

City of Lafayette
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday March 20 at 6:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Kerr called to order at 6:34 p.m.

2. FLAG SALUTE: Chair Kerr lead flag salute.

3. ROLL CALL: Chair Kerr called the Roll:

Present: Chair Ron Kerr, Stephen Belding, Sheila Neuman, Scott Adamson, Jon Meola (joined via Zoom), Roger Webb (joined at 6:45 via Zoom)

City Staff Present: Jim Jacks, City Planner; Branden Dross, City Administrator; Nicole Laudisio, Community Development Clerk

Not Present: David Rogers

Others: Russell Burrows

4. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

None.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

a. January 16, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Adamson made a motion to approve January 16, 2025, Minutes and Commissioner Neuman seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-0 (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Sheila Neuman)

b. February 20, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Belding made a motion to approve February 20, 2025, Minutes and Chair Kerr seconded the motion, the motion passed 5-0 (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Sheila Neuman)

6. WORK SESSION:

a. Parks Master Plan

City Planner Jacks began the work session regarding the Parks Master Plan, the previous meeting on February 20, 2025, was a joint work session with Planning Commission and City Council to reach a consensus on the goals and ideas for the Parks Master Plans specifically pertaining to- Veterans Park, Commons Park, and Terry Park. City Planner Jacks continued to page 2 of his staff report, the summarized consensus from the previous joint work session established that Terry Park will retain the natural

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION**

DATE & TIME: Thursday, April 17, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Council Chambers, 486 Third Street, Lafayette, OR 97127

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. FLAG SALUTE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**
- 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. March 20, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.....2
- 6. WORK SESSION**
 - a. Parks Master Plan.....7.
- 7. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- 8. NEXT MEETING**
 - a. May 15, 2025
- 9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Council Chambers is accessible. If you need an accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or wish to participate remotely, please notify the City at (503) 864-2451 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION**

DATE & TIME: Thursday, April 17, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.
PLACE: Council Chambers, 486 Third Street, Lafayette, OR 97127

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. FLAG SALUTE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. CITIZEN INPUT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**
- 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. March 20, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.....
- 6. WORK SESSION**
 - a. Parks Master Plan
- 7. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**
- 8. NEXT MEETING**
 - a. May 15, 2025
- 9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Council Chambers is accessible. If you need an accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or wish to participate remotely, please notify the City at (503) 864-2451 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

aspects and possibly have river access. Commissioner Neuman brought up the waterfalls, that are around 4 feet tall, on the Yamhill River that will impede recreational water activities. Chair Kerr suggested that the river access may be a riverbank rather than a boat launch. Discussion ensued regarding making a trail connecting Terry Park to Locks Loop, a nearby Yamhill County Park on the river. City Administrator Dross stated that access to the river is an economic opportunity, Terry Park is within the Urban Renewal Boundaries and could bring people into the downtown commercial area because of the close walkable proximity to Terry Park; City Administrator Dross emphasized that we do not want to implement something that will need to be scrapped later down the line. Commissioner Webb brought up that we can utilize the research being done by the steering committee while also staying on their radar. Chair Kerr stated that Terry Park is relatively underdeveloped and suggested some initial options to consider such as lighting, paths, season stairs to the river, grill/picnic area, or a pavilion. City Administrator Dross asked if removing the vehicle restrictions and gate on Terry Park is something the commission would be interested in. Commissioner Adamson stated that the population will want parking, Commissioner Neuman stated there tends to be a seasonal group that occupies the park and would want the restrictions to stay. Commissioner Webb asked how we get people to get to these parks and suggested asking ODOT for a lighted pedestrian crossing across Highway 99.

City Planner Jacks suggested moving on to Veterans Park as the discussions for Terry Park are mirroring what is already in the 2013 Parks Master Plan; the consensus for Veterans Park based off February 20th, 2025, joint work session and the result of the public survey is that it will be used as a dog park and possibly a walking path. Commissioner Belding suggested the path could connect Washington Street to Bridge Street and could have a permeable surface to drain precipitation. City Planner Jacks made a note that ADA standards will apply to the path. Commissioner Neuman stated the park could get benches, a human/pet fountain, and a dog waste container. City Planner Jacks suggested contacting the Daughters of the American Revolution or other veteran focused nonprofits that could provide sources of funding; City Planner Jacks also mentioned the idea from the joint work session of tying in a memorial for service dogs of war.

