

**CITY OF FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**February 8, 2011 \*\* MINUTES**

---

**RECEPTION**

A reception was held at 6:30 pm to present an award of appreciation to retiring Commissioner Lysdale and to welcome incoming Commissioners Peters and Wise.

**CALL TO ORDER ~ ROLL CALL ~ PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the meeting at 7:00 pm. Roll call: All Commissioners were present. Also present: Community Development Director Belson, Senior Planner Farley-Campbell, Assistant Planner Pezley, and City Manager Willoughby. Commissioner Hoile led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The Agenda was adopted as amended.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of January 11, 2011 were approved as presented.

The minutes of January 19, 2011 were approved as presented.

The minutes of January 25, 2011 were approved with corrections as proposed by AP Anderson in a handout.

**Public Comments:** *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.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:** Chairperson Nieberlein read the following into the record: *These proceedings will be recorded. This hearing will be held in accordance with the land use procedures required by the City and the State of Oregon. Prior to the hearing tonight, staff will identify the applicable substantive criteria, which has 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 these criteria or other criteria in the Plan or Land Use regulations, which you believe applies to the decision per ORS 197.7[6]3 (5). Failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the Planning Commission and parties involved an opportunity to respond to the*

*issue, would preclude an appeal based on that issue. Prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional evidence, arguments, or testimony regarding the application. Failure of the applicant to raise constitutional or other issues relating to proposed conditions of approval without sufficient specificity to allow the Planning Commission to respond to the issue precludes an action for damages in Circuit Court. Any proponent, opponent, or other party interested in a land use matter to be heard by the Planning Commission may challenge the qualification of any Commissioner to participate in such hearing and decision. Such challenge must state facts relied upon by the party relating to a Commissioner's bias, prejudgment, personal interest, or other facts from which the party has concluded that the Commissioner will not make a decision in an impartial manner. Does any Commissioner wish to declare a conflict of interest, bias, ex-parte contact, or site visit?*

Commissioner Muilenburg stated he would like to make a statement for the Commission and the audience. He stated as Planning Commissioners, they make decisions based on the codes and regulations and there are a lot of health and safety issues surrounding a cell phone tower near schools. Commissioner Muilenburg said the purpose of the zoning regulations is to protect the health, safety, and well being and also the property value of the community. He said federal law does prohibit the Commission from ruling based on what they call a "harmful environmental effect of the RF radiation emissions." Commissioner Muilenburg said they have also interpreted these harmful environmental effects to apply to the human health. He said after reviewing this and based on this ruling, he believes that he can now make a decision based on the criteria in an impartial manner and put aside what the harmful or health issue is.

Commissioner Tilton stated that he did make a site visit and he has no bias.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked the audience if there was anyone who wished to question the Commissioners regarding their ability to make an unbiased decision. No one from the audience spoke.

Chairperson Nieberlein opened the public hearing at 7:21 pm.

**AMERICAN Tower – PC 10 12 CUP 02:** A request for Conditional Use Permit and Design Review for a storage building and a new 150' cell tower to be incorporated with light pole west of the home bleachers at the Siuslaw Football field as applied by Steven Topp, AICP, Power River Development Services, LLC representing American Tower and Siuslaw School District.

AP Pezley gave a brief overview of her presentation including the comment that PWD Miller and the Florence Municipal Airport Manager, Gary Rose are available by telephone if the Commissioners have any questions in regards to the airport.

AP Pezley identified the planned location of the tower and included that it will be 1,000' from Siuslaw Middle School. She stated the City provided notices to 142 property owners located within 300 feet of the Siuslaw district's 87 acres. AP Pezley continued to describe the fenced perimeter. She said the height of the tower is proposed to be 150' and the tower is allowed as a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the residential district. AP Pezley clarified that the school district is zoned as a residential/multi-family district. She explained the designated airport

overlay and stated that the tower is located outside the airport-protected space. AP Pezley stated the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Oregon Department of Aviation (ODA), and the Florence Airport Manager and Sponsor are all in agreement that the tower will not be a hindrance to the airport.

