IN PRIVATE RRORERY NOVAS HAVE BEEN SEROUSLI DAMAGED OR LOST:TTHIS INSTALLATION 15 ONLY A TEMPORARY MITIGATION TO OUR PROBLEM AS WELL AS SEVERAL OTHERS.
 N DEVELOANG. DRANAGESYSTEM TO LOWER THE, THEADSACENT UETDNO LAME LEVEL DUNG WIN CR MONTHS OF HEAD Y RAN $A L L E$ WHO THE WETLAND AREA
 $G \in T$ FOOD $\angle D!$

Land Management Division
Lane County Courthouse 125 East 8th Avenue Eugene, OR 97401

FAX \#: (503) 687-3947


# RECEIVED BY LAND.MANAGEMENT 

 and Readiness DivisionFES 121997

Lane County - Land Management Division
Attn:- Jerry Kendall
125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401-2926

## Dear Jerry

I have reviewed the land-use application submitted by Gene Benedict. Mr. Benedict is proposing to pipe storm water from the Idylewood subdivision into one of a series of lakes within this watershed Based on the preliminary design it appears that there will be a discharge of material into a water of the United States, therefore a Corps of Engineers permit will be required. My concerns regarding the proposal are as follows:

1. Of primary concern are impacts to downstream developments: Although the applicant believes that there is no surface discharge from the lake there may be substantial movement of water through the porous; sandy soils. At least one residential development downstream, the Sandpines development, has experienced problems with flooding during storm events similar to those described in the application. The proposed scenario would place additional water into the system at this critical time.
2. Similarly, has the applicant evaluated how raising the elevation of the lake, even for a brief period, will effect water levels within the development?
3. It is unclear how flows from typical stoms will be prevented from entering the new collection system. Are they relying totally on infiltration? What is the maximumintensity storm that can be expected to generate no runoff into the collection system?
4. Although I did visit the site last spring, I do not recall if there was a wetland fringe surrounding the lake. If there is the applicant would need to provide an assessment of the impacts of elevating the water levels on those wetlands. The assessment should include an estimate of the increase in the elevation of the water surface and its duration.

The Corps of Engineers' regulatory jurisdiction extends to the ordinary high water mark of the lake, and to any wetlands either around the lake fringe or along the route of the pipeline. We do not have a 50 cubic yard threshold for jurisdiction, therefore; as I indicated earlier it appears the work will require a Corps permit Although we recognize the seriousness of the of the problem, we could not authorize a project which could exacerbate downstream flooding.


Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Please feel free to contact me at the address shown above, or by telephone at (503) 326-6103.


Teena Monical
Project Manager
Regulatory Branch

Copies Furnished:
ODSL (Leibowitz)
Harry Taylor

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Please feel free to contact me at the address shown above, or by telephone at (503) 326-6103.

Sincerely,


Teena Monical
Project Manager
Regulatory Branch

Copies Furnished:
ODSL (Leibowitz)
Harry Taylor

KENDALL Jerry

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:

File No:
Applicant:
Location:
RS:

STEERS Jim
KENDALL Jerry
Heceta Beach Rd (4223-96)
Tuesday, February 18, 1997 9:57AM

Tax.Lot: : $\begin{gathered}18-12-10.40 \\ 400,401\end{gathered}$
Proposal: Planning Director Review for stormwater drainage system within PWC Zone.
Comments: The proposed project will drain an area of the Idylewood Subdivision and an area adjacient to this subdivision. Specifically: (1) Sandrift St from a few hundred feet east of Saltaire St to just south of Oceanea Dr., (2) Gullsettle, and (3) an undeveloped area to the SE of the current end of Gullsettle. The stormwater will dump into a small lake which is identified as a Prime Wildlife Area.

The Prime Wildlife Area impacts several property owners which have property adjacient and within the wildlife area. These owners may have concern about the proposed drainage system.

Lane County is impacted in two ways:

1. A portion of the wildlife area is within a parcel of land owned by Lane County, 18-12-10.40•TL 1600. Jeff Türk should be contacted regarding this proposal.
2. A portion of the wildlife area borders Heceta Beach Roadd. This is a County road that is classified as a Major Collector. The elevation of the small lake is approximately 6 feet below Heceta Beach Rd. There will not be any impacts to Heceta Beach Rd.

$$
2-18
$$



$$
2-21
$$

No gnats ioctl



NOTIFICATION OF MAPPED NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY REFERRAL

APPLICANT :


OWNER: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

OREGON DIVISION OF STATE LANDS (DSL)
775 SUMMER STREET NE,
SALEM OREGON 97310
(503) :378-3805

NWT MAP MERCIAn LAKE 3
$\qquad$ RS $\qquad$ $18-12-10-34$ T 801
)This parcel contains mapped wetlands or waterways as indicated on the NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY maps. The. Oregon Revised, Statues (ORS) Chapter 215 requires the Land Management Division (LMD) to send notice of the application to the Division of State Lands (DSL). Issuance of the permit can not occur until we receive a response from the DSL or 30 days (whichever is less).

Enclosed is a copy of the notice sent to the DSL: DSL will contact you if any permits are required or further information is necessary.

D.G: NICKEL P.L.S.O. ENGINEERING ASSOCIATE LANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS LMD/PLANNTNG
125 EAST 8 th AVENUE
EUGENE; OREGON 97401-1337
This parcel has wetlands. This permit will not be issued until 30 days from today March $24,1.997$ or until DSL responds.


1. County: LANE
City:
Responsible Jurisdiction: $\square$ City
2. APPLICANT: HAREY TAYLOR

| P.O.BO | $\begin{aligned} & \text { name } \\ & 14 \sum 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| VEMCIA | mailing address $0 R \quad 97487$ | city state zip (541) $\$ 35$ 6202 phone Local Case File No.: Pa 4223-96 DSL File No.: (8). County

LANDOWNER: $\frac{\text { GEAtE BenEDLCZ }}{\text { name }}$
mailing address
city
(5A1) \&8B 6402 state
phone
3. LOCATION:
 NWI quad map name Mer<ar LAvE 3 . (attach copy with site indicated) Attached: $\propto$ NWI map $\propto$ Parcel map $\nless$ Site plan _ Other
4. SITE INFORMATION:

NWI Wetland Classification Code(s) POBF \& PSSC
Adjacent Waterway (if any) In Floodplain? $\mathrm{Y} \rightarrow \mathrm{N}$
Current Land Use $\backslash \angle \subset A T E$ Zoning
5. PROPOSED ACTIVITY:


## DSL RESPONSE

( A removal-fill permit is required from the Division of State Lands.
[ A removal-fill permit will be required when the development project proceeds.