Discussion ensued around the cost of developing parks and City Planner Jacks reminded the commission that the financial aspects are up to City Council and the City Administrator and suggested we move on to discuss Commons Park. Chair Kerr noted that this park has more of a focus on people. City Planner Jacks explained the preexisting features of the park such as the community center and the backstop for kickball, some of the suggested features to be added are- a basketball court that has a cover/pavilion that can be used as a stage or quasi-amphitheater, possibly a water feature, and possibly a pickleball court. Commissioner Belding stated that this park has the most potential to attract citizens as a whole and suggested a pedestrian crossing across Highway 99 to allow citizens on the northside of town an easier walkable way to the park. Commissioner Webb suggested soccer goals that are moveable and can be stored away when not in use. Commissioner Neuman stated that Commons Park is already being utilized for recreational sports and that placing the multi-use covered basketball court and pavilion needs to be strategic to maximize the use of the park. Commissioner Adamson stated he would like to prioritize Veterans Park followed by Commons Park and then the last priority is Terry Park.

7. NEW BUSINESS:

None.

8. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

9. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

None.

10. NEXT MEETING:

a. April 17, 2025

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Kerr moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Adamson seconded; the motion passed unanimously (aye- Ron Kerr, Stephan Belding, Sheila Neuman, Jon Meola, Scott Adamson, Roger Webb)

Minutes approved on the 17th day of April 2025.

CERTIFIED:

ATTESTED:

Ron Kerr, Chair

Nicole Laudisio, Community Development Clerk

DRAFT

City of Lafayette

486 Third Street, P.O. Box 55

Lafayette, Oregon 97127

Phone: (503) 864-2451 Fax: (503) 864-4501



TO: LAFAYETTE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JIM JACKS, CITY PLANNER

SUBJ: WORK SESSION TO DISCUSS CHAPTER 5 (Proposed Park Improvements) OF THE PROPOSED 2025 LAFAYETTE PARKS DEVELOPMENT PLAN

DATE: April 17, 2025

I. BACKGROUND

Following-up on the March 20, 2025 Planning Commission (PC) agenda item regarding updating the 2013 Lafayette Parks Development Plan, the April 17 agenda includes a work session regarding Chapter 5 (Proposed Park Improvements) (see attached).

Early this past summer the Council tasked the PC with updating the Plan's socio-economic data in Chapter 2 with the latest Census data and more importantly, reviewing and updating Chapter 5 with its list of improvements for each Park.

The purpose of reviewing Chapter 5 on April 17 is to review and discuss the proposed amendments to Chapter 5 to ensure they are consistent with the PC's consensus at the March 20, 2025 work session.

Chapter 5 from the 2013 Parks Development Plan is the basis for the proposed amendments which are shown in ***bold italics*** for added language and ~~striketrough~~ for deleted language. The 2013 Plan included many references to the Lafayette 2004 Parks Development Plan. Much of the 2004 language is proposed to be retained because it provides background for the language in the 2013 Plan, but as an option, less language from the 2004 Plan can be retained.

For Commons Park, the 2013 Plan included information about the 2004 Plan such as it calling for the removal of the then existing asphalt basketball court and installing a backstop, spectator stands, etc., at the baseball field. Those improvements were installed in 2010. Based on the input from the City's 2024 online survey, the City Council and the Planning Commission, a basketball court with some type of cover is now proposed.

Where the Commission prefers less retention of language from the 2004 Plan, please comment to that affect at the work session.

II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review Chapter 5, discuss the proposed changes and provide direction to staff.

Chapter 5

Proposed Park Improvements

This chapter describes proposed improvements to the existing city park system and a recommendation for a neighborhood or community park in the north portion of the city. The improvements were identified by the Lafayette Parks Committee for the 2004 Plan and by the Lafayette Planning Commission *in coordination with the City Council* for the 2012 2025 Plan to meet community needs. In the 2004 Plan the Parks Committee, and in the 2012 Plan the Planning Commission, expressed a need to provide *The 2025 Parks Master Plan provides* amenities that appealed to a variety of user groups and helped provide a greater sense of community within Lafayette.

The 2012 2025 Plan anticipates a Park Committee ~~will~~ *may* be created in the future and one of their primary functions ~~will~~ *could* be to review the ~~prioritized~~ list of projects ~~from the 2011 Parks Community Survey (see below and Appendix A)~~ and recommend projects to the City Council as part of the annual fiscal year budgeting process. ~~It~~ *If formed, it* is anticipated the new Parks Committee and the City Council will evaluate the projects as to cost, need, benefit-for-the-buck, time to install and other factors. ~~Whereas the 2004 Plan included site plan designs showing specific improvements and their locations at each park, the 2012 2025 Plan does not include such specific plans for each park. It is anticipated the new Park Committee will review the plans from the 2004 Plan and revise them as necessary.~~ As the master plans for each park are prepared, the Committee may make recommendations annually to the Budget Committee for projects in each fiscal year. All the recommended projects may be focused on one park or there may be projects for several parks. ~~Many of the desired improvements identified in the 2011 Parks Community Survey could be located at several of the existing parks or at new park sites.~~

The update process in 2014 2025 included *an online park survey and a virtual community meeting in 2024* that was in the August utility billing. About 140 ~~300~~ *online surveys* responses were received.