AP Pezley entered the following exhibits into the record:

- Exhibit S: Email dated 2/4/2011 from Sandra Larsen, Oregon Department of Aviation, Aviation Planning Analyst.
- Exhibit T: Letter dated 2/7/2011 from Agnes Castronuevo (Archaeologist for the Confederate Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians).
- Exhibit U: Letter dated 2/7/2011 from Gary Rose (Florence Municipal Airport Manager).
- Exhibit V: City of Portland handout titled: *Human Health Concerns about Radio Frequency Emissions from Cell Phones and Wireless Antennae Equipment*.
- Exhibit W: Selected Radio Frequency Safety FAQ's from the following website: (<http://www.fcc.gov/oet/rfsafety/rf-faqs.html>) *Frequently Asked Questions about the Safety of Radio Frequency (RF) and Microwave Emissions from Transmitters and Facilities Regulated by the FCC*.
- Exhibit X: Handout titled: *What are the Dangers of Living Near Cell Phone Towers*.
- Exhibit Y: Handout received from Commissioner Muilenburg titled: *Cell Tower Safety Assistance*.

Regarding Exhibit T, AP Pezley recommended the following Condition of Approval 14 *Cultural Resources*: Applicant and/or representative are responsible for contacting the Confederate Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians immediately if any known or suspected cultural resources are encountered during work *Under Other Requirements*.

AP Pezley stated that this ends her presentation and she is open to any questions.

Commissioner Wise stated that the radiation must comply with the standards set by the FCC and he questioned how the City will establish in an ongoing basis, that it remains in compliance. CDD Belson stated normally they would leave something such as this up to the FCC but perhaps the applicant can indicate how the FCC would ensure continued compliance.

Commissioner Wise stated that this cell tower is likely to have other leaseholders in the future and he questions if they are required to make any contact with the City before executing such a lease. CDD Belson stated that they would check into Commissioner Wise's question and provide an answer before the Planning Commission makes its decision.

Commissioner Wise asked if the owners would be allowed to place any signage up. AP Pezley responded stating that the signage proposed will be on the fence. AP Pezley stated the signage will indicate who to contact in an emergency and also that people are to keep out. CDD Belson stated if the owners wished to place additional advertising signs, they would be required to obtain a sign permit.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated the fence is proposed to be 11' in height. He said under condition number 3 on page 8 of 36 in the staff report, there is no mention of the size and 11' is not an approved height. Commissioner Muilenburg asked if the height is part of the conditions of approval or does it include a variance. AP Pezley referenced page 6 of 36 in the staff report. She read the following section from Title 10, Chapter 35, Section 5. "Except for provided below, the height of fences and walls between the building and the front line shall not be 3' as measured from grade and no greater than 6' in height in the rear and side yard unless taller fences or walls are allowed through design review approval." Commissioner Muilenburg questioned if the 11' fence needs to be spelled out clearly in the conditions of approval. AP Pezley said the Commission could clarify the fence height in the resolution. CDD Belson added that they could clarify the fence height in the statement of what is being approved.

Commissioner Muilenburg referenced page 11 of 36 in the staff report. He read the response to item D and stated that property can be buildings or it could be property owned only by the Siuslaw School District. Commissioner Muilenburg said he believes item D means that it is only going to land on Siuslaw School District's property but the terminology seems to leave it open. AP Pezley stated that with a motion, they could add this to the findings of fact and make it clearer.

Commissioner Muilenburg referenced page 15 of 36 in the staff report under item E. He stated the last sentence indicates there will not be electrical interference with the surrounding uses. Commissioner Muilenburg asked if it means surrounding uses of that property or is it surrounding uses of the residential and commercial neighborhood and how far out does this go. AP Pezley stated surrounding uses are land uses. Commissioner Muilenburg clarified the interpretation in that the assumption is, it would not cause electrical interference. CDD Belson stated that if the Commission is not comfortable with a finding or if they do not feel there are facts in the record that supports a statement, the Commissioners have the option to change the statement. She stated that the burden of the proof is on the applicant and there needs to be findings that support the approval so if the Commission does not feel that there are facts to make a statement then they need to make sure that the applicant has a chance to provide those facts and if the Commission is still unsatisfied then the Commission can say that there is not sufficient evidence.

