

CITY OF FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
August 9, 2011 ** MEETING MINUTES DRAFT**

CALL TO ORDER ~ ROLL CALL ~ PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the meeting at 7:01 pm. Roll call: All Commissioners were present except Commissioner Tilton (excused) and Commissioner Wise (excused). Also present: Senior Planner (SP) Wendy Farley, Planning Consultant (PC) Carol Heinkel and Public Works Director (PWD) Mike Miller. Everyone present stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- July 26, 2011 –Regular Meeting.

Commissioner Muilenburg spoke regarding page 6 of 11, the third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs. Commissioner Muilenburg said it references Commissioner Peters but he would say that it was part of his (Commissioner Muilenburg) questioning. Commissioner Peters stated that this was correct.

SP Farley stated that it was sometimes difficult to know who was speaking on the tape.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated that the minutes were well done and Chairperson Nieberlein stated she would be more diligent to recognize by name, who is speaking.

The minutes for July 26, 2011 Regular Meeting were approved with corrections. *Please see the July 26, 2011 meeting minutes for those corrections.*

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairperson Nieberlein read the following into the record: *This is an opportunity for members of the audience to bring to the Planning Commission's attention, any items not otherwise listed on the Agenda. Comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person, with a maximum time of 15 minutes for all items.*

There were no public comments.

4. PUBLIC HEARING - STORMWATER CODE – PC 11 06 CPA 01 AND PC 11 07 ZC 01

Chairperson Nieberlein stated they will have a public hearing on Stormwater Code, PC 11 06 CPA and PC 11 07 ZC 01 which is titled as Legislative Amendments to the Florence Realization 2020 Comprehensive Plan, Florence Stormwater Management Plan, and Florence

City Code Titles 9, 10, and 11 for Consistency with Florence Stormwater Design Manual and Various Housekeeping Amendments.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated he has a comment that is not on the agenda.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked what the comment is regarding.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated he had someone ask him a question of why Florence was not painted on the Spruce Street water tower. Commissioner said he knows this has been in discussion before and the person asking him the question if the City had ever thought about this because there are a lot of water towers in different cities around the states that have the name painted.

Chairperson Nieberlein placed this discussion item under Agenda item number 5 – Planning Commission Discussion Items.

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the public hearing at 7:06 pm.

Chairperson Nieberlein read into the record the following statement. “This hearing will be held in accordance with the Land Use Procedures required by the City and the State of Oregon. The Planning Commission decision must be based on facts. Prior to the hearings tonight, staff will identify the applicable approval criteria, which have also been listed in the Staff Report. These are the criteria the Planning Commission must use in making its decision. All testimony and evidence must be directed toward those criteria or other criteria which you believe applies to the decision per ORS 197.763 (5). Failure to raise and issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the City and parties involved an opportunity to respond to the issue would preclude an appeal based on that issue. You must comment either in writing or verbally during a public hearing in order to have standing for an appeal. Any proponent, opponent, or other party interested in the Land Use matter to be heard by the Commission may challenge the qualifications of any Commissioner to participate in such hearing and decision. Such challenge must state facts relied upon by the party relating to a Commissioners bias, pre-judgment, personal interest, or other facts from which the party has concluded that the Commissioner will not make a decision in an impartial manner.” Chairperson Nieberlein asked if any Commissioner wishes to declare a conflict of interest or bias and does anyone from the public wish to challenge Commissioners impartiality. No one spoke.