- A removal-fill permit may be required.
- A permit may be required by the Corps of Engineers (326-6995)
D. Information needed includes:
(1) A wetland determination/delineation report. (Consultant list available from DSL)
$\square$
$\square$ State permit $\square$ was issued has been applied for.
No removal-fill permit is required for the described project if/because:

Comments: $\qquad$

Response completed by:
Date

* If the project is changed to involve fill or removal from the wetlands area; a state removal-fill permit will be required.



Date: $\qquad$ $2 \mathrm{k} 1 / 97$
From Reoherd + Resemay th iic
17157 Sandrigh (maieno allusi : P. O Bot 2383 )
Thlocence, Oxe 97439
LAND MANAEDBY
LAND MANAGEMENT
Regarding Department File No. PA $4223-96$
Comments:
He are kerif niuch in favar
af the pinpicel etormenste diranage Ajpten for Heljeler fuledivionvo dte live on Aasdigh stoet unhere lect of drainage and hogh ruator $\mu$ an ongoing prallem and pnuet le Canrectel Ke Laje yow unee grié Mn. Renedes the necessury, perinits to impliment thi standicingese sptem:. Le is imperative that vue are given Kelif from this situatión as au poppety is inarehlisa vintie une do pee kilif. (ote juich heenued yauc letter on Hebrilly and refhid immednately to toy to mect the Hehn. 13 th deadineo


## Noble \& Martinis

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1114 TWELFTH ST. SE
NORMAN F. WEBB
MICHAEL J. MARTINIS
February 13, 1997

## SENT BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

AND REGULAR MAIL (541) 682-3947


SALEM, OREGON 97302-2897

Mr. Jerry Kendall
Lane County Public Works
Land Management Division
125 E. 8th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401
Re: Dept. File No. PA 4223-96
Referral Notice and Opportunity to Comment on a Proposed Development

Dear Mr. Kendall:
This office represents Susan Petrone, a homeowner in the vicinity of the above-referenced proposed development. I just recently received the Referral Notice. It is my understanding that the deadline for comments is 5:00 pom. on February 13, 1997. I am currently in trial in Linn County and will not be able to fully evaluate the proposed development before the deadline.

My client is currently experiencing severe flooding problems on her property. It is unclear at this time whether the proposed drainage system will help or hinder her property. Accordingly, we respectfully request that you hold off making any decision until we have had an opportunity to review this matter and make a public comment.

I have spoken with your staff and informed them that $I$ anticipate being in a position to make a more definitive comment by Friday, February 21, 1997. If that is not possible, please consider this our objection to the proposed development for the purposes of any appeal rights we may need to sustain.

I appreciate your courtesies and assistance in this matter.
Very truly yours,

Norman R. Hill
NRH/dla
cc: Susan Petrone
(Dictated but not read)


## Weble E Martinis

attorneys at law
1114 TWELFTH ST. SE

February 13, 1997

SEAT BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
AMD REGULAR MAIL (541) 682-3947
Mr. Jerry Kendall
Lane County Public Works
Land Management Division
125 E. 8th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401
Re: Dept. File No. PA 4223-96
Referral Notice and Opportunity to Comment on a Proposed Development

Dear Mr. Kendall:
This office represents Susan Petrine, a homeowner in the vicinity of the above-referenced proposed development. I just recently received the Referral, Notice. It is my understanding that the deadline for comments is 5: 000 pom. on February 13,1997. I am currently in trial in Linn County and will not be able to fully evaluate the proposed development before the deadline.

My client is currently experiencing severe flooding problems on her property. It is unclear at this time whether the proposed drainage system will help or hinder her property. Accordingly, we respectfully request that you hold off making any decision until we have had an opportunity to review this matter and make a public comment.

I have spoken with your staff and informed them that $I$ anticipate being in a position to make a more definitive comment by Friday, February 21, 1997. If that is not possible, please consider this our objection to the proposed development for the purposes of any appeal rights we may need to sustain.

I:appreciate your courtesies and assistance in this matter.
Very truly yours,
WEBB E MARTINIS
Norman R. Hill. Hold
NRH/dla
cc: Susan Petiole (Dictated but not read)


Date: $2-6-97$ LAND MANAGEMENT

From: $\qquad$ Robert L Seminal

FEB 131997
PO Box 543
Cottage Grove OR -974.

Regarding Department File No.: $\qquad$ PA $4223-96$

Comments:
We have concerns over the potential change in gourd wats levels that may affect the septa systems and therefore the water quality in the secrowndeng areas. 0 ,
W. thou havering the ansures to the fie Tiontanctitenilnoustion ur oppose The starmwate diacrige se dem Change proposed in this development.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

(541)997-2242 $¥$ FAX 997-9019


## FAX Transmission Cover Sheet

TO $\qquad$ PHONE\#: $541-682-40.57$ COMPANY: Lane $C_{t y}$ Land Mat DEPT: $\qquad$ FAX\#: $541-685-3947$

FROM: DON MALAgamba $\qquad$ DATE: Felon. 12, 1997

NUMBER OF PAGES (including this one): 2 DESCRIPTION / REMARKS: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

IF THIS TRANSMISSION IS INCOMPLETE OR ILLEGIBLE, PLEASE CONTACT THE SENDER AT (541)997-2242.


DATE: February 12, 1997
FROM: Don \& Pat Malagamba
87836 Sandrift Street
Florence, Or 97439
Regarding Department File No.: PA 4223-96
COMMENTS:
We would like to strongly urge the Lane County Planning Director's approval of the planned stornwater drainage system for the Idylewood Subdivision. This subdivision (along with several other Lane County developments), has had severe water drainage problems that have impacted a large number of homeowners. The livability of homes are at stake as well as the homeowner's real estate investments, which in turn can adversely affect County real estate tax revenues. The high water levels on County roads in Idylewood also present serious access problems in the event of an emergency situation.