Commissioner Muilenburg said they have a letter indicating FAA approval. He asked if they received an FCC approval. CDD Belson stated they have exhibit E, which is a letter from Ken Seymour who is an Engineering Manager from AT&T. She said she believes it to be reasonable to require follow up proof that they can obtain a license. CDD Belson stated that exhibit E was provided to show that they can meet the FCC standards. She stated that there is a review criteria in the code that states, "Does the facility comply with the electromagnet radiation standards as established by the FCC." CDD Belson said it does not require explicit approval by the FCC but it requires facts to show that the facility will comply with the emission standards that have been established by the FCC. She stated that this criteria and finding in the staff report is on page 26 of 36 under item F.

Commissioner Muilenburg questioned if the generator and storage facility tank will use propane, gasoline, or diesel. He stated generally this type of tank would be above ground. AP Pezley stated this would be regulated by the building code and the fire code. AP Pezley said it is her



understanding that they will use diesel. She said it would be approximately 200 gallons and it would be located inside the encaged fence area.

CDD Belson stated to answer Commissioner Wise's earlier question regarding if another telecommunications facility would need to get Planning Commission approval to be located. She stated that in looking through the code, she does not see anything requiring this, but rather, it is encouraged that they merge together to reduce the number of towers throughout the City. The additional providers would need a building permit.

Commissioner Peters referenced page 25 of 36 in the staff report. Commissioner Peters said apparently AT&T is attempting to authenticate their proposal in terms of safety and in terms of non-interference by Ken Seymour. He stated it is one thing for an applicant to hire an expert who is qualified to make the statement as an engineer but this is their own employee who is making this statement. Commissioner Peters stated he is not sure if they have any grounds for raising a requirement that there be an independent engineering assessment.

Commissioner Peters stated that another curiosity he has is, this proposal is for a current lighting tower of "who knows what height." It's mentioned as 60-feet, as 80-feet, and 87-feet in the applicants' documents but it is going to be replaced by a tower that will be either 150-feet or 154-feet. Commissioner Peters stated that they couldn't be sure of the height because the various heights are intermixed page by page. He said some might think this to be trivial but if you look at the cumulative disparity between the lowest number of the current tower and the highest number of the projected tower it is 30-40 feet and that could make a difference visually and in terms of safety. Commissioner Peters stated that perhaps the Commission could request that the applicants clean up their application. He referenced 10-33-7 on page 25 of 36. Commissioner Peters stated that it is not clear in the application if the football field lighting will also be on this tower. AP Pezley stated they are going to replace the pole with the cell tower and then add the stadium lighting onto it. Commissioner Peters stated this is not consistent with 10.33.7 where it states "no lighting shall be permitted except as required by the FAA" and he questions if the FAA is not going to require lighting for a football field on their cell tower.

CDD Belson stated that the FAA is concerned about lighting interfering with the airport and so the existing lighting would just be relocated to be onto the tower. She said they would read this as the lighting is not being added to the cell tower for the cell tower function but rather, it is just providing a different structure on which to put existing lighting for the field. CDD Belson stated that this means there will not be any more lighting than there currently is now. She said regarding some of the items that the Planning Commission feels to be unclear, if it is in the staff report they need to make it clear in the findings and if it is in the application they should make it clear in the resolution of what is being approved.

AP Pezley spoke in regards to Commissioner Peters' statement regarding Ken Seymour. CDD Belson advised the Commission that they can ask the applicant the question and they could have some discussion about what would make the Commissioners comfortable.

Commissioner Wise stated he does not think that someone who has a conflict of interest can be the verifier, particularly when something is not tangible. He said if they were employed by a builder and it was something that they could go out and touch, review, or measure this would be alright because through their own resources they could verify it but if any applicant were to use

someone with a vested interest to satisfy a requirement and it is merely their word, he (Commissioner Wise) does not see how the Commission can accept it.

Chairperson Nieberlein called for a 5 minutes recess at 8:00 pm.

Chairperson Nieberlein reconvened the meeting at 8:08 pm.

### **Public Testimony**

Chairperson Nieberlein read the following into the record. *We will be taking testimony from the applicant, and proponents, and opponents and copies of written comments received have been distributed to the Planning Commission.*

Chairperson Nieberlein requested that those who wish to speak should sign in and state their name.