NOTE: The following is deleted for the 2025 Plan update as it relates to the 2011 park survey which was determined to be out of date to inform the 2025 Plan update. The deleted information will be replaced with the results of the 2024 online park survey.

Question 9 listed 24 possible park improvements and asked the respondent to prioritize them. A rating of 1 is the highest priority and a rating of 8 is the lowest priority. The following is the result. The numbers to the right of each item represent the average rating for that item.

1. Young child play equipment (2.61).	13. Community swimming pool (4.25).
2. Bathrooms at Perkins and/or Commons Parks (2.98).	14. Master Plan - Veterans Park (4.40)
3. Shady areas (3.06).	15. Trails/interpretive stations - natural areas (4.66).
4. Dog waste sack dispensers at all the parks (3.07).	16. Soccer field (4.77). Tie.
5. Youth sports or recreation programs (3.23).	16. Skate park (4.77). Tie.
6. Drinking fountains (3.33).	18. Open field for drop in activities (4.80).
7. Little league/softball field (3.41).	19. Horseshoe pits (4.84).

8. Improve lighting at existing parks (3.45).	20. Dog park – off leash (4.97).
9. Picnic shelter/tables (3.64).	21. Paved parking Perkins / Commons (4.98).
10. Splash pool (4.02).	22. Frisbee golf course (4.99).
11. Community Center at Commons Park (4.04).	23. Acquire land for park in north area (5.12).
12. Basketball court (4.20).	24. Tennis courts (5.72).

The City Council makes the following general findings and statements of support.

1. The City Council finds a significant amount of the new residential development since 2000 was in the north portion of the city, but the area has only two small mini parks (Community Pride Park and Lafayette Plantation Park). The concept of individual subdivisions dedicating one or two lots to the city for a park is not meeting the city’s needs. The per-acre cost of maintenance is high for small parks, and few activities can occur in a small park. The recently acquired Veterans Park is also small and should not be significantly improved until a Park Master Plan is developed with citizen involvement.

2. The City Council finds a neighborhood or community park of 5 to 10, or up to 20 or more acres, is needed in the north portion of the city capable of accommodating large groups for annual family picnics and other large scale activities and community events. The City Council supports the city acquiring a neighborhood or community park in the north portion of the city. Because the city has grown out to the urban growth boundary in the north portion of the city, the city should be aware of land outside the current city limits and urban growth boundary and understand that if land is added to the urban growth boundary in the future, such land may contain an area suitable for a neighborhood or community park.

3. The City Council supports constructing a basketball court and skate park at Commons Park.

4. The City Council supports the city initiating a master plan process for Veterans Park, but only after it is known if the park will be extended to the north and if the site will be used for a fire station.

The proposed improvements are listed below for each park *are based on the 2024, the City Council’s comments and the Planning Commission’s comments*. Because dog waste sack dispensers have been installed at many or all of the parks, and because their cost is relatively low, they are not specifically included. The proposed improvements in the 2012 2025 Plan provide the framework for the 2012 2025 Capital Improvement Program described in Chapter 6.

Proposed Improvement Projects by Park

NOTE: The purpose of the 2025 Plan update is to review Veterans Park, Terry Park and Commons Park. Therefore, changes are proposed only for those three parks.

Community Pride Park

1. Two additional benches which would provide a total of three. The current single bench outside the shelter and the seating in the shelter are not sufficient at all times for all those who wish to sit. The benches are not costly and would provide an immediate benefit to the community.

Lafayette Plantation Park

1. An interpretive station regarding streams, riparian habitat and wildlife along the fence on the north side of the park facing the East Millican Creek drainage. The drafting of the interpretive language and graphics could take several months, but once approved the manufacture of the sign and its placement could be accomplished in less than one fiscal year.
2. Two benches and a larger young children's play equipment set to replace the existing smaller set. The benches and play set are not costly and would provide an immediate benefit to the community.

Veterans Park

The main portion of Veterans Park (0.55 acres or 23,958 sq. ft.) was purchased by the City in 2010. It is abutting and is combined with Tract B (0.09 acre or 3,927 sq. ft.) of the Lafayette Estates Subdivision. The total Park is a new small (0.64 acres or 27,936 27,885 sq. ft.) undeveloped park that was purchased in 2010. It has been ~~was~~ leveled and planted to field grass. The site is ~~was~~ a possible location for a new fire station which would occur only if the city and the Carlton Fire District decide the city should become part of the Carlton Fire District and if funding for a new station is available, but the proceeds from a voter approved bond measure funded the City Fire Department's new fire station on the half-block along 4th Street between Jefferson and Market Streets in downtown, and an agreement was reached where the City Fire Department and the Carlton Rural Fire Protection District share a Fire Chief.