Lane County has failed to carry out their governmental responsibilities regarding the issuance of building permits for land development in this area. By issuance of the original construction permits it is implied that no dangerous or seriously damaging conditions would occur, when in fact County records and files indicate that the Counry was aware of geologic hazards prior to homes being constructed.

Land use planning did not adequately provide for stormwater drainage in this area of the County. As a minimum, the County should be doing everything possible to help expedite a solution. Mr. Benedick's proposed solution represents a simple approach that can be implemented without cost to either the horneowner or governmental agencies.

Date: $\quad 219197$

From: Annette \& David Leger-Teffrecy
87760 saltaire
Florence, OR, 97439

RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

FEB 121997
AM
$7.6, \mathcal{G}, i \cup, 1 i,: 2,1,2,3,4 ; 5,6$

Regarding Department File No.: PA $4223-96$
Comments:
Mr. Kendall,
Were writing in support of the above proposed drainage system.

Although we do not live on sandrift, we help to feel that this system mayvalleviate our drainage problem on saltaire. Our diamage problem is a result of the water being allowed to collect on sandrift.

Thanh you,
: Arete Leger - Jefferey
$\rightarrow$ David lzher-Jeffroy


DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY'
PORTLAND DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 2946

PORTLAND, OREGON 97208-2946
February 11, 1997
Operations, Construction, and Readiness Division

## RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: Permit Application ID No: 97-163
FES 121997
Lane County - Land Management Division
Attn: Jerry Kendall
125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401-2926
Dear Jerry:
I have reviewed the land-use application submitted by Gene Benedict. Mr. Benedict is proposing to pipe storm water from the Idylewood subdivision into one of a series of lakes within this watershed. Based on the preliminary design it appears that there will be a discharge of material into a water of the United States, therefore a Corps of Engineers permit will be required. My concerns regarding the proposal are as follows:

1. Of primary concern are impacts to downstream developments. Although the applicant believes that there is no surface discharge from the lake there may be substantial movement of water through the porous, sandy soils. At least one residential development downstream, the Sandpines development, has experienced problems with flooding during storm events similar to those described in the application. The proposed scenario would place additional water into the system at this critical time.
2. Similarly, has the applicant evaluated how raising the elevation of the lake, even for a brief period, will effect water levels within the development?
3. It is unclear how flows from typical storms will be prevented from entering the new collection system. Are they relying totally on infiltration? What is the maximum intensity storm that can be expected to generate no runoff into the collection system?
4. Although I did visit the site last spring, I do not recall if there was a wetland fringe surrounding the lake. If there is, the applicant would need to provide an assessment of the impacts of elevating the water levels on those wetlands. The assessment should include an estimate of the increase in the elevation of the water surface and its duration.

The Corps of Engineers' regulatory jurisdiction extends to the ordinary high water mark of the lake, and to any wetlands either around the lake fringe or along the route of the pipeline. We do not have a 50 cubic yard threshold for jurisdiction, therefore, as I indicated earlier it appears the work will require a Corps permit. Although we recognize the seriousness of the of the problem, we could not authorize a project which could exacerbate downstream flooding.


Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Please feel free to contact me at the address shown above, or by telephone at (503) 326-6103.

Sincerely,


Copies Furnished:
ODSL (Leibowitz)
Harry Taylor

Date: $\qquad$
from: Julio L. Tor 87751 Sactaire

RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT.
Florence $O R, 97439$
FEB 121997

Regarding Department File No.: PAY $P 23-96$
Comments:
mr. JerrylCendall, as a neichbor of authose families affecres by Last Years flooding to th is Yeans Henyrain face I hope You find Posirive for this Prose -Since its needed for Their Reciet And All others who build on move irro our Nelohbahooi, into mefurone. Thank to


\[

\]

Date: $\qquad$ FEBRUARY 9,199?
From: Nomen Boutey 87958 SALTIRE ST.
FLORENCE OR 97439
Regarding Department File No: PA 4223.96
Comments:
DIR W/HOIL SLBATVISION IS IN FAVOR of THIS PROJECT.

WE REALLY NEED THIS. THIS WOULD RELIEVE HIE TREMENDOUS WATER PRESSURE WITCH CAUSES OUR HOME TO FLOOD. AS THE WATER IS REMOVED, THE GROUND WATER GOES DINA RIGHT AWAY AT OUR HOUSE "PLEASE APPROVE THIS PERMIT
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


Date: $\qquad$ Feb. 11, 1997
From: ML. EARL F. Pishioneri' of 2740 Saltaine st. Florence, ore 92439

Regarding Department File No.: $\qquad$
comments: concerning Proposed nevelopement IF And when Drainage Problems Experienced by us at Above ADDRess and others, chase by. sid id Address; ARe Aleviated by A Pump Installation At spot Indicated on, Mut then And only then could I possibly Approve of Further Revelopement.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


Date: $\qquad$
From: $\qquad$ 87746 Saltaire Street $\qquad$

Florence, OR 97439,

## RECEIVED BY. LAND MANAGEMENT

FES 111997
7, $8,9,10,11,12,1,2,3,4,5,6$
B

Regarding Department File No.: PA 4223-96
Comments:

Our property is located on the west side of the Idylewood _- development--it is not shown on your maps. We and our neighbors do have a problem with rising ground water after heavy rain It is necessary to have sump pump runningto prevent the water from flooding lot

Any steps that can be taken to drain the water away from
this development will be greatly appreciated. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$



RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

FEB 111997 $\frac{1,4}{7,8,9,10,11,12,1,2,3,4,5,6}$

Regarding Department File No:: PA 4223-96
Comments:
As OUR HOME is AFFECTEO BY STORM $\omega_{A T E R}$,
WE FE\&L THAT THE COUNTY SHOULD APPROVE GENE BENEOICT'S APPLICATION FOR THE DRAINAGE SYSTEM WITHIN THE PRIME WILDLIFE COMBINING ZONE.