#### **Steven W. Topp ~ 12566 SW Bridgeview Ct. ~ Tigard, OR 97223**

Mr. Topp approached the Planning Commission and stated that he is a land use and development consultant speaking on behalf of American Tower Corporation (ATC) who is proposing the cell tower with the primary tenant intended to be AT&T. He stated that AT&T is not the only intended tenant on the pole but they are the primary and most immediate tenant that will be on it. Mr. Topp stated there is nothing that he needs to add to the staff report in general or the conditions of approval. He stated in terms of the ongoing FCC compliance consideration, getting approval from the jurisdiction is one major part of the process, but it is not the only part. Mr. Topp stated they have what they refer to as regulatory compliance; they have to deal with a preservation office and the environmental agencies. He stated an example of this is the letter received from the Confederated Tribes. Mr. Topp stated that once the carrier has everything lined up the carrier then has to file a notification of compliance with the FCC showing how they are within the thresholds. He stated the frequency radiation exposure levels are way below the standard. Mr. Topp stated once the radiation exposure levels are determined; those findings are forwarded to the FCC. He stated that the FCC does not reply with a response letter to confirm that they are in compliance. Mr. Topp stated that there is a general presumption that because they are certified engineers, that the information they are providing is accurate unless someone else comes forward and disputes the findings. He stated that the Commission could require an independent study but because the information is so straightforward, he does not see it as necessary.

Commissioner Muilenburg verified that the FCC will not come in and do any tests but the FCC requires they are to be in compliance. He concluded that if it is discovered somewhere down the line that they are not in compliance, they will answer to the FCC.

Mr. Topp stated that Commissioner Muilenburg is correct. He said the FCC does not test every site but rather, the testing is random. Mr. Topp stated the FCC also governs interference with televisions or radios and towers are not allowed to disturb those things. Mr. Topp said there would be signs on site of who to contact in the case on an emergency and/or in the case of issues. He stated for additional carriers to be included on the site, the carrier will need to come to the City for a mechanical permit for the equipment that they

bring onto the site. Mr. Topp indicated that the heights shown on the application are rough heights and the structural calculations that are included with the application do take into consideration all of the possible four additional carriers with a full array of antennas.

Commissioner Bare verified that AT&T will be the primary tenant and Mr. Topp said yes. Commissioner Bare verified that there is the opportunity to lease or sub-lease space and Mr. Topp said yes, there would be space within the compound and space up on the tower. Commissioner Bare asked how many potential entities could lease this space. Mr. Topp named off a variety of cell phone and internet carriers and said in terms of the signage, it will only be the safety regulatory signs on the fenced compound either on the building or on the fence. He clarified that they do not put signs up on the pole but there is a small FCC registration number. Mr. Topp stated the Planning Commission could place a condition that no advertising signs would be placed on the pole itself. He referenced the staff report in terms of the height of the pole, if it were to fall it would not effect adjacent property, it means other than the school property because there is the general presumption that when you are placing a pole on somebody's property, then they are assuming that risk because they are the ones receiving the rent or lease money but their neighbors should not be impacted from that stand point.

Commissioner Wise asked Mr. Topp if he is aware of any cell tower failures. Mr. Topp stated that he has read of only one failure which was during a massive flood event where a large tree log slammed into the tower thus making it bend, but the tower did not come out. He stated the proposed pole will be 150' above ground and it will be 40' below ground in a concrete casing. Mr. Topp stated that the pole will be 150' and the FAA approved 154'. He stated that the additional 4' is to accommodate for FAA lighting as well as a lightning rod. Mr. Topp stated that it is his understanding that the lights on top can be either flashing or steady, so if there is a preference by the Planning Commission; it is something that they would want to specify in their decision. He referenced the comment of the varying heights in the application. Mr. Topp stated that he took this application over after it began and he did not catch the discrepancy. He stated that the existing light pole is 87' 1" and they are proposing 150' because this is the height that AT&T has indicated would be the height necessary to achieve maximum coverage. Mr. Topp stated that his final statement is in regards to the 11' fence. He stated that the applicants prefer this height to deter people from trying to climb over. Mr. Topp stated that the standard site typically has a 6' fence with barbed wire. Mr. Topp stated that he did not believe the barbed wire would be appropriate at this location so this is why they went with the taller fence.

Chairperson Nieberlein clarified that the pole will be 150' with 4' for lighting and lightning rod this is where the 154' figure came to play. Mr. Topp stated that Chairperson Nieberlein is correct.