SP Farley stated that the purpose of this evenings meeting is to consider a recommendation to the Council for the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Code amendments related to stormwater. She stated that there is a three step process for these amendments. The first process, the Commissioners dealt with on June 7, 2011 when the Commissioners initiated the amendments related to stormwater and tonight’s second step is the recommendation to the Council. Once Council receives the recommendation, they will have another hearing which will also be another opportunity for public input and testimony. The reason that the proposed amendments are necessary is to make the Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Florence Stormwater Design Manual which was approved by Council on December 6, 2010 and to include the Guiding Principles for the Siuslaw Estuary Partnership. It is also to make the Comprehensive Plan consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 11 and to update Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan relating to Public Safety Policies and Recommendations. There are

also some changes related to grammatical and/or formatting errors. The criteria related to tonight's hearing are the Florence Realization 2020 Comprehensive Plan (Plan Adoption, Amendments, Review and Implementation; Chapter 1, Citizen Involvement; Chapter 2, Land Use; Chapter 11: Utilities and Facilities); Florence City Code (FCC) Title 10: Zoning Regulations; Chapter 1: Zoning Administration, Section 3-C: Amendments and Changes: Legislative Changes; Oregon Statewide Planning Goals (OAR 660.015): Goal 1, Citizen Involvement; Goal 2, Land Use Planning; Goal 11, Public Facility Planning; Oregon Revised Statutes: ORS 197.175, 197.250, 197.253, 197.610, and 197.615. Oregon Administrative Rules: Division 11: Public Facilities Planning (OAR 660-011); and Division 18: Post Acknowledgement Amendments (OAR 660-018-0005).

SP Farley asked Florence Planning Consultant, Carol Heinkel (PC Heinkel) for the staff report.

PC Heinkel stated that she and Public Works Director Mike Miller and Community Development Director Sandra Belson gave a comprehensive Power Point presentation on June 7, 2011 when the Planning Commission initiated the amendments. She suggested that she would go through the staff report and identify the changes since the initiation and explain why those changes occurred and that she and PWD Miller would respond to their questions. The Planning Commissioners nodded in agreement with this.

PC Heinkel suggested they start with Exhibit B1, proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments. She said two substantive changes from the June 7th version came about when it became apparent that the Water Master Plan that was listed in the Comprehensive Plan is not the most recent Water Master Plan. The most recent plan is the Water Master Plan Update that was approved by the Council this year and this should become part of the Comprehensive Plan and part of the Public Facilities Plan. In reading the Water Master Plan Update, she observed that it is based on the most recent set of population projections and, in order for this to happen, state law requires that the most recent set of population projections be included in the Comprehensive Plan. This is an opportunity to complete this task. The most recent set of population projections was adopted by the Lane County Board of Commissioners in the year 2009. To sum up, the two changes are to incorporate those updated population projections and the updated Water Master Plan into the Comprehensive Plan.

PC Heinkel stated the changes made since June 7th are highlighted in yellow. She said many of the changes made since June 7th were identified during a couple of meetings with the Development Review Team who are members of Planning and Public Works. This Team gets together and discusses matters of mutual concern every Monday. Some of the changes that are highlighted in yellow are clarifying changes. For example, on page 1 of Exhibit B1, the words "to begin" were added on line item 19 to clarify that that process will occur as the Comprehensive Plan is updated over time. The words, "Population Projections," were added on line item 34 for further clarification. On page 2, the changes highlighted just refer to the changes made as part of this process, to clarify that, in the future, that list will get expanded. She said that facilities plans are already mentioned above, so there was no point in having it listed again down below. She said they took out the paragraph about those plans being adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan, because this was conflicting. In number 3, these changes take out the old population projections and put in the ones that Lane County adopted

in 2009, as required by State law. On page 4, the highlighted section is the new population projections that go out to the year 2035.

Commissioner Peters said he sees only the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) projections included in this study and the previous ones had the City of Florence projections. He asked why there are no Florence projections here.

PC Heinkel stated that according to her knowledge, the population projections that the County adopted are just for urban growth boundaries (UGBs) and she does not know if the methodology that the County used included any city population projections. She asked SP Farley if she knew the answer.

SP Farley stated she is not familiar with the process.

PC Heinkel stated that the planning area for the Comprehensive Plan is the UGB so the population projection that needs to be part of the Comprehensive Plan is for the UGB. It would be more informative if they did have the population projections for the Florence city limits. If they are available, they could include them but she does not know if they are available. She said they could check and see if the Commission so wishes. She hasn't reviewed the methodology; she just put the numbers in so she could check the methodology to see if they included City population projections.