WE HOPE THAT THE COUNTY WILL APPROVE Tier Request in. a Timely Manarrsowi wont Have Continual draniage Problems.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FILE } \# \text { PA } \\
& \text { EXHIBIT } \# 22(\partial) \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

Date: 2.9.97

From: Tharisa Pactrinin Mecreesh.
87162 Sattive Ex
Horenco, Dr 9. I4sp

FES 1111997

Regarding Department File No: PA P4223-96 Comments:

We have werioos thoding in over cill-de-ste. - Ground water is espored on bhe siugtace in many areas. thir kind of ifloodup. veriviody compriniejes the inteqicty of the foateing on whiah our hibes stand. ule unalurztood ther area $\%$ be free of flooding
when we purdiered ove heme. vifen we puideced ow heme. Oor hexae is our secuerity. Thence
heln ur! help ur!

Date:_PEBRURARY 9. 1997
From: hours P. Dust
87686 Saltairc St. (In IDycewoors) Plurcencl, OR
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

FEB 111997
${ }_{7,8,9,10,11,12,1,2,3,4,5,6}^{P M}$

Regarding Department File No.: $\quad P A \quad 4223-96$
Comments: 70: Jerry Kendrec
I. HAVE BEEN ACTIVELY INVOLVED WITH OUR DAMAGE PROBLEM DURING THE LAST YEAR. THERE ARE BASICALLY TWO PROBCEINS: I - EAST SIDE DESCRIBED IN TAG PAPER AND 2 - wCST SIDGOA IDYECWMOD ( WHERE I RESIDE) MR BENEDICT HAS JUST COMPCLTLED THE INSTALLATION OF A $12 "$ DEAN OR STORM PIPE TO. THE WEST ALMOST TOMFHODODENDROWG. FIVE Q NUS HAVE CONSTRUCTED A DRAINAGE DITCH.. WITH COMLLO LINER ALONG THE BOUNDRIES OF OUR PROPERTIES. THIS DITCH RUNS CONSTANTLY FROM WATER SIPPING THRU THE GRound ARMM THE EAST SIDE (AREA DEFINE -A IN TI F PAPER). We CAN ABSURG YUU THAT A PUMP STATION IN THE DESIGNATED AREA WILL BENEFIT MANY MORE PROPERTIES THAN INDICATED WITHIN ENCLOSED MAP: WE SIMPLY ASK THAT. HIGH WATER TABLES ARUM LARGE -AMOUNTS OF RAIWPACL BE CONTROLLED WHEN THEY RISE. ABOVE THE SURFACE OF OUR LOTS AND UNDER OR INTO OUR HOUSES. WV G TRUST THATYou will ACTIVEC'S RURSLA THE ARMIT To COWSTRUCT THE $2-11 / 18$ pumping station. Sub bush; $\qquad$ EXHIBIT \# 20


Fliminar lan

RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

FES 111997
${ }_{7,3,9,1 \cup, 2 i}^{M}, 12,1,2,3,4,5,6$

Regarding Department File No.: $D$ A $4+2$ ふー 6
Comments:
Q Samur $2 x$, um un apiguy hnme anvini chominivinav xasideriys. ai un eaxper y Landengt $x$ a erena
 Gfanc on weediy, *pxin dayt noghr Ohhin tie ditclira vir flim, dur e xain, Cha shent io fluodie ilvina dibrion try Lumpuas bntur adstinn o have unato Andi myehaina, $\sim$ hozgaq hach zand L L unill asuláy L Llaen macd

She drelopor sfinuel toke fuce risponainidy
 liun buen gonng on fir u gaar $x$ ar che Pranint line Q maz talel my hacusin, t, cunsabo 10 .


## Dear Nancy:

I am in receipt of your letter dated 2-5-97. I note the cited ecological concerns, that is, timing and duration of inundation and potential downstream flooding impacts, but am uncertain as to exactly what type of response your agency is requiring of the applicant. Please clarify.

For your information, I have sent a full copy of the proposal to Teen Monical of the Army Corps for review.


Sincerely,


Jerry Kendall/Associate Planner (541-682-4057)
$2-14-97$ SSCROR NO
jurisatutian. $-2 K$

Harry Taylor P.O. Box 1420

Veneta, Or. 97487

- Inr Loy guins Pounty flanner. Lare County Court House

FES 101997 C,

Plear Sir,
Theresident of Qiean Woodlands are having a water prollem, pramaily caviod by the residents of Sllewod\& purping uratu out of then area. It sing condentanding $x$ het the Idlewaod developer was to ed that these woield le gioblems wich water after cosistruetion hod piogressed to a centain eistint

- hav talked to guople who hove been in this area years loxger than. Ohave hived hane and thy cannot remember any -high coaterproblems previouly, not erion diving the ptorms last winter (95-9C).

C Drve by the purnping opeciation and theywer pumping water to the east,


Towaid ede oard dures Ihis ain caused a raising of the eiater luels

- Oin Ocoin Woodlands a al as farsarth: as stecta RQ, Thure was water over therad sicuser places:

As there any way that bhe developer of QdCewood Cini fue fured to set up a system wheribly the water ean be gurnped \& the ovest where it conld fer id it wayto lie ocean?

Sinculy
Walter F Peinkaro WALTER F REINIJARD O4824 GLORIA GAYLE WAY FLORENCE, OR 97439

# $T H E \mathbb{S H E V A S}, C L A U D E \& S T E L Z A$ <br> 87740 SAND RIFT STREET <br> FLORENCE, OREGON 97439 

February 06, 1996

Jerry Kendall
Lane County Land Management Division
Public Service Building
125 E 8th Ave.
Eugene, OR. 97401

## RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT

FEB 101997
M,


Refer: Department File No.: PA4223-96

Dear Planning Director:

As a resident of the subdivision that will be effected by this "storm water drainage system" I urge you to expedite approval of this proposal so that we may have, at least this much of a solution to our problem before next winter. This flooding that we have experienced these last two winters has cause considerable hardship to the residents of this area. Some have suffered physical damage to their homes and vehicles (because they had to drive in and out of there property through water). Property values have declined. Because of this many of us have filed for relief on our tax bills.