1. ~~Until it is known if the site is to remain a park, complete a property line survey, including the setting of pins at the property corners. Once the property lines are established, install fencing on the north and south property lines to limit park users from entering those properties. Green chain-link fencing about three feet high has been installed on the 100 foot east and west property lines along N. Bridge and N. Washington Streets, respectively, and along the 238 foot north property line. Additionally, where there was no fencing on the south property line, new fencing was installed.~~

2. During the preparation of the 2012 Plan city staff contacted the owner of the partially occupied 21-lot Bridge Street Estates *Manufactured Home* Subdivision abutting the park on the north to determine the availability of the five lots abutting the park, and the likelihood of the manufactured home on Lot 11(1157 N. Bridge Street) being relocated to another lot in the subdivision. The additional lots (Lots 11-15) ~~are were~~ about 0.47 acres each (20,675 square feet) ~~and could accommodate park activities or parking. It was~~ *The City* determined the cost of the lots was not conducive to further inquiry ~~and the owner of the lots continued his plan to install manufactured homes on the lots. As of 2025 all the lots have been developed with manufactured homes. If the situation changes in the future, the city should consider whether enlarging the park would be worthwhile because, even if Lots 11—15 were acquired, it would still be a small park with single family residences abutting to the south. Such an expansion would not meet the city's need for a neighborhood or community park, however, an expanded site would provide for more types of activities or parking.~~

2b3. The City Council *2025 Plan* notes the approximately 0.09 acre (3,927 square foot) portion referred to as Tract B (*Lafayette Estates Subdivision*) at the northwest corner of the Park *extending northerly along the east side of N. Washington Street*. It includes an asphaltic concrete surface with a landscaping *area containing four street trees* separating it from the sidewalk on Washington Street. Currently, it is isolated from the rest of the *main portion of the p*Park, ~~but if the row of lots abutting~~

~~the park to the north is acquired, Tract B would no longer be isolated .~~ ***Based on comments at the February 20, 2025 joint City Council and Planning Commission work session, it is a possible location for a veterans, or more generally, a “heroes,” commemorative element for veterans, and fire, police and emergency medical responders.***

34. ~~If it is determined that Veterans Park will continue to be a park and not a fire station, the City Council~~ ***The 2024 online survey overwhelmingly called for the main portion of Veterans Park to be a dog park. To ensure easy access between N. Washington and N. Bridge Streets, the February 20, 2025 joint City Council and Planning Commission work session reached a consensus that a hard surface pedestrian/bicycle path be installed. Whether it would be along the north or south property line was left to the Veterans Park Master Plan preparation process. An issue to consider is, the west end of a path along the north property line would be at N. Washington Street and would result in users being at the southern portion of the commemorative element with easy access to the element. A path along the south property line would place the path 100 feet south of the commemorative element. The 2025 Plan supports the preparation of a Master Plan for a dog park, including studying the possibility of the Tract B area with a commemorative element.*** ~~and that the process would include significant outreach to the abutting property owners and potential users in the neighborhood and from throughout the city. Because the site may remain vacant for a period of time, the city may be approached by individuals or groups suggesting specific recreational facilities be placed on the site before the Master Plan process occurs. The city may want to allow a facility such as tennis courts to be constructed before a Master Plan is adopted. Any such facility should not have a high potential for negatively affecting the abutting residential uses. Additionally, the city should recognize that any facility constructed prior to the Master Plan process will likely never be removed and, therefore, will dictate, to a greater or lesser degree, the character and layout of the park. An unlighted tennis court with high fences to ensure balls do not go into the abutting residential properties may be appropriate provided citizen involvement and support is garnered. When a master plan process is initiated, the key deficiencies listed in Chapter 4 should be reviewed to ensure inappropriate facilities are not incorporated into the master plan~~ ***the dog park element is properly planned.***

Perkins Park

The updated list of proposed improvements to Perkins Park is significantly less than the proposed improvements in the 2004 Parks Plan because many improvements were constructed in 2010. The improvements were limited by the available funding. For the 2004 Plan, the Parks Committee indicated that amenities should appeal to families with younger children and their recommended improvements accommodated that user group. A recommended 24 to 28 foot diameter splash fountain to be located in the south-central area of the park was not installed during the 2010 improvements. A splash pool was rated No. 10 out of 24 possible improvements citywide in the 2011 Community Parks Survey, but the annual cost to maintain such a facility must be considered before a decision is made to construct such a facility due to the high maintenance costs experienced by other cities. A children’s mural area on the existing pump house was not included in the 2010 improvements, but a mural could be created with little cost during any fiscal year.