Commissioner Muilenburg stated that this pole is going to be located very close to the stadium and Mr. Topp did mention a failed pole. Commissioner Muilenburg asked Mr. Topp to explain how safe this pole will be in regards to wind, earthquake, and lightning, considering how close it is to the stadium. Mr. Topp stated that the compound itself would have a lightning rod with wire distributed below the gravel base so that lightning would be distributed into the ground. He said, in terms of wind and earthquakes, this is part of the building permit. Mr. Topp said there is a soils report, which gives them a basis for

foundation design. He stated regarding wind, it is designed according to the established coastal wind speed standards of up to 110 mile winds..

Commissioner Wise asked if there is any reason to be concerned should there be a fire and Mr. Topp said no. Commissioner Wise stated he is worried about children playing with the generator. Mr. Topp said he believes it to be appropriate that the Planning Commission require as a condition of approval that the generator is to be secured in a manner that is satisfactory to the Fire Marshall.

Commissioner Wise proposed the following Condition of Approval: The Planning Commission would like an established procedure from the Fire Marshall on how to accomplish the security of the generator as opposed to leaving the decision up to the Fire Marshall as to whether or not the security is necessary.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked if there was anyone present who wishes to speak either in favor or against the proposal and no one spoke.

Chairperson Nieberlein asked if there were any other questions and no one spoke.

Chairperson Nieberlein closed the public hearing at 8:53 pm.

### **Planning Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Muilenburg proposed the following change to the finding of fact: On page 13 of 36 of the staff report, under item D where it says the effects on adjoining land uses, he would like to propose that on the last sentence it shall include, "If the tower were to fall, it would not land on adjacent properties."

There was a consensus of the Planning Commission to approve the finding of fact amendment.

Commissioner Muilenburg proposed the following condition of approval: "There shall be no advertising signs placed on the pole."

CDD Belson stated the following condition of approval: "To deter vandalism and prevent tampering with the fuel storage, the diesel generator and fuel tank shall be secured and secured in a manner acceptable to the Fire Marshall."

There was a consensus of the Planning Commission to approve this condition.

Commissioner Tilton stated he would like to include the following consideration: "The Planning Commission would prefer a blinking light on top versus a steady light."

There was a consensus of the Planning Commission to approve this consideration.

CDD Belson stated that the blinking light would be listed under "Other Considerations."



CDD Belson stated that she would include the following consideration: "The Planning Commission prefers blinking lights if allowed by the FAA."

There was a consensus of the Planning Commission to approve CDD Belson's wording.

Commissioner Wise stated that to achieve the technology goal of encouraging people who would like to utilize the landmark, he would like to add a notification mechanism of when other companies are added to the tower.

CDD Belson asked Commissioner Wise if he is wishing to add language and Commissioner Wise said no, he is just saying for their own benefit, they should have a way of capturing this information for whoever has responsibility for that aspect of the plan.

Commissioner Muilenburg asked if everyone is in agreement with condition number 14.

There was a consensus of the Planning Commission to approve condition number 14.

CDD Belson stated regarding the height discrepancies, they could add into the approval "There was an 87' tower that would now be replaced with 150' tower."

Mr. Topp approached the Commission. He stated that when the building permit drawings are submitted, they would be consistent throughout in identifying the existing height of the lights and the proposed height of the pole.

CDD Belson read back the following changes to the findings of fact:

- Page 13, item D at the top, "other properties" will be changed to "other adjacent properties."
- Page 18, item J they would add language to the findings that references the Planning Commission's preference for the blinking light.
- Page 19, they would add language to the finding about public health, safety, and welfare referencing the condition of approval for securing the fuel storage.
- In the approval they will state 150' high tower that can go up to 4' for lightning rod and lights, that the stadium lights that are being replaced are 87' high, that there will be an 11' high encaged fence for the compound, and no parking.
- Add condition of approval, number 14 for the archaeology.
- Add condition of approval that they allow no advertising signs on the pole.
- Deter vandalism and prevent tampering of the fuel, require that it be secured as approved by the Fire Marshal..
- A preference for blinking lights if allowed by FAA.

- Page 26 of 36 of the staff report, they would add that in terms of supplementing the finding, they leave the finding as it is, that it does comply and include that ongoing compliance will be demonstrated through submission to the City of documents provided to the FCC.