Those of us that live here were not aware of this flooding when we bought. You in Land Management knew. I have documents from county employees dated in the early 80 s that even name the affected lots.

This proposal will only "bandaid" the problem. We (you the county, me the citizen) have a much larger and potentially more serious problem. As we grow and develop in Florence drainage in the whole area is becoming a very serious problem. It is going to have to be addressed!

I have one other concern; the term "Prime Wildlife" is used. The area east of us (between Idylewood \& 101) is a great green belt. I spend time hiking there. But we have more "wildlife" in the subdivision.


# RECEIVED BY LAND MANAGEMENT 



JERRY KENDALL
ASSOCIATE PLANNER
LANE COUNTY LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION
DIVISION OF

125 EAST 8TH AVENUE
EUGENE OR 97401
STATE LAND BOARD
JOHN A. KITZHABER Governor
PHIL KEISLING
Secretary of State
JIM HILL
State Treasurer
The Division of State Lands recently reviewed Gene Benedict's proposal to install a storm water drainage pipeline and drain storm water up to two times a year into a natural lake/wetland system in Lane County (Section 10 (3/4) and (4/0), Township 18S, Range 12W.

775 Summer Street NE Salem, OR 97310-1337
(503) 378-3805

FAX (503) 378-4844
TTY (503) 378-4615

According to the proposal; the additional storm water would raise the elevation of the seasonal lake by one foot: Ecological concerns to the Division and to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers include the a) duration and timing of inundation and effects on the wetland b) potential downstream flooding impacts to other subdivisions and the Sand Pines Golf Course. In addition, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would require a permit for installation of this pipe outfall and.riprap into the seasonal lake.

Feel free to call me with questions at (503) 378-3805, extension 235.
Sincerely,

c: Harry Taylor, Land Use Consultant
Teen Conical; Corps of Engineers
Gene Benedict, Owner

## NCL/djc

IIsalemlfolcountiesVanelviolat1\pa422396.doc



Regarding D Deparnment File No. PA4223-96
recenved by LUNI MANAGEMENT

TER 61997

Comments:
$714 y$ lat 130 plodmere cost
Unigh liapted the lot on the two maper aln reterining to poi ©n $\#$, amples is ino inc lidedio, the drainage plan in H2 if is inclieded:

Ith drain age plan vill corsect The problem of toomuch vater uagree
that it shoulod le installed.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


Date: $\qquad$
From: $\qquad$ John Bosch
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Regarding Department File No.: PA 4223-96
Comments:
$\qquad$
PROPOSED PROJECT IS NOT LOCATED WITHIN 700 YEAR
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


# Referral Notice and Opportunity to Comment on a Proposed Development 



## Date:

January 23,1997
Department File No.: PA 4223-96
Property Owner: ... Gene Benedict

Applicant:
Gene Benedict; c/o Harry Taylor

Agent:
Harry Taylor

Location (Address):
(None) Located east of Idylewood Subdivision
Tax Assessment Map: 18-12-10.4, lots 400 \& 401; 18-12-10.3.4, lot 801

Nature of the pending development application: Planning Director Review for a stormwater drainage system within the Prime Wildlife Combining Zone per LC 10.245-15(4).

Lane County has received an application for the proposed development. This notice includes copies of relevant materials from the application file and has been mailed to nearby property owners and to service providers. If you are a nearby property owner, the proposed development may have some impacts on the use of your property. If you are a service provider, the proposed development is in your service area and may place demands on you for the services your agency provides.

The purpose of this notice is to provide you with an opportunity to review, ask questions and to comment on the proposed development and to submit your comments to Lane County prior to the Planning Director's decision to approve or deny the proposed development.

The application and related materials are available for inspection at the Lane County Land Management Division at no' cost and copies will be provided at reasonable cost. The name of the Lane County Land Management Division representative to contact concerning this application is Jerry Kendall at 682-4057.

You may write your comments in the spaces provided on the other side of this page and return this document to the attention of Jerry Kendall, Lane County Land Management Division, Public Service Building, 125 East 8th Ave., Eugene, OR. 97401. ... Fax 682-3947 ... Please submit any written comments regarding the proposed development by 5 P.M. on Januafy $13,1997$.


Date:

```
i
```

From: $\qquad$

Regarding Department File No.: $\qquad$
Comments:

Location: West of Heceta Beach Rd.; Florence
Map No: 18121034 \#8011 181210.4 \#400, 401
Plot No. UGB/Fio
Proposal: Planning Directorreview for a Stormwater Drainage System within the Prime Wildlife Combining zone per LC10.245.15(4)


MAP NO. 18121034 \#801
PLOT NO. UGB - Flo
TIMX CODE -97-18/97-19
 PROPERTY IS LOCATED.
 ThE BOTTOM OF THIS PORMTHE IMPORMATION IN THE FLE WIICH YON WOULD UKE COFIED AND SEMT WITI THI FEFERAL NOTICE COMPLETE THIE REEPRRALIOTICE AMD ATTACHITTOTAIS FORM
3. CLERIGLL SEMD A COPT OFTHE REERRAL NOTICE AND FATERIALS TO THE AGENCIES ASINSTRUCTED. BELOW.

RETRERALGENCIES

DBUILDING
వwater Qvemitin/avalit
ХTRAMSPORTATION
ХENYIROMMENTAL MEALTIT
XRURAL ADCRESTMG
ХFLOOD MAMAGEMIENT
DCOATALOVERLAY
区PIRE DITRICT Siuslaw RFPD\#1
వPOWIR CO Ceníral Lincoln.PUD

ХWETAMD'S
$\square$ VATER MATER
$\square$ METRO FLAN BOUNDARY
XNRBAM GROMH BOUNADMY Florence DOTHER
$\square C / O K E N$ LONTAFAR
Puble modkS
CITY OF FLO.
INSTRUTIONS FOR ATTACHICD MATERMALS

 BELOW:

SEND COPY TO. HADEY TAYLOR.