One of the important improvements to Perkins Park in the 2004 Plan was the rehabilitation of the picnic structure. The 2010 improvements included demolition of the old structure and the construction of a new structure, however, it does not include all of the recommended changes in the 2004 Plan due to limited funding. The 2004 Plan proposed improvements to allow for separation of the structure with the eastern portion available for users with reservations, but no separation was included. It called for a center island for food preparation and storage that would be accessible from the east side of the structure, but no island was constructed. The 2004 Plan called for the west side of the structure to

remain open for other users, but the improvements included two permanently fixed tables in the middle which do not divide the structure into eastern and western sections.

The 2004 Plan included other significant improvements including new fencing and redefined entries at the corners of the park and a large walking garden near the southeast corner. One mid-block entry would remain on Market Street (to the east). The 2010 improvements included a new green chain link perimeter fence with mid-block openings on the north, east and south sides. No access points at the corners were provided, nor was the garden at the southeast corner. Various elements within the park were to be connected with a series of walking paths which were constructed connecting the picnic structure and the two sets of play equipment. New street sidewalks on the west, north and east were not constructed, but a sidewalk on the south side was constructed on 7th Street and the sidewalk on Market Street extending from 7th Street one-half block to the north with a mid-block access to the park was retained.

The 2004 Plan included:

- Additional lighting. (Not constructed in 2010.)
- Replacement of the existing lawn with an eco-lawn material that is drought tolerant, low growing, and provides color. (Not replaced in 2010.)
- Renovated parking area. (On-street gravel parking provided on 7th Street in 2010.)
- A restroom facility. (Not constructed in 2010.)
- New fencing. (Constructed in 2010.)
- Additional trees and a flower border along the southern park boundary. (Some trees were planted in 2010.)
- Drinking fountain. (Not constructed in 2010.)

1. Permanent ADA restrooms to replace the current porta-potty because bathrooms at “Perkins Park and/or Commons Park” were rated No. 2 in the 2011 Community Park Survey. It is understood this project would be expensive if designed to be vandal resistant and that such cost may cause the project to be constructed at a later time.

2. A drinking fountain as a stand-alone item or as part of the restroom building. It could include a dog watering basin.

Commons Park

The 2004 Park Master Plan included a plan with a park design laid out for the property. The 2024/2025 concepts for Commons Park are different. They are based on consideration of the need for an active teen facility, specifically a basketball court of a size that will fit the area. It would replace the asphalt basketball court that was removed in 2010. A cover is desired that would allow it to also be used as a pavilion area for community functions such as a farmer’s market, winter holiday functions and summer entertainment. The following summarizes the 2004 design and the improvements that were installed in 2010.

The 2004 Plan’s Figure 7 showed the proposed improvements to Commons Park *at that time*. They included landscaping improvements, and in the area north of the Community Center it called for several large planter boxes, benches, sensory path, drinking fountain, and a small play area.

Several designs for improvements to the Community Center were shown in Figure 8. The improvements were intended to enhance the entry area and provide improved access to the basement areas at the rear of the building. A deck would be installed at the south end of the building with storage available underneath. Figure 8 also showed the Bridge Street right-of-way becoming part of the park and the private property west of Bridge Street being used as a skate park or mountain bike course.

The 2004 Plan also included several recreational amenities. A modular skate park was shown on the then existing concrete pad adjacent to the basketball court. The asphalt basketball court and adjacent pad were removed in 2010. The 2011 Community Park Survey rated a skate park No. 16 and a basketball court No. 12 out of 24 items. Lighted horseshoe pits were proposed to be located next to the skate park and the northwest portion of the park was to serve a multi-purpose function with a 60-foot base-to-base infield and a 35-yard by 50-yard age 9 soccer area. The northeast portion of the park was to serve as left field for baseball and also provide an 84- foot by 105- foot multi-use field area.

Other improvements in the 2004 Plan included:

- Replacement of the existing backstop. (Constructed in 2010.)
- Irrigation of the play field. (Not constructed in 2010.)
- New fencing and benches adjacent to the play field. (Constructed in 2010.)
- Additional lighting. (Not constructed in 2010.)
- A restroom facility. (Not constructed in 2010.)
- Community signage kiosk, if stand alone, or signage area on wall of restrooms. (Not constructed in 2010.)
- New park sign. (Constructed in 2010.)
- Improved and better-defined parking area along Adams Street. (Not constructed in 2010.)