Commissioner Peters said it was just a question and he was wondering if there was a change in policy; that, if they are no longer focusing on the City and only on the UGB, perhaps there should be a sentence to that effect.

PC Heinkel stated it isn't a policy change, it is the methodology used to derive the projections for the UGB. The methodology used to derive the population projections in the existing Comprehensive Plan calculated the two areas separately. It analyzed the projected population for the city limits and the area between the city limits and the UGB and combined the two totals for the UGB projections.

Commissioner Bare referenced Exhibit B1 on page 2 of 20. He said there is projected population of the Florence city limits for the years 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2025.

PC Heinkel said Commissioner Bare's comment is correct. This methodology was done back in 2000. When these population projections were done, they used that methodology; and the new projections were derived using a different methodology; but she is not sure if it included projections for the City limits or not. The new population projections replace the old and the methodology that was used then is no longer current so they will have to look at the new methodology. She said she would be happy to do this for the Commissioners. She will have to go and check the County records.

Commissioner Muilenburg said he had the same question as Commissioner Peters. He wonders if the Stormwater Management Plan would also affect the City of Florence and not just the UGB.

PC Heinkel said Public Facilities Plans generally have a service area; and, in the case of stormwater, it would be the UGB, but the requirements would kick in upon annexation to the city. The population projection you would reference is the UGB.

Commissioner Muilenburg clarified that the Stormwater Management Plan that they are looking at is only going to be for the UGB and it is not going to have anything to do with the Florence city limits.

PC Heinkel stated the existing City of Florence Stormwater Management Plan is for the UGB which includes the city limits. She said the planning area for facilities plans is generally the UGB, although it depends on the specific facility. She asked PWD Miller to clarify the planning area for the different facilities in Florence.

PWD Miller said in the case of sewer for instance, our Sewer Master Plan incorporates everything within the UGB. The Water Master Plan however, encompasses a service area that we have agreed to because of cost considerations. Heceta Water District would remain the service provider for a large part of the UGB.

Commissioner Muilenburg clarified that this statement includes Florence along with the UGB and it is not just the UGB.

PWD Miller said Commissioner Muilenburg is correct.

Commissioner Muilenburg clarified that it is Florence and the UGB that this plan is designed for and PC Heinkel said that is correct.

Commissioner Muilenburg said he noticed that they spoke a lot about the sole [source] aquifer that they have and there is some pretty good language in there that protects this. Since they are unique in that respect, the population figures including the population of Florence and the UGB, he could not find it but they had a report from 1987 on the aquifer and he was wondering if anyone has this report. In this report, regarding the projections, 15,000-25,000 were just about to the limit of what that aquifer could handle as far as projection of population so if they look at the projections, in the UGB they are at 15,000 and if Florence was at 9,000 we are at that 25,000 mark. He wants to make sure that in this plan, they take into consideration, the density. If they were Portland or Eugene, it wouldn't be a big deal but because they are on this aquifer, this makes a big difference.

PC Heinkel clarified that this process does not adopt new population projections. The projections have already been adopted. This process incorporates the adopted projections into the Comprehensive Plan so that facility plans, such as the Water Master Plan Update, can be based on them. The projections were adopted by Lane County as required by State law. In order to use these adopted figures for planning purposes, the projections need to be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Muilenburg said the effect that the population is going to have on our planning and development is referenced where it specifically talks about the development and the procedures to do the development and he is curious if they need to mention the 1987 report as something that planning uses so they do not lose sight of this.

PC Heinkel said the population numbers in any previous plan are no longer applicable. The information in the reports is still relevant, but the population projections, if any, in existing reports need to be updated. As far as the 1987 aquifer study is concerned, that report is referenced in the existing Comprehensive Plan and applies to areas inside the city and outside the city and, in fact, outside the UGB. She said there are policies in the Comprehensive Plan now and proposed policies that address protection of the aquifer. She referred to existing water facility policy #6 which states, "The quality and quantity of recharge to the City's sole source aquifer shall be maintained consistent with use of the aquifer as a domestic water source."