Location: Wést of Heceta Beach Rd., Florence
Map No: 18121034 \#801/ 1812104 \#400; 401
Plot No. UGB/Fio
Proposal: Planning:Directorreview for a Stormwater Drainage System within the Prime Wildlife Combining zone per LC10.245.15(4)


## SLM'S DATE

## REQUESTOMA PORMAE MOTIICATION"E RETEERALS

| 区PD | $\square \mathrm{CORC}$ | TMME | PLOTNO UGB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square 10$. | $\square \angle C P C$ | DATE | FILE NO: PA 4223-96 |
| $\square$ BCC | $\square \mathrm{Q} P$ P | PLACE | TAM CODE $97-18$ (map): 97-19 (TAIMS) |

## APPLICANT: Gene Benedick

QGENT: Hary Taylor
OWNER: Gene Bendick
SITE ADDIRESS: (None)

MAP NO. 18-12-10.4
MAP NO. 18-12-10.3:4
МАР №. 18-12-10:4

TAX LOT 401
TAXLOT 801
TAXX LOT 400

PROPOSAL: Planning Director Review for a Stormwater Drainage System within the Prime Wildlife Combining Zone per LC 10.245-15(4).

## STAri: JK

SPECIAL NMTRUCTIONS See plot plan for layout of facility (Exhibit "A") on tax maps.

Clark James M. 5180 Heceta Beach Rd Florence OR 97439

Duke Kent \& Carol
87827 Sandrift
Florence OR 97439

Hix Lawrence TE ETAL
87797 Sandrift St Florence OR 97439

Smith Nancy J.
330 Crest Drive
Eugene OR 97405

Hèad James F \& Eileen
5139 Heceta Beach Rd
Florence Or 97439

Heceta Inc.
PO Box 1180
Waldport OR 97394

Benson Bruce \& Sheryll
1187 Sanborn Ave
Eugene OR 97404

Willoughby Wayne Jr \& L.A.
5011 Kelsie Ct
Florence OR 97439.

Harry Taylor
P.O. Box 1420

Veneta OR 97487

Cox Óscar R
05176 Heceta Beach Rd
Florence Or 97439

> Ewing Robert \& Jennifer
> 05143 Heceta Beach Rd
> Florence OR 97439

Lane County Owned Lands
125 East 8th Ave
Eugene OR 97401

Thompson Wayne \& Betty
4354 Spruce Street
Florence OR 97439

Smith Gerald \& Koto
PO Box 306
Phoenix OR 97535

Beckman Marvin \& Darlene
PO Box 3516
Florence OR 97439

Grainger Donald TE
Donald L Grainger Trúst 1102 Pasadena Ave
Fillmore CA 93015

Stoker C Robert TE ETAL
87849 Sandrift Street
Florence OR 97439

Genë Benedick
27962 Ward Lane
Eugene OR 97402

Derrickson Thelma May TE
Ball May I TE
PO Box 1018
Florence OR 97439

Hawkins Frank \& Rose
PO Box 2186
Florence OR 97439

Shrader Peter \& Sandra
PO Box 2324
Florence OR 97439

Wilson Michell \& Lucille 05190 Heceta Beach Road
Florence OR 97439

Jeremiah Robert \& Sandra
P.O. Box 543

Cottage Grove OR 97424

Burleson Robert \& Janet
5043 Kelsie Ct
Florence OR 97439

King Charles \& Betty
5009 Kelsie Ct
Florence OR 97439

Larsen Richard \& Doris
87791 Sandrift Street
Florence OR 97439:

PA' 4223 - 96
Benedick
Page 2

Linda Clark<br>87723 Saltaire Stréet

Florence OR 97439

Silva Calude TE ETAL
87740 Sandrift Street
Florence OR 97439

## Clark Linda <br> 87723 Saltaire Street <br> Florence OR 97439

Weber George Glenn
087729 Sandrift St
Florence OR 97439

Watkins William M \& S A
87701 Sandrift St
Florence OR : 97439

White John M Te<br>Etal<br>87764 Saltaire St<br>Florence OR ` 97439

Geiss Lee \& Diane
87767 Sandrift Street
Florence OR 97439

Borges June TE
June Borges Trust
PO Box 3126
Florence Or 97439

Takeyäma Margery
Margery Takeyama Trust
87623 Sándrift Street
Florence OR 97439

Almquist Oscar \& Amy
87719 Saltaire Street
Florence OR 97439.
Hollinhurst John Wilfrid Te
Etal
87698 Saltaire St
Florence OR

Takeyama Margery P Te Margery P Takeyama Trúst 87623 Sandrift St Florence OR 97439

Ishii Richard \&'Rosemary
P.O Box 2383

Florence OR 97439

## Kinslow Cecil \& Janice

PO Box 842
Florence OR 97439

Michael Keith \& Teresa
Attn: OR Pacific Banking
PO Box 22000
Florence OR 97439

Lane County
County Ownied Lands Dept
Lane County Court House
Eugene OR . . 97401

Lee Jack A Te
Etal
87591 Sandrift St
Florence OR " 97439

Spivey William F Iii \& J A
87733 Sandrift St
Florence OR

PLOT NO. $\qquad$

ASSESSORS MAP \& TAX LOT NUMBERS


Gene benedick
PLOT NO. $\qquad$

ASSESSOR'S MAP \& TAX LOT NUMBERS

| $18 \cdot 12 \cdot 10 \cdot 3 \cdot 1$ |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1400 | Lee |
| 1300 | Wrtlen's |
| 1200 | Takeyema |
| 1100 | Weber |
| 1000 | Spivey |
| 1500 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# BENEDICK JULIUS E.\& E J 

BENEDICK E JUSTINE 1-2
27962 WARD LN
ÉUGENE OR 97402
:CLARK JAMES M
5180 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE OR 97439
Taxlot: 1812104000401
Taxlot: 1812104000400

COX OSCARR
05176 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE OR 97439

DERRICKSON THELMA MAY TE
BALL MAYI.TE
$P^{\prime} O$ BOX 1018
FLORENCE OR 97439
'Taxlot: 1812104001300

DUKE KENT F \& CAROL $G$
87827 SANDRIFT
FLORENCE OR 97439
Taxlot: 1812103100200

EWING ROBERT J \& JENṄIFER L
05143 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCE OR 97439
Taxlot: 1812104000300
HAWKINS FRANK L \& ROSE E
POBOX 2186
FLORENCEOR 97439
HIX LAWRENCE TE ETAL:
87797 SANDRIFT ST
FLORENCE OR 97439
LANE COUNTY
COUNTY OWNED LANDS DEPT
LANE COUNTY COURT HOUSE.
EUGENE OR 97401