As indicated above, some of the planned improvements were installed. Improvements to the park in 2010 were a little league/softball field, including a new backstop, team benches, spectator bleachers, and trash containers. The basketball court was removed as part of upgrading the little league/softball field.

~~A respondent's comment from the 2011 Community Park Survey stated there are no young child play sets on the south side of 99W.~~

~~The City Council notes that Commons Park could be enlarged by vacating a portion of the Bridge Street and Adams Street rights of way.~~

~~The City Council notes the vacant land across Bridge Street to the west (the south half of the block), but does not consider the area suitable for park expansion because it is small and is isolated behind the houses on the north half of the block. However, the small area and its isolation could be overcome if the land were available at a low cost. If the small area was combined with the south end of the Bridge Street right of way, the combined area may be adequate for selected park facilities.~~

~~The City Council supports the following , **with Item 1 as the highest priority and the other items not in prioritized order**, improvements (not in prioritized order) are: Those items from the 2004 Plan that are not listed here can be future considerations.~~

1. ~~Basketball court and skate park~~ **with a cover suitable to house community activities.**

2. Community Center improvements.
3. Permanent ADA restrooms ~~because bathrooms at “Perkins Park and/or Commons Park” were rated No. 2 in the 2011 Community Park Survey.~~ It is understood this project could be expensive if designed to be vandal resistant and that such cost may cause the project to be constructed at a later time.
4. ~~Medium size play structure.~~ **Pickleball court(s).**
5. ~~Irrigation system for the baseball field/multi-use field area.~~ **Portable smaller soccer goals for open field use.**
6. Improved lighting.
7. Benches (2 at ~~play structure~~ and 2 at the basketball court **and pickleball court(s)** and 2 at skate park).
8. Drinking fountains (1 at ~~play structure~~, 1 at basketball court, 1 at baseball field). One of the fountains can be part of the restroom building. They could include a dog watering basin.
9. Trash receptacles (1 at basketball court **and pickleball court(s)**, 1 at skate park, 1 at ~~play structure~~).
10. Bike rack at the basketball court.
11. Consistent with the 2004 Plan’s Figure 8, connect Commons Park to the **City-owner property on the south side of the RR tracks which has about 900 feet of frontage on the Yamhill + River**, which is about 200 feet to the south. A pedestrian/bicycle and maintenance vehicle undercrossing of the railroad tracks similar to the undercrossing at Multnomah Falls which connects a large parking lot to the falls and the undercrossing in the City of Keizer which connects the Keizer Station shopping area to the neighborhoods to the west. The connection could be via the Bridge Street right-of-way or from the park itself. An optional RR crossing could be an at-grade ~~pedestrian-only~~ **pedestrian/bicycle/maintenance vehicle** crossing as shown in the 2004 Plan’s Figure 8. The property to the south of the park and the tracks is about 3.4 acres (Tax Map T4S, R4W, Section 12AA, Tax Lot 3700). ~~It includes about 900 feet of frontage along the Yamhill River.~~ With the purchase of two more lots, or their southern portions, to the east, a connection to Terry Park would be achieved and the City Path System would be closer to reality.

Terry Park

The 2004 Plan’s Figure 9 showed the proposed improvements, *at that time*, to Terry Park. They were intended to improve river access from the park. Proposed improvements included developing trails to the Yamhill River. Trail development would include ~~some~~ clearing of vegetation, particularly Himalayan blackberries. **At the time of the 2012 Parks Development Plan** a significant amount of blackberry and other non-native vegetation ~~has~~ **had** been removed on the east edge of the park adjacent to Lafayette Highway. With improved river access, a floating dock could be installed. The purpose of the dock in the 2004 Plan was not clear, for example, a canoe/**kayak** put-in/take-out, or for fishing, bird watching and nature appreciation. Given the river’s ~~depth~~, low flow during much of the year, **a boat ramp for launching motorized craft is likely not workable.** ~~and the riverbank’s steep~~

~~topography, a~~ **The 2025 Plan supports a dock facility for canoe/kayak put-in/take-out** dock for canoe put in/take out may or may not be appropriate. A dock **and** for fishing, bird watching, nature appreciation and quiet contemplation would be appropriate.

Other improvements from the 2004 Plan included additional landscaping along the north edge of the park and expansion/definition of parking areas. The landscaping would have provided needed separation between the park and the adjacent residential uses, and created a buffer between the access road and the main park area. Additional landscaping improvements included over-seeding the existing lawn with an eco-lawn type product for low-growing, durable and drought-tolerant color, and re-establishing some low-growing hardy vegetation along the southern edge of the access road. The improvements called for in the 2004 Plan have not yet been provided.

The 2004 Parks Plan indicated additional parking may be needed along the east side, but that it was a long-term improvement that would be based on increased user demand at the park.

Other improvements in the 2004 Plan included:

- A restroom facility (~~Figure 9 showed several potential locations~~).
- A picnic area at the top of the river**bank** slope.
- Additional parking areas located at the southwest corner of the access drive.
- Play equipment area located in the southwest corner of the lawn area.

Terry Park's topography is low on the south side **at the river** and high on the north side which forms a natural amphitheater. As a long-range concept, the park may have potential for hosting outdoor entertainment events with a "clamshell" stage and backdrop. The concept is ~~only~~ preliminary, and it is not known if sufficient area exists for ~~the~~ **an** amphitheater and parking. The topography and the potential for an entertainment venue, however, should not be ignored. Because this potential is a long range item, it is not included in the capital improvement project list in Chapter 6.

1. Three or more new picnic tables and a trash container for each table at the top of the **riverbank**. Remove non-native vegetation to open-up views of the river for each table. Their use would be intended for the dry season and pull-over parking on the grass off of the existing road could be allowed as an experiment to determine if it would suffice or if gravel or paved parking would be needed near the tables.
2. Repair the storm drain system from Market Street into the park and the ditches along the gravel park road that conveys the Market Street run-off down to the river.
3. Investigate whether non-motorized boats can navigate the Yamhill River downstream **from Terry Park**. ~~or~~ ~~upstream~~ **Upstream from Terry Park, approximately at S. Bridge Street extended, a waterfall of up to about 4 feet and rapids block upstream access, although portage past the waterfall and rapids may be possible. Downstream from Terry Park, rapids and the remnants of the old dam and locks at the Yamhill County Locks Park prevents, apparently, low-water paddling downstream to the confluence of the Yamhill and Willamette Rivers upstream from Locks Park to Terry Park, although portage but movement upstream from Terry Park may be possible.** If navigation is possible, investigate funding, including the Oregon State Marine Board, for a put-in / take-out dock for non-powered boats, including constructing a path down to the dock. If a dock for non-motorized boats is not appropriate, consider a dock for fishing, nature appreciation and quiet contemplation, including constructing a path down to the dock.

4. Contract with a professional land surveyor to determine the location of the 100-year flood plain boundary in the park and mark it with permanent markers.
5. Frisbee golf course if sufficient space exists (No. 22 of 24 possible improvements in the 2011 Community Park Survey). Although it was ranked No. 22, due to the low cost of construction, it could provide an immediate benefit to the community for a small cost.
6. Acquire property to connect Terry Park to Commons Park. The connection could be via the purchase of two lots, or their southern portions, to the west, ~~and a third~~ **which would allow connection to the City-owned** 3.4-acre property immediately south of Commons Park. With the purchase of the ~~three two~~ **two** lots, or portions thereof, and the construction of an underpass of the tracks, **or an at-grade crossing**, as described above for Commons Park, a connection to Commons Park would be achieved and the City Path System would be closer to reality.
7. *On July 15, 2024 the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Region 10, announced the pre-implementation compliance measures (PICM). Lafayette and other affected cities and counties in Oregon who participate in the National Flood Insurance Program must adopt PICMs into their local floodplain overlay districts. On March 13, 2025 the Lafayette City Council passed Ordinance 650 thereby adopting the Region 10 Model Ordinance for floodplains. The Region 10 Model Ordinance melds the necessary provisions into the 2020 Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development’s model ordinance. The primary effect is the Lafayette Zoning and Development Ordinance, Section 2.112, Floodplain Overlay District, now includes additional provisions related to the Endangered Species Act’s protection of endangered species. They apply to development in the 100-year floodplain (Special Flood Hazard Area – SFHA). The provisions include “no net loss” of habitat functions and a 170-foot riparian habitat buffer. The proposed improvements to Terry Park within 170 feet of the top-of-bank will be subject to the PICMs.*
8. *The City will monitor and work with the Yamhill River Steering Committee, Travel Oregon, Willamette Valley Visitors Association, Visit McMinnville, Yamhill County, cities and park districts along the Yamhill River, and regional partners to plan for and implement greater access to the Yamhill River.*

Wascher School

The 2004 Plan indicated the city had expressed interest in developing one or more baseball fields on the approximately 6-acre play area located behind Wascher Elementary School. Three different options for development of play fields on this site were shown on Figures 10 through 12. They included both baseball fields and a soccer field. Option 1 showed a configuration with a single baseball field in the northeast corner and a soccer field located along the west side of the field. Option 2 showed an arrangement with baseball fields located in the northwest and southeast corners, with a soccer field located between the two. Option 3 showed a configuration with a larger baseball field in the northwest corner and a soccer field extending from west to east.

The options also included a walking fitness course/path around the play fields designed to accommodate fitness stations at various points.

The McMinnville School District owns and maintains Wascher Elementary School. Initial discussions between the City and the School District regarding development of a baseball facility in 2004 were positive. Development of such a facility would require additional steps. These steps would include:

- Agreement on the field configuration design for the facility and amenities, such as irrigation, bleachers, etc;
- Solicitation and procurement of design services;
- Site planning and engineering;
- Development of costs estimates;
- Development of intergovernmental agreements regarding construction and maintenance costs and responsibilities;
- Construction contracting; and
- Ongoing maintenance.

The 2004 Plan's Capital Improvements Program in Chapter 6 included \$40,000 for construction of a baseball facility at Wascher School.

A baseball field backstop exists at Wascher Elementary School, but there is no discernable infield and the outfield appears to be rough grass that does not meet expectations for a baseball field. Soccer goals and an area for a soccer field exists at Wascher Elementary School, but it is vegetated with the same rough grass as the baseball outfield. The soccer field is partially in the outfield area.

1. Contact the McMinnville School District when it is appropriate to initiate discussions to address the bullet points above.

Lafayette Community Path

In the 2004 Plan the Parks Committee identified a city path system as a long-term improvement within the city. The Committee expressed interest in developing a path system that would connect the various parks within the city. Figure 13 showed one possible configuration for a path system. The path would link the parks that existed in 2004 and potential development areas. The path would also connect with the proposed fitness/walking path at Wascher School. Over time, the path could be expanded to make connections to other features outside the city limits.

This project would require additional work by the City to identify a more specific location for the path, particularly in the areas along East Millican Creek and Henry Creek, and consideration of Community Pride Park, Lafayette Plantation Park and Veterans Park. In addition to any construction costs, additional costs include engineering, particularly along East Millican Creek and Henry Creek, vegetation removal, and the purchase of property or easements over private property. The Capital Improvements Program in Chapter 6 includes an initial \$20,000 for preliminary engineering and site analysis. A figure of \$25,400 has been included in the 2012 Plan in Chapter 6.

Several aspects of the 2004 path system were very conceptual and remain so in 2012. The path system included on-street and off-street segments. It is a long-term concept, although some segments, especially the on-street sections could be signed now such as the Perkins Park to Wascher Elementary School route on 7th Street. The 2004 version showing the path along Market Street and crossing the railroad tracks would necessitate new and costly safety crossing equipment be installed where Market Street intersects the tracks. The 2004 path crossed 99W in three locations and each would need more investigation, especially in the Millican Creek area in the west and the Henry Creek area in the east.

1. Continue to consider the Community Path System as a long-range project. If any action is to be taken regarding the path, focus on signing the routes between recreational activity areas where sidewalks exist and any preliminary engineering and site analysis be a secondary priority.

Additional Park in the North Area

In the period from 2000 to 2012 many new subdivision lots were created in the north portion of the city. The only city parklands in that area are Community Pride Park (0.23 acres - 10,058 square feet - about the size of two 5,000 square foot lots) and Lafayette Plantation Park (0.21 acres – 9,128 square feet – smaller than two 5,000 square foot lots).

The area to the north and east of Community Pride Park has been mentioned as a possible site for a park. The factor that makes it unattractive is, it is land that received tentative plan approval for a subdivision and the public and private infrastructure has been installed (streets, gutters, curbs, sewer, water, storm drainage, power, gas, communications). The final plat for an initial phase was recorded (Green Highlands) and although the final plats for the remaining phases have not been recorded the new owner intends to submit a new subdivision application and record final plats for the remaining phases.

Another area that has been mentioned as a possible park site is the undeveloped 20 acres in the northwest corner of the city limits. It was the subject of an approved planned unit development in 2007 (Lafayette View Estates), but the approval lapsed, and the property remains undeveloped. Access to the property would be problematic because no public right-of-way abuts the property, and the west, south and east sides are characterized by steep slopes associated with East Millican Creek. An access over East Millican Creek would necessitate a bridge which would be a significant span at significant expense. Haylen Drive is the nearest public street, but it does not extend westerly to abut the property and if it were extended, it would place all the trips to the park on a local residential street, Haylen Drive, through a local residential area.

The city should acquire needed parkland, including a suitably sized parcel for a community park in the north portion of the city. Consideration should include the possibility of land that is outside the urban growth boundary (UGB). The Capital Improvements Program in Chapter 6 includes \$625,500 to \$1,622,625 at \$37,500 per acre to acquire 19.68 to 43.27 acres.