She referred to other existing and proposed recommendations and policies that speak to the City's adopted aquifer protection plan. PC Heinkel said the Siuslaw Estuary Partnership Project will be preparing an Aquifer Protection Plan that will be coming before the Planning Commission after approximately January 2012 to be adopted by September 2012 and this plan will include much broader Comprehensive Plan policy and code amendments to deal with protection of the aquifer. In response to a question from Commissioner Muilenburg, she said that a policy can refer to a future plan.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated that this will answer a lot of his concerns. He said, additionally, the proposed Code definition of a Stormwater Management Plan is proposed to be changed to a Drainage Plan but there is also a Site Stormwater Management Plan. He asked if the Site Plan or the Drainage Plan has changed and if there will still be a requirement for a Stormwater Management Plan.

PC Heinkel said this is a key change that will be addressed as part of the presentation. She asked if she could continue to go through the changes and address that when she came to it; the Commissioners agreed. Going back to Exhibit B1, page 5 of 20, she referred the Commission to the Water System Master Plan Update of January 2011 on line reference number 27. On page 6, line reference number 39 the language at the bottom explains what happened with the Water Master Plan, that it was approved by the Council in February of 2011 and this is why they are incorporating the updated plan into the Public Facility Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. The updated plan is also referred to in Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan. On page 13, beginning at line item number 12, this is a continuation of 6. When the amendments were initiated by the Planning Commission, she (PC Heinkel) mentioned the difficulty with policy is that you want the policy to be broad enough so that the City does not need to change the policy every time you make a little change to procedure; but, by the same token, you want the policies to be specific enough to give the City the authority and the policy direction for code changes. Staff also went back and looked at these policies to see if there is any redundancy. To do that, they put the policies into categories. In this way, it was easier to eliminate redundancy and also to better understand what the policy intended to accomplish. They also did get some comments from Lane County and she said she will address those after she goes through the changes. The categories are Water Quality, Water Quantity (Flow Control), Stormwater Management Facilities and Design, Public Stormwater System, Groundwater, Maintenance, Public Education, and Intergovernmental Coordination. The only new policy (from the June 7th version of the proposal) would be number 30, which is Stormwater drainage onto County right-of-way is prohibited. This was put here at the request of Lane County.

Commissioner Muilenburg referenced Exhibit B1, page 13 of 20 under number 1 of Water Quality for clarification that the land use and development policies procedures are basically going to be all of these and PC Heinkel said he is correct. This is a Guiding Principle from the Siuslaw Estuary Partnership that all of the partners agreed to.

She pointed out on page 13 of 20 under item 6, on line number 22, there is a number 11. If the Commission will recall when staff presented the amendments for their initiation on June 7, 2011, this policy 11 was a long list. In looking at that, staff thought this is where there could be redundancy; so they took the long list out and relocated those items under the topic headings (categories) but section B and E did not seem to work. It seemed that “improve management of industrial and commercial operations” is not a City function and under e, “require on-site controls and development standards” seemed redundant. On page 17, we had originally had this number two as a policy, and now propose it as a recommendation. She said this is partly in response to comments from Lane County staff, but also just in the sense of how things usually work. This is now proposed as a recommendation that the City and Lane County should work cooperatively because you can’t really mandate cooperation. On page 19, there is a change to the public safety section of Chapter 11 to not include the Western Lane County Emergency Management Plan in the Appendix of the Comprehensive Plan because the direction is to take things out of the Appendix. PC Heinkel finished her presentation of the Comprehensive Plan changes.

PC Heinkel said they did not have any additional changes to the Stormwater Management Plan (Exhibit B2).