Taxlot: 1812103100400
Taxlot: 1812104001400

Taxlot: 1812102000400
Taxlot: 1812104001600

SHRADER PETER F \& SANDRAD
POBOX 2324.
FLORENCE OR 97439

SMITH NANCY, J
330 CREST DR
EUGENE OR 97405
THOMPSON WAYNE R \& BETTY A
4354 SPRUCE ST
FLORENCE OR 97439

WILSON MITCHELL \& LUCILLE
O5190 HECETA BEACH RD
FLORENCEOR 97439
Additional taxlots:
Taxlot: $1812100000101-$
1812104000100--
$1812104001800=$
$1812101301400^{\circ}$
$1812101302200 \%$
1812101302400
1812101302500
1812101302600
1812101302700
1812103100101
$1812103100500^{\circ}$
1812103100600
1812103100700
1812103100800
1812103400100
1812103405800
$1812103405900 \checkmark$
1812103406000
1812103407200
1812103407300
$1812103407400^{\circ}$
1812103407500
1812103407600
1812103407700
1812103407800
1812103407900

Taxlot 1812103100300

Taxlot: $1812104000500^{\circ}$

Taxlot: 1812104001500
Taxlot: 1812104001701

Taxlot: 1812104001100
Add Hany Tiglor
to notice liso

- 2 K
$1-17.97$

Harry Taylor

Public Works
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION
P.O. Box 1420

Veneta, Or. 97487
Re: PA 4223-96 Need for ownership listing
Dear Mr. Taylor:
As discussed by phone today, please provide a list, by Map number, of all contiguous (as defined in LC 13.010) holdings of Mr. Benedick in relation to the subject property on which the project occurs. This information is required in order to give proper referral and decision notice per LC 14.050(3)(c) \& 14.100(4).

The adjacent property list provided on the "Land Use Application" was in error. While that error would normally warrant an "incomplete" per LC 14.050(3)(b), it was not possible to detect that error until the office staff began compiling the notice list.

PA 4223-96 cannot proceed until the list is provided. This omission will further delay the expected processing timelines mentioned in my letter dated 1-17-97.

Both the County and your client are obligated to meet the requirements of LC 14. I appreciate your efforts in resolving these unforeseen items.

Sincerely,


Jerry Kendall/Associate Planner (541-682-4057)

c. . Gene Benedick<br>27962 Ward Ln.<br>Eugene, Or. 97402



HARRY A. TAYLOR
LAND USE CONSULTANT
P.O. BOX 1420

VENETA, OR 97487
(541) 935-6202
(541) 935-4918 FAX

January 22, 1997


RECEIVEDBY
LAND MANAEDBY
JAN 241997
7, ${ }_{7,3,9,10,11,2,1,2,3,4,5,6}^{\text {PM }}$

Ms. Nancy Liebowitz Divisign of State Lands
775 summer Street NE
Sałem, OR 97310-1337
Re: Benedick Storm Water Drainage Plan, Florence, Oregon
Dear Nancy,
The purpose of this letter is to request a response from DSL regarding a proposed storm water drainage plan. to serve a portion of the Idylewood subdivision. Enclosed is a copy of a Special Use Permit recently filed with Lane County regarding Prime Wildife Overlay Zone requirements, engineered plans, application narrative and a letter of response from Doug Cottam, ODFW Wildife Biologist.

The Applicant, Gene Benedick is desirous of constructing a drainage system to alleviate occasional seasonal ponding that impacts up to 13 lots and local streets in the subdivision. It is important to note the system is expected to operate at most once or twice a year. The February 1996 floods caused the most damage and inconvience; however, the November 1996 rainy period did not cause. any appreciable flooding. Based on past events there are years the system may never be used.

In summary, storm water would be collected in a 3000 gallon storage tank and pumped about 850 feet to discharge in a seasonal lake on the Applicant's property. The system incorporates a siltation chamber, oil separator, and clay backfill and rip-rap at the discharge point to maintain water quality and prevent erosion, sedimentation.

It is my understanding that Mr. Benedick met on-site with DSL and a number of other' agencies to consider alternatives that would correct this situation. Opening channels between the seasonal lakes was not allowed, but the proposed method was apparently given a conceptual approval, subject to preparing a specific plan. We believe the attached information provides that pfan


## Page 2

Liebowitz letter January 22, 1997

Jerry Kendall, Lane County Planner, (541-687-4057) has been assigned the prime wildlife review of this application. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.


## Enclosure

cc: Gene Benedick (w/o enc)
$\checkmark$ Jerry Kendall, Lane County Land Management Division (w/o enc)

Mrs. Richard Ishii
P.O. Box 2383

Florence, OR 97439
Jack and Barbara Evans
87810 Sandrift Streèt
Florence, OR 97439
Lee and Diane Geiss
87767 Sandrift Street
Florence, OR 97439
Mr. Claude T. Silva
87740 Sandrift Street
Florence, OR 97439
Concerning: PA 4223-96 Stormwater Drainage System for Idlywood Subdivision
The Lane County Land Management Division received this application from Mr. Benedick and Harry Taylor on December 30, 1996. After the internal processing is completed, referrals to affected property owners and other agencies (i.e. Division of State Lands, Fish and Wildlife, City of Florence Public Works) as required by Lane Code will be sent. That mailing should take place next week. There is a 14 -day comment period; and after that time, consideration will be given to any information received and a decision will be made by the Planner, Jerry Kendall.

Mr. Kendall is available by telephone at (800) 826-8978 extension 4057 or at the Florence Annex on Wednesdays, 997-3462 if you would like further information regarding this application.