Commissioner Hoile stated that she did not see any comment with regards to the school and she does have a concern that perhaps the public does not even know there will be a cell tower placed. CDD Belson stated that there was a sign on the property and they did mail out 143 notices to surrounding property owners. She said it was in the newspaper and prior to the City's advertisement in the newspaper the applicant was required to place an advertisement in the legal advertisement section of the newspaper for the height issues. AP Pezley stated that the School District gave American Tower authorization to be representatives for this application.

Commissioner Tilton moved that the Planning Commission approve PC 10 12 CUP 02 a request for Conditional Use Permit and Design Review for a storage building and a new 150' cell tower to be incorporated with light pole west of the home bleachers at the Siuslaw Football field as applied for by Steven Topp, AICP, Powder River Development Services, LLC representing American Tower and Siuslaw School District as modified with the five additional conditions of approval and the changes to the staff report and to the findings of fact. Commissioner Bare seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson**

Commissioner Muilenburg made the motion to nominate Jan Nieberlein for Chairperson and Mark Tilton for Vice-Chairperson. Commissioner Hoile seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Chairperson Nieberlein stated that on 2/28/2011 the sign code would be before the City Council for a public hearing. Commissioner Tilton stated he would possibly be available to attend the Council meeting to act as the planning representative. Commissioner Muilenburg stated if Commission Tilton were unable to attend, he would be available.

## **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **Monthly Report**

CDD Belson stated that the Commission has the monthly report in their packets. CDD Belson offered to answer any questions in regards to the monthly report.

Commissioner Wise asked if there is more data regarding building permits and he wondered if they could review a trend line. CDD Belson stated that July of 2008 is as far back as she has consistent data. She said prior to this, they have data but it was not the same type of collection method, so placing it on a graph would not be helpful.

Commissioner Muilenburg asked about the garbage in reference to the senior center approval. AP Pezley stated that the enclosed garbage was approved.

### **Discussion with CM Willoughby on Dumdi v. Handy et al Case**

Chairperson Nieberlein stated that the Commission has very rarely emailed each other and they don't speak over the telephone very often. She stated she is proud that the Commission has kept a clean open meeting. CM Willoughby spoke in reference to recent events with the Dumdi v. Handy et al Case concerning Lane County Commissioners, stating that it is important the Commission keep their decisions public.

The Commission continued discussion about public meeting law.

### **CALENDAR**

Tuesday, March 8 ~ 7:00 pm City Hall (Tentative)

CDD Belson stated that, last night, the Council did approve Ordinance No. 2, which approves the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and City Code for Parks and Recreation. She stated this work is finished in terms of the land use process and the next step is to look at the code for the Parks and Recreation Commission, rename that Commission to a Committee and look at its duties. CDD Belson stated once this is done, they would start recruiting members for a Parks Committee. She stated the Council would be taking up motorized recreation as a topic at the 3/7/2011 meeting so both the Parks Committee and motorized recreation language will be on the Agenda. CDD Belson stated that the non-motorized recreation language was removed from the Comprehensive Plan so it is no longer a land use issue but it is more of a city code issue in terms of what the Council will allow regarding motorized vehicles or special events. She stated the third item to follow would be to cost out the high priority projects that were listed in Ch. 7 of the Parks Plan. CDD Belson stated that Public Works has started on this and they will have costs on this in two to three months so they will have a capital improvement plan, the basis of which will be for establishing system development charges. She stated that looking for a location for a dog park and trails are the highest priority projects of this year. CDD Belson stated that there will be a public hearing with the Council on the 28<sup>th</sup> for the sign code but she does not anticipate them to deliberate because it is a full agenda. She stated, in regards to the code amendment for residential infill for affordable housing, the Mayor has decided to invite the Planning Commission to his home as an example and have this become the kickoff for a work session. CDD Belson stated that this would occur on 3/22/2011, which is a regular Planning Commission meeting date.

The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission will be 3/22/2011.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Florence Planning Commission, Chairperson Nieberlein adjourned the meeting at 9:53 pm.

APPROVED BY THE FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION ON THE \_\_\_\_ DAY  
OF \_\_\_\_\_ 2011.

Jan Nieberlein 03-28-11

**JAN NIEBERLEIN, CHAIRPERSON  
FLORENCE PLANNING COMMISSION**