There were several changes to Exhibit B attachment 3 (Exhibit B3). They amended the section headings to show the changes that they made to the individual sections. To address Commissioner Muilenburg’s earlier comments, on 2, the definition of Drainage Plan replaces Site Stormwater Management Plan and Preliminary Development Plan. The existing code contains a Stormwater Management Plan, a Site Stormwater Management Plan, a Drainage Plan, and a Preliminary Development Plan. This has never been effectively implemented because it is not clear how they all fit in any kind of a process. In reality, all that is required is a drainage plan, no matter what it is called. The Drainage Plan requires different levels of detail for different reasons depending on the size of the development and the impact of the stormwater system. In addition, the Stormwater Design Manual requires different kinds of reports with different names. What the changes do is simplify the terms and streamline the permit process. The term “Stormwater Manual” now refers to the City of Florence Stormwater Design Manual, which is the first document an applicant goes to. The Manual contains three approaches you can take for stormwater management. If you add all the existing required plans to these three approaches, it quickly gets confusing. The changes take out all of the requirements related to all of these different plans and just provide a requirement for a drainage plan; the Code would now refer to the Stormwater Manual for what the drainage plan needs to include. This makes it simpler for a developer and for staff.

In addition to this, there is the City of Florence Stormwater Management Plan. This plan is for public stormwater systems; and it is part of the Public Facilities Plan. The Water Master Plan Update and the Wastewater Master Plan along with the Stormwater Management Plan make up the Public Facility Plan. On page 2 of 25, BMPs (best management practices) are now proposed to be found in the Stormwater Manual. Staff proposed to bold the word “and”

on page 4 because this is the full definition of a “public stormwater facility” and the word “and” is very important.

Commissioner Muilenburg asked if the Stormwater Manual is the same as the Stormwater Design Manual.

PC Heinkel said yes. There are requirements for stormwater facilities in the Florence Stormwater Design Manual and that is customized to Florence but if there’s question that can’t be answered in there, the next thing you would go to is the 2008 Portland Manual so it is a combination of these two that makes up what is called the “Stormwater Manual.”

Commissioner Muilenburg said because they have so many manuals and it has been explained that it will be less confusing, he questions for people like himself, does PC Heinkel think they need to, wherever they have Stormwater Manual, state “Stormwater Design Manual” so they keep the consistency or does she think there will not be any confusion.

PC Heinkel said it actually means more than that. She referred the Commission to the top of page 6 where the Stormwater Manual is defined and the term “Stormwater Manual” means “the 2008 City of Portland Stormwater Management Manual, as superseded by the City of Florence Stormwater Design Manual” so it is a little more complicated than just the Design Manual, although in most situations, the Design Manual is what people will use.

Commissioner Muilenburg said he understands that the Stormwater Manual is a combination of the two documents and the Stormwater Design Manual is just the Florence document.

PC Heinkel said this is why the definitions are so important.

PC Heinkel referred to page 8 and said they looked closely at all of the requirements. This is where they simply state a drainage plan is required for all development except as provided in the exceptions and the submittal requirements are specified in the Stormwater Manual. On the bottom of page 9 item 6 B, they had further discussion on this but if the Commission looks at page 10 at the top, they just wanted to make it clear what they were saying there. They would like to change it to say “A registered professional engineer licensed in the State of Oregon shall prepare, certify, and seal the drainage plan whenever a professional engineer is required in the Stormwater Manual or in State Law.” The reason for this is because some people felt that the way it was worded before was confusing.

Going back to page 4, pollution generating impervious surface, there was some discussion if this is all inclusive. They discussed if there might be other pollution generating impervious surfaces so they wanted to add that the impervious surfaces that generate pollution including “but not limited to” and this way it would include other types of surfaces that now or in the future are known to pollute.