Sincérely,

cc: Commissioner Dumdi Gené Benedick


KENDALL Jerry

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:

KLINE Katherine
KENDALL Jerry
RE: PA 42023-96/ .Benedict
Thursday, January 23, 1997 10:43AM

There was a problem with the mailing list on benedict. I had to give it back to Sandy. They owned a lot more property than what was listed on the application

From: CENTRAL Jerry
To: KLINE Katherine
Subject: PA 4223-96/.Benedict
Date: Thursday, January 23, 1997 9:20AM
Please see if you can get the pending referrals out for this one soon.
Its for the flooding in Idlewood in Florence, and folks are pressuring for a quick turn around.

Re: PA 4223-96 Stormwater drainage system for Idylewood Subdivision
Dear Mr. Taylor:
This letter is to acknowledge your call requesting a status check on the above cited application. Here is a brief chronology:

12-30-96 Application submitted
1-7-97 Met with you for project background. Application deemed complete for processing per LC 14.
1-7-97 Application sent interoffice for graphics, compilation of notice list.
1-17-97 Graphics completed. Sent to Office Aide for referral mailings.
After the referrals are sent out early next week, LC 14 requires a 10 day wait period for responses.

I am aware of the flooding that occurred last February, and of the need for expedited handling of this request. I am also aware of 15 applications which are in my possession that were submitted earlier then the subject application. Normally, the write-up on the subject application would begin about February 17th. I have discussed this matter with the Planning Director. If your client wishes to have this application expedited, the expedited rate stated in Lane Manual will need to be paid. This equates to $\$ 75 /$ hour times \# of hours $+15 \%+\$ 5$. The total expedite fee is, of course dependent on the number of hours the assigned planner (myself) works on the project. I estimate $3-5$ hours work required. With the 10 day waiting time for referral responses, 1 could begin the write-up on the application the week of February 1st. The expedite fee pays for my voluntary overtime spent on this application, so that the other 15 project applicants are not delayed.

If your client desires expedited processing time, please submit a fee for three hours, or $\$ 263.75$, payable to Lane County. You will be notified if additional hours are compiled. Since your client will want to know a ceiling limit, I will commit to a maximum of 6 hours at the overtime rate, the remainder will be covered under the already paid fee. If the process takes less than 3 hours, a proportionate amount will be refunded.

It is important to stress that the expedite fee simply pays for County planner staff time giving this application priority. I cannot ask referral agencies, such as the Division of State Lands, the City of Florence, etc. to expedite their review timelines. Although I am in receipt of a response from Mr . Cottom of ODF\&W, DSL will play an important role in this project. It is timely here to note LC 10:245-70(2). From our meeting last week it is my understanding that no response has been solicited by you or your client from DSL. Such an action would have compressed the processing time.

Sincerely,


Jerry Kendall/Associate Planner
c. Gene Benedict

27962 Ward Lane
Eugene, Or. 97402
Jane Burgess/LMD

## WETLAND LAND USE NOTIFICATION FORM

 DIVISION OF STATE LANDS WETLANDS PROGRAMfy County:
Responsible Jurisdiction: D City
2. APPLICANT: HAREY TAYLOR name
P.O. BOX 1420
mailing address
$\frac{V \operatorname{cosex}}{\text { city }}$ oR 97487
(541) $\$ 356202$
phone

Local Case file No. Ps $42+3-927$ OSL File No.: OUNO9-00.63. B County
name
mailing address

(5A1) \&8B6402 phone
LANDOWNER: CREATE BEMEDLCZ
 NWI quad map name Mercia LAKE 3 (attach copy with site indicated) Attached: $x$ NWI map $\propto$ Parcel map $\quad$ Site plan Other
4. SITE INFORMATION:

5. PROPOSED ACTIVITY:

(This form is to be completed only by planning department staff for mapped wetlands)
DST RESPONSE
$C C$ : Nancy Leibowitz,DSL
7 A removal-fill permit is required from the Division of State Lands:

- A removal-fill permit is required from the Division of State Lands.

A removal-fill permit will be required when the development project proceeds.
0 A removal-fill permit may be required:
EA A permit may be required by the Corps of Engineers (326-6995)
E -Information needed includes:
E. A wetland determination/del indexation report. Consultant list encased『- or site visit by DSt to verify western evert of wetlands an site.
$\square$ State permit $\qquad$ $\square$ was issued $\square$ has been applied for.
a No removal-fill permit is required for the described project if/because:
proposed drainage system appeals to encroach into Local wietciinds. Inventory mapped Comments: wetland (Site ID se -35A, map enclosed). A permit is required far 50 cubic yards or mare off fill and lar removal within the wetland area. Site should not be altered prier to an an-site review of potential wetlands within project area. Please call we at $x 2 y G$ if you hawse any $q u e s t i o n s$.
Response completed by: Mary Rkenhan-Walsh
Date March 13.1997

* If the project is changed to involve fill or removal from the wetlands area; a state removal-fill-permit will be required.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ prepared by EGR \& Associates dated May 16, 2005

[^1]:    I am aware that past interpretations of this code section for development projects that EGR designed has allowed grading on slopes in excess of $25 \%$ where the overall site slopes on average were less than $25 \%$. These projects were reviewed by John Petsch with Shane Hughes as the lead engineer for EGR.

[^2]:    Signature of Applicant / Agent

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ From PA 10-5821, the preliminary subdivision application, currently pending. It is noted that while the final subdivision configuration will be modified prior to Final Plat approval, any changes to the outer perimeter of that plan in a direction towards the boundaries of the PW district may void this unvestigation. Other pending applications related to this $4^{\text {th }}$ addution include PA 10-5824, a variance for road connectivity, and PA 10-5822, a Preliminary Investigation for the Beaches \& Dunes Combining District. Because of the interrelated nature of these applications, the file record for PA 10-5821 is considered the file record for the remaining applications.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ From PA 10-5821, the preliminary subdivision application, currently pending. It is noted that while the final subdivision configuration will be modified prior to Final Plat approval, any changes to the outer perimeter of that plan in a direction towards the boundaries of the PW district may void this unvestigation. Other pending applications related to this $4^{\text {th }}$ addution include PA 10-5824, a variance for road connectivity, and PA 10-5822, a Preliminary Investigation for the Beaches \& Dunes Combining District. Because of the interrelated nature of these applications, the file record for PA 10-5821 is considered the file record for the remaining applications.