On page 5 they added the “s” to “structures.” On page 7 there was a typo under item C. On page 7 under D, there are some natural drainage ways that are maintained by the City so they wanted to use the same language in D as in A “Natural streams and drainage ways may or may not be publically owned and maintained.” On page 7 there are two crossing out of drainage and drainage management and this is just to be consistent with the definition. There is something called the Stormwater Management Report that is required in the Manual but

this is all in the Manual so it does not need to be here. On page 12, number 8, she had proposed this at a Development Review Team meeting and then she looked at it again and realized that it could be problematic to have this language so they all agreed to remove number 8. Under “Modified Requirements,” what they are looking at here is exemptions that are projects exempt from the requirements of the Code. This stays the same and then modified requirements, projects described below shall follow the requirements contained in the erosion prevention and sediment control practices for single family residences and small projects brochure available from the city. This is not new policy but just clarification. On page 13, again this is just a clarification that is highlighted and B through E, they are proposing that those be deleted because they are all addressed in the Stormwater Design Manual.

Commissioner Muilenburg asked since they took out A, the modified requirements, are these ones that may not require a drainage plan or is there somewhere else that says or lists some types of things that may not require a drainage plan.

PC Heinkel said this is correct; if you look at the bottom of page 11, section 9-5-2-4, these are exemptions and modified requirements so these do not require a drainage plan and the modified requirement is in the brochure. On page 14, they just added the word drainage plan. On page 15 they just took out all of the requirements that are repeated in the Design Manual. On item “C” in the second part they put the original item back in. On page 16 E, again they made it consistent with the Stormwater Manual.

On page 17, the maintenance responsibility, when they looked at the Manual, it turned out that it said something different than what the Code said. What the Code says basically is it gives the City the flexibility to make a determination on a case by case basis and there are a lot of reasons when it comes to stormwater management that you would want to do this. So the staff felt they Commission would not want to take away the flexibility. They proposed some changes to the Manual to be consistent with the Code and what they say here is that the Operations and Maintenance Agreement will be recorded with the Lane County Deeds and Records Office and the Stormwater Manual contains a sample Operations and Maintenance Agreement form. In the Manual this is now referred to as an example. On page 18 the person specified is responsible for the maintenance and the maintenance agreement. The proposal amends the Code easement sections to correct the section numbers and to improve clarity and consistency; so, on page 19, it is “in accordance with the Operations and Maintenance Agreement.” PC Heinkel said this completes this part of her presentation.

PC Heinkel turned to the changes to the Design Manual. The Planning Commission would not be asked to adopt changes to the Design Manual because the Manual is an administrative tool for the City to use rather than a City policy document. The Council would be asked to approve changes to it from time to time when there is an accumulation of changes. Staff made the current proposed changes to make everything in sync. For the Planning Commission, this is more just informative. In terms of the changes, the Code has “over 10,000 sq. ft” and the manual had “over one acre” so they proposed making the Manual consistent with the Code because this was a policy change. The proposed amendments to the Manual also make the Manual consistent with the City’s existing adopted operations and maintenance provisions and the definition of public stormwater facility.

Commissioner Muilenburg asked for clarification that a single family residence does not have to do a drainage plan.

PC Heinkel said 4.2 Design Methods now refers the Design Manual. The term “drainage plan” is now proposed to be added to the Design Manual to make that cross reference. On page 4, they wanted to clarify that again the determination of public versus private is in the Code and that the maintenance responsibility will be set out in the Operations and Maintenance Agreement. There is a sample of this agreement in the Manual Appendix. These are some ways that the City may share some of the responsibility but it is not “shall” language because the City does have flexibility. On page 5, they wanted to add typical submittal requirements that the City has on these drainage plans. These are in addition to what is already in the Manual. PC Heinkel said this concludes the changes that have been made since the initiating meeting.

SP Farley wanted to add that the DLCD notice was sent was on June 9, 2011.

PC Heinkel stated that she will amend the staff report to include this date.

Chairperson Nieberlein stated that ordinarily they would be going to public comments but for the record, there is no one from the public present at this meeting.

Chairperson Nieberlein closed the public hearing at 7:56 pm.

Commissioner Muilenburg commended PC Heinkel on this report and that she answered his questions very well. He said he appreciates this and he has a better understanding of how this all comes together.

Chairperson Nieberlein said she thinks they all feel the same way as Commissioner Muilenburg. She thanked those involved for their assistance.

Chairperson Nieberlein said if there are no further questions and there is no further discussion she would entertain someone to make a motion for recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Muilenburg said since this is going to the Council for adoption but they still have the aquifer protection plan and maybe some other documents that are not quite complete, could someone explain if this could be adopted and these documents come in later. If they adopt it, those are in here but they can just be added later but the Council will review those or will they adopt those when they are added in.

PC Heinkel said the proposed Comprehensive Plan language states “consistent with an adopted aquifer protection plan” and, when there is an adopted aquifer protection plan, this policy will apply. The Aquifer Protection Plan will come first to the Commission and they will make a recommendation to the City Council; then, the City Council will consider it for adoption. She would suspect there would be Comprehensive Plan policies and code changes to implement this plan and she does believe this plan will become part of the Comprehensive Plan. It will contain strategies and measures to protect the aquifer; for example, one strategy might be to limit the use of certain chemicals within certain time and travel zones and, because that is tied to specific areas, it would be a land use matter.

Commissioner Muilenburg said, so the proposed changes before them tonight can be adopted but that policy will not be implemented until the Aquifer Protection Plan is adopted. PC Heinkel said yes.

PC Heinkel added that there was a referral response from Lane County Land Management and their concerns were addressed in the staff report Exhibit A, starting on page 5. They had a concern about how the policy 11 in the June 7th version of the proposal would overlap with DEQ regulations and that policy would require Lane County to adopt regulations. Staff changed the policy to say “require containment to minimize effects of chemical and petroleum spills.” Lane County also wanted to remove Policy 1 in the June 7th version of the proposal and it was removed. Policy 30, “stormwater drainage onto County rights-of-ways is prohibited” was added.

Commissioner Peters moved that it be resolved that the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council adoption of Legislative Amendments to the Florence Realization 2020 Comprehensive Plan, Florence Stormwater Management Plan, and Florence City Code Titles which show Exhibits A and B1 through B3 with amendments as noted during this meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hoile. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

5. PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION ITEMS

Commissioner Muilenburg reiterated his comment about the City ever thinking about painting the word “Florence” on the water tower at Spruce Street.

PWD Miller said he would like to do this but there is a money and planning issue to do this correctly. It is probably \$20-25,000 because it takes a special team to go up there and do this type of painting because of the height and then to do it right and make it last, there needs to be some preparation. This tower was slated for demolition in the past. They looked at it during the Water Master Plan update and they would like to utilize it because it is a steam fixture. It is at the wrong elevation for the water system to actually use. The water would sit there and cause water quality problems so it does not enhance anything going into the water system. It is a small tank with ¼ of a million gallons of storage. Another thing to consider is the seismic issues and the old tar on the inside needs to be removed. It was built in the 60’s and it would need to be tested for lead paint. Like other communities such as Junction City, they have their name on a tower and this is a concept they are looking at but again there is the funding issue.

Commissioner Hoile said over by Gallagher Park, she noticed that near the sign, one of the sprinkler heads are broken off.

PWD Miller said he appreciates Commissioner Hoile making him aware of the broken sprinkler head.

6. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

CDD Belson did not present her report as she was not present and was excused from this meeting.

SP Farley stated that the Code Enforcement addition to the staff report was placed on the dais as part of the Community Development Department monthly report.

7. CALENDAR

Tuesday, August 23, 2011 at 7:00 pm – City Hall (Regular Meeting with a Public Hearing on the proposed veterinary clinic).

Tuesday, September 13, 2011 at 7:00 pm – City Hall (Regular Meeting with a Public Hearing on Coast Village Zoning Code).

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Florence Planning Commission, Chairperson Nieberlein adjourned the meeting at 8:11 pm.

APPROVED BY THE FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THE ____ DAY OF _____ 2011.

JAN NIEBERLEIN, CHAIRPERSON
FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION