

**City of Florence
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
250 Hwy 101, Florence, OR 97439
August 10, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Phil Tarvin called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

Commissioners Present: (In House) Chairperson Phil Tarvin, Vice Chairperson Sandi Young, Commissioner John Murphey, Commissioner Eric Hauptman, Commissioner Ron Miller, Commissioner Andrew Miller.

Staff Present: (In House) Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell, Assistant Planner Dylan Huber-Heidorn, AIC FEC Manager Aleia Bailey, and Planning Technician Sharon Barker

At 5:30 PM, Chair Tarvin opened the meeting, Sharon Barker did a Roll call. All members present. Commissioner Hauptman led the flag salute

First item was an announcement by Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell, Employee Recognition; the departure of Dylan Huber-Heidorn

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Start Time: 5:32PM

Action: Approved

Motion: Commissioner John Murphey

Second: Commissioner Eric Hauptman

Vote: 6-0

There was no discussion on the agenda and it was approved unanimously.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF July 13, 2021 and July 27, 2021

Start Time: 5:32 PM

Action: Approved

Motion: Vice Chair Sandra Young

Second: Commissioner John Murphey

Vote: 6-0

3. To review and consider adopting to current Covid 19, public meeting procedures for not allowing in person attendance at City Hall meetings, per Executive Order 20-16. Wendy FarleyCampbell gave the presentation.

The last time you approved a recommendation, and this time you are not doing that; you are acknowledging that there is going to be a change In summary we are required to provide the opportunity for people to participate in a video type of manner, or remote type of manner, it could be via phone and because of that, it is also providing the opportunity for us to meet in person as well there are two key changes in all of the information that was provided in the handout, the Council did approve that at their last meeting now the committees and the commission and urban renewal district, everybody will be acknowledging this change at their upcoming meetings. This is to let you know and the public know they can participate remotely and that now you can officially be here in person. We do not need a motion. Thank you.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:
None were noted

No Speaker's cards were received nor public comments made.

Chairperson Tarvin relayed basic instructions regarding the proceedings and asked if any member wished to disclose a conflict of interest, ex-parte contact, or biases. None were declared. No citizens present wished to challenge any commissioner.

5. **PC 21 12 EAP 02 - Cannery Station Phase 1 PUD and Tentative Subdivision Extension**

A request by Peter Englander, representing Cannery Station LLC, for a one-year extension to the approval of PC 18 33 PUD 02 & PC 18 34 SUB 01, which were to expire April 23, 2021. PC 18 33 PUD 02 & PC 18 34 SUB 01 were conditionally approved on April 23, 2019, for proposed Planned Unit Development and tentative subdivision for Phase 1 regarding the development of a Mixed-Use Development to include a 64-Bed Assisted Living Facility, ten Single-Story Transitional Cottages Units, a 42-Unit Three-Story Apartment Building and two Single-Story Commercial Structures. The 17-acre parcel is located east of Highway 101 across from Fred Meyers, west of Florentine Estates, north of the Community Baptist Church, and south of Munsel Lake Road. Property is located at Map No. 18-12-14-20, Tax Lot 00700, in the North Commercial District regulated by Florence City Code Title 10 Chapter 30.

5:47 pm Chair Tarvin opened the hearing and called upon Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell to deliver the staff report for this agenda item.

FarleyCampbell: Good evening Planning Commissioners, in your packet this evening, you may see a little different format, we just simply added cover sheets, for each agenda item, hopefully making it easier and quicker for both you and the public to be able to find the respective item on the agenda.

FarleyCampbell: To introduce this item, the Cannery Station Resolutions PC 18 33 PUD 02 and PC 18 34 SUB 01, Phase 1 Final PUD and Phase 1 Tentative Sub Plan received approval on April 23, 2019 and was due to expire on May 24, 2021. They were set to expire 31 days after the approval was signed and mailed and that would have been May 24, 2021, the applicant did apply before the expiration date, so the application is live, like Central was, and Stonefield Investment. What you are looking at tonight are extensions - one for the final PUD and one for tentative subdivision, and this is Phase 1 exclusively. Whatever your action is tonight, to extent each of the subsequent phases effective one year. Phase 1 Tentative Sub is on the southern end of the lot; this is some living unit and some transitional cottages for those residents that still want independent living, a commercial building and an apartment complex, and all of those different development buildings will be spread across 6 lots and fronting on 3 different streets, extension of Spruce and Redwood streets. The entire acreage will be broken into developable tracks and open spaces. The project was stalled due to Covid-19. Since the approval, there has been no land use changes in the area; the only zone change was - it wasn't really a zoning change it was an architectural change - regarding to parking at the assisted living facility. The applicable criteria are Zoning Administration Title 10 and 11, Sec. 1-6-3 23, Planned Unit developments, Sec. 14 Chapter 1 and 3 Sections 1-6-3 and 14. Chapter 3 from Title 11. Subdivision Tentative Plan Procedure Sec 6. An extension is a Type III application, no matter what type of application it is. Property owners within a 100' were provided notice, property was posted and notice was published in the Siuslaw News. All within the time frames required by City Code. By City code the Planning Commission can grant 2 one-year extensions, so the only extension permitted from here tonight is a one-year extension, even though they can come back to you next year and request another extension as well. On June 21, 2021 the Florence City Council approved a City-wide extension on Land use items for any

projects that were still alive and active: what I mean by that - it could not have expired. This happened in June, so in order for Cannery to receive the benefit of an additional year extension, in addition to what ever you grant this evening, assuming you do, they would have had to have had their extension approved by you and the reason that the Council granted the Ordinance approval is due to the hardships that many developers are facing with regards to Covid 19 shortages of all kinds, supplies, materials, staffing, money- you name it. The results of the Ordinance is that any extensions that you will have granted being Cannery and Stonefield that you already granted will then get a 2 year extension. Everybody else will get the one year extension that is active right now. This situation of two years, is included in the Condition 4 of the proposed Resolution. Aerial of site: Everybody in yellow received a notice of this hearing tonight. The proposed property that is requesting an extension is just east of Fred Meyer, South East of the intersection of Munsel Lake Rd and Hwy 101, just north of the Florence Baptist Church- Florentine Estates is situated to the east. (Phase 1 PUD Plan was displayed. Phase 1 Tentative Subdivision Plan was displayed). As more plats come in, they will be replated into lots. There was no public testimony or referral comments received. Chuck McGlade submitted a letter that was given to you and is posted online. There are 3 extension criteria: 1. The request for an extension is made in writing prior to expiration of the original approval. 2. There are special or unusual circumstances that exist which warrant an extension. 3. No material changes of surrounding land uses or zoning has occurred. All three were met. Staff recommendation is that the application does meet the applicable criteria of City Code, staff recommends approval with the following conditions of approval. All modifications require approval, they cannot make any changes without revisiting the Planning Commission, they also have to submit an Agreement of Acceptance prior to issuance of building permit. They have to abide by applicable conditions of PC 18 33 PUD 02 and PC 18 34 SUB 01. This extension of approval shall expire May 25, 2022 after which Ordinance 11 Series 2021 offers an additional year. You have several alternatives available, you can approve based on the findings of facts or you can deny it, provided that it does not meet the criteria. Are there any questions?

Commissioner Hauptman: Did we first hear this in 2018?

Wendy: yes, and I think you even heard them before that, because they had their preliminary PUD was the first hearing around 2017 and they received that and then they had to follow up and provide their final PUD and a tentative Plan, which I what you are extending now. Now it is worth saying that whenever we say that the Conditions of Approval, of those last two resolutions, that is what they are getting an extension for part of the condition of approval would then and that is that they also meet the conditions of approval for their original PUD as well.

Applicant Peter Englander attended meeting via conference call and gave a brief statement he is the director of or project management for American United partner of Chuck McGlade and his projects since 2017, as you have just reviewed the tentative subdivision plan and the final PUD project was approved in 2019 we immediately starting working on financing the assisted living facility and as we ran into the covid in 2020 because it was taking some time, we actually had a financing plan back off due to Covid, so we had to go back to the market and seek other financing for the project we have been working with a department of housing and urban development lender since mid-2020 and have made significant progress with them, then we have also have submitted for your next Planning Commission meeting approval of the final plat which will also trigger substantial public improvements on a property which will start prior to our closing of financing on the assisted living facility as Wendy described which we hope will close in the first quarter of 2021 and then we will be constructing that facility, at that time the other issue that has delayed factors is that once we got the project back up and running you know the construction business has been relatively busy and we have had a challenging time of getting all the consultants back on the projects. But we have done so that last couple of months that why we are going to be back in front of you in two weeks with the approval, we look forward to seeing you again.

Chair Tarvin asked applicant to stand by in case there were any questions and if the Commissioner had any questions.

Commissioner Hauptman: You do now have a commitment for financing?

Applicant: We do not sir, the application for HUD takes a significant amount of time and we are doing what is called a two-step process in order to make that application we have to have an approved plat, because we have to submit a survey, so we have been working with Rob Ward, in all of that, that is why we are going to come back to you in two weeks to get the plat approved and then we will immediately be able to produce a survey, upon recordation of that plat and at that point we will be able to submit to HUD, they will take approximately 120 days to review our initial application and produce a commitment which we hope to get right around the beginning of 2021 and then we will immediately go back and apply for that loan, and we hope to be able to close that loan within the next 60 – 90 days.

Commissioner Hauptman: you said the first quarter of 2021, did you mean 2022?

Applicant: yes, 2022 yes you are right.

Chair Tarvin asked the applicant if he has read the staff report and findings of fact on this matter and if he understood the conditions of approval as they are proposed. The applicant said that he read the material and understands the conditions as proposed.

There were no speaker's cards.

There were no further recommendations other than this application does meet the applicable criteria, and thus recommends approval with the conditions.

Chair Tarvin; read script regarding closing of the hearing. The Commissioners and Staff saw no reason to keep the hearing open. Hearing closed at 6:06 pm

Chair Tarvin asked the applicant if he would like to waive his right to submit final written argument. The applicant waived his right to submit final written argument.

Applicant: I want to be sure I answer this correctly, I think I don't wish to so that you can make the decision this evening.

Chair Tarvin, yes if you wish to waive your right than we can move on to make a decision tonight.

Applicant: Ok, so I do wish to waive our right.

Commissioner Murphey; point of order before we close the hearing, I believe when we opened the hearing, we spoke that the hearing was on PC 18 33 PUD 02 and PC 18 34 SUB 01, the hearing should actually be on PC 21 12 EAP 02, because that is the resolution we will be voting on

Commissioners were asked if they would like to discuss this item.

Commissioner Hauptman: The problem I have with this, they had three years before of work in this development, prior to Covid and there has been some work done out there, there is a base where they stripped the soil off the top of a dune, and just now we are hearing about them having financial difficulties, where were they the first three years? This was before Covid, I understand that a lot of lenders

backed off in 2020, what happened three years before that, I imagine you weren't searching for financing, that's the problem I am having.

Commissioner Murphey: They had the initial financing, but he stated tonight that they went away when Covid hit and that they started searching

Commissioner Murphey I would like to make a recommendation that we approve resolution PC 21 12 EAP 02 Cannery Station Subdivision Extension using Alternative one.

Commissioner Ron Miller second

Chair Tarvin we have a motion and a second with no new conditions added, staff will you please poll the commission?

Commissioner Ron Miller: yes

Commissioner John Murphey yes

Commissioner Andrew Miller yes

Commissioner Eric Hauptman: no

Vice Chair Young yes

Chairman Tarvin: yes

Motion carries 5-1

Open Hearing: 5:47 pm

Close Hearing: 6:06

Close Hearing: 6:16 pm

6. **PC 21 19 VAR 01 – Variance Round 2 Driftwood Shores Variance**

An application from Martin Alletson, on behalf of the Association Owners Driftwood Shores & Surfside Inn., for a variance to the requirement to add lap siding on the 1st and Falcon St. facing walls of the 80' x 40' metal building constructed at 88427 1st Ave. on the North East Corner of 1st Ave. and Falcon St.

Chair Tarvin opened the hearing and called upon Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell to deliver the staff report for this agenda item.

FarleyCampbell: Your second hearing tonight is a request from Driftwood Shores home owners association. You first looked at this project back in 2018, and then in 2019 where they proposed a modification to their site plan, reoriented the building from pointing towards this other street to pointing towards 1st Street and that came with requisite parking, elimination of parking, that was because they were able to use the parking at the Driftwood Shores building site, and then they had some stormwater locational changes to that previous parking area, they came to you on both the 10th and 24th of November 2020, and you approved a Variance for 2 of 3 items that they requested a Variance from. They were all architectural, the first two you approved were related to awning size and window percentage and they were nominal around 3-7% difference in the total amount required, the item that was not approved was the lap siding because there was not sufficient information in the record to justify the Variance and they were set forth to make the modifications to apply for lap siding. The applicant hired an engineer to engineer the application of siding to the building, and plans were drawn up and those were provided to the building department and they also provided those plans to a building manufacturer and to the lap siding manufacturer, and having testimony from the two manufacturers advising against attaching the lap siding to the building having that information, has been provided with a Variance application Round 2 if you will for the lap siding. I am going to have a little bit different wording for what they are applying for

Variance-wise from a code perspective, in upcoming slide. Property owners within 300 feet were provided notice on July 21, and media notice was published on July 31, 2021 public hearing was set for August 10, 2021. (Aerial photo was shown of site location). Subject building is located just east of 1st Ave. on the corner of 1st Ave and Falcon Street and there is an undeveloped alley on the northern border. Overview of the Variance request Florence City Code Title 10, Chapter 6, Section 6 -3 is the Design Review chapter, and requires that Commercial buildings that are not within the Main Street and Down Town Districts if they follow and pick from this list of items that they can have - it had to do with window sizes, awning coverings, eaves... there are all kinds of things to pick from, there is a statement that buildings need to meet a horizontal and vertical design elements and what that means is they need offsets, meaning they need to have a alcove that sets back 6 feet or have a projection that is 6' out , and it has to happen every 30 feet to create something that you would typically see on a commercial building, some design features.

In 2018 whenever you looked at this, you said it's a box, well instead of making a box if you can't meet the offsets, then let's apply lap siding, the lap siding requirement come from a negation of the offset requirement, a way to meet in the middle, by this horizontal vertical design requirement. The applicant is looking for a Variance from this code section. The direction that staff is taking is let's have a reset on the lap and is there something else that they can do to meet the offset requirement? The building is there, what do we do? At the time that staff recommended lap - we certainly did not understand the requirements involved with the engineering on spacing requirements for lap siding and that it would actually require that you don't affix lap siding to metal, when you put the building up you never put the metal on that side of the building you construct the wall with plywood or whatever you do and you affix the siding to the wall. The condition that was approved last time was: The applicant shall supply elevations with building permit application which demonstrate an appearance matching the swimming pool building across 1st Avenue with lap siding on the 1st Avenue and Falcon Street faces of the building. Variance has to meet Variance criteria. Since the photos were taken there has been a fence constructed heading south along the southern building face from the west edge of the building to enclose the storm drain facility and pump system., for protection against vandalism and theft. You are trying to replicate that look of the pool building across the street. Variance criteria was listed. Staff has proposed Findings that propose that we accept the Planning Commissions selection of one or more of the alternatives that have been presented for you. And that the criteria can be met with alternative solutions. Alternative solutions are: **1.** Leave building as is with no screening, **2.** Construct 6' tall cedar fence along 1st Ave, **3.** Plant soldier trees arborvitae (12' tall) or spartan juniper trees (15-20' tall) along 1st St. **4.** Construct 4' high false wall faced with pool building brown shake siding set 12' from the building along 1st Ave to give the image of building siding, **5.** Construct 6' tall cedar fence and plant arborvitae (12' tall) or spartan juniper trees (15-20' tall) along 1st Street. **6.** Leave the building as-is with existing cedar screening stormwater swale plantings along Falcon St. **7.** Plant soldier trees such as arborvitae (12' tall) or spartan juniper trees (15-20' tall) in between the existing cedar fence and stormwater swale plantings along Falcon Street.

The applicant has offered a couple of options for plantings, he's offered arborvitae or juniper trees, he has provided the height of those trees along first street and again instead of a fence it will be vegetation. The last recommendation from the applicant is to combine **2&3** and construct a 6' cedar fence and include the vegetation as well, and you would want to stipulate whether the vegetation is on the inside or outside of that fence line. Moving to Falcon St. the applicant's letter seemed to indicate that the fence was there, there are storm water plantings there, and that is probably good enough alternatively, but if the Planning Commission does not feel it is good enough then planting the aforementioned trees as screening between the building and the fence, where the opportunity presents itself, because you do have a swale there as well, and to also preserve the opportunity to maintain the building. So you would be looking at #1. Do you want to look at something different then offsets and have him basically have him remove all of the metal siding from the building and make the building where you can attach siding from something? If not, this manufacturer than some other manufacturer or consider an alternative of one or more of the

alternatives, or decide a Variance for the offsets to begin with and go with the orange and then you would have the painted building as it exists presently. There were 3 sets of proponent testimony from Babcock, Brau and Roth. The alternatives before you this evening, you can select on or more of the alternatives that I have provided, staff would modify the Findings to accommodate that. I have some highlighted areas in the Findings and the Resolutions where I have left your answer; staff did not make a recommendation specifically other than to say we think that it can't do lap so let's do something else, which we could have done back in 2018 had we known that lap could not be added to the building without tearing the whole wall done. You can also deny the application and have them tear the wall out, and find some siding assuming that there is some. You can also close the public hearing and leave the written record open so that, we could get more information so that you can make a decision, or if you want to hear more verbal testimony, then you would want to leave the public hearing open so that we could continue to provide you dialog between both staff and the applicant.

Vice Chair Young: For years we required wood siding of some kind on Kingwood, which is industrial, I don't know whether there were the kinds of problems that they were talking about rust and all that, but the wood siding is still on the fronts of most of those buildings, how come it works on Kingwood, but it won't work here? They are metal buildings there too.

FarleyCampbell: I would speculate it's because they were not attached to the metal when they were constructed.

Vice Chair Young: It was a requirement for years. Everybody did it?

FarleyCampbell replied that it is still a requirement, the code still says that the street faces have some architectural detailing. The off setting did not come up until recently and most of the buildings were built prior to the existing code. The design review code relating to commercial buildings is fairly new.

Vice Chair Young: I understand the reasons they gave.

FarleyCampbell: The engineering that they provided was to affix the lap to the metal and putting all those perforations into the metal would promote rust in an ocean environment.

Chair Tarvin: I do have one question, just to clarify, in your presentation it was said that on the 1st Street frontage that the applicant had either suggested or agreed to raising a fence and trees, or did I misunderstand?

FarleyCampbell: That was Item #5. These solutions came from the applicants' materials as alternative solutions and are what the applicant recommended. Staff did not attempt to find other solutions. If you would like staff to look for additional solutions, we can.

Martin Alletson (applicant testimony): I apologize for being here again, and after our last meeting, we had every intention of doing what the Planning Commission requested, then at that time we hadn't spoken with the metal building company, we hadn't spoken with the lap siding company, and it was only after we had spent a significant amount on engineering that we find out from both companies that they disagreed with what we were going to do and later we found out that the siding was not available, they don't make it any more in either the color or the style so we wouldn't be able to do even #4 on the list 4' high with the same kind of siding that is on the pool, our original intent was to have this building look like the pool building, but none of the siding is available anymore, at the time we said we would follow the Commission's requirement we weren't aware of that.

One Question from Chair Tarvin: It would appear that one of your suggestions is to plant trees and place a fence on 1st Street frontage, is that something you are prepared to do? None of us look forward you or us where you come back to us again and let us know what you can't do.

Alletson: *We can definitely build a fence and put trees in.*

Chair Tarvin: ok, and in that regard if that is something that is considered by the Commission, do you have any suggestion as to where the best place to plant the trees would be in particular in this case would it be close to the building outside the fence or visa versa, or in the front yard.

Alletson: *Given how strong the wind is in that area we have concern of the siding, what we would do is we would build a fence parallel to the building and we would have to build baffles along the fence where we plant the trees to give the trees some shelter for at least 2 or three years, or until they have grown strong enough to with stand the wind, pretty much everything we have planted on that street so far has died. So we would have to build the baffle along the front of the fence or behind the fence to let the trees develop and grow.*

Chair Tarvin: Have you submitted a plan about how that would be laid out, or are we just in the conceptual phase at this point?

Alletson: *I submitted a hand written drawing of what it would look like, but we have been told by our landscaper that as long as we protect the trees from the wind that, they should do fine.*

(Looked at page 26 of Agenda Item #6 from the website).

Comm. Murphey: Do you understand why we are here tonight? You erected the building before you came to the Planning Commission, which should have been your first stop. If you had come to us for approval before you ever erected the building, you wouldn't be having these issues.

Alletson: *I thought we did have approval from the Planning Commission the first time.*

Comm. Murphey: You came to us when the building is up for the window sizing and changes in your awning sizing and to agree on the wood siding, the building was already up at that point. Is that correct?

Alletson: *We did increase awning size and for what ever reason the builders or the metal building siding, the windows were already sized when we bought the building.*

This slide shows the fence with the trees in front then we would put dividers in between each tree to protect them from the wind, you still see the front elevation but the side elevation would be protected by another place.

Comm. Hauptman: What kind of dividers? Is it wood or what?

Alletson: *Yes, it would be similar to the fence that is currently on the Falcon Street side.*

Chair Tarvin: It appears by this diagram that the trees are placed outside the fence, in addition to the trees and the fence that is shown on your diagram you also need some kind of protective mechanism in the first couple three years to establish the trees? And that would be something similar to a fence? I guess what we would be wanting to know is would it be something like an eyesore?

Alletson: : No

Chair Tarvin: So would you propose to maybe making something like a small fence in front of each one? In addition to the 6' fence behind the trees?

Alletson: Yes

Alletson: stated he has read staff report and finding of facts, and that he understands.

There was no public testimony.

FarleyCambell: With the decision to permit the 6' fence along 1st Street, it would be with the understanding and acknowledgement that that would also be a Variance to the fence criteria because along where the front door is on a corner lot the fence height maximum is 4' along that stretch, so there is criteria in the fence code for an exceptions process where a greater height is allowed for screening, safety, security and that code section is 10-34-5 that also acknowledges if you were to pick one of the images that is in the packet, it would be in concept only, they are not meant to be representations of the amount of arborvitae that would be planted there or the permission of the loading zone along the street. That is just a representation of the screening there, not approval of anything else. Like loading zones. So the arborvitae would need to be planted in specification of what ever landscaping/planting list specifies, that is what we would be looking at. You could amend if you would like to specify in planting in accordance with the landscape planting list.

Now is the opportunity to discuss closing the public hearing.

Comm. Hauptman: I would like to see an actual rendering, I am having trouble picturing the wind buffers for the trees.

Chair Tarvin: I believe that it is worth continuing the meeting to a date certain as long as we have the time. I would like to see an actual plan view an elevation rendering, with a plan that doesn't have to be extremely complex but it should be more with the native vain, a proposal by the applicant to meet the requirement of mitigating not putting on the siding.

Comm. Murphey: Can you bring the options up please? If we are going to do what you and Eric are suggesting, we have to give them something to go by, we have to pick a solution to get a rendering, we can't expect them to give us one for each one on list.

Chair Tarvin: I would agree on that and if I were to make a suggestion it would be on the #5 (*Construct 6' Tall cedar fence and plant arborvitae (12' tall) or spartan juniper trees (15'-20' Tall) along 1st Street.*)

Vice Chair Young: There are also Falcon Conditions 6 & 7 on here. Ddo we want them to extend around the Falcon side?

Comm. Murphey: If we are going to do that, I would like to see a rendering on #5 and #7 (*#7 Plant soldier trees such as arborvitae (12' tall) or spartan juniper trees (15'- 20' tall) in between the existing cedar fence and stormwater swale plantings along Falcon St.)* hinging on 4 and 7.

Vice Chair Young: we can't do 4 because the color isn't available.

Commissioner Murphey: His brown shake siding, yeah. The siding is not available that is on the pool building, it's just the color of the pool building.

Vice Chair Young: You would have to ask them but they said something about it not being available.

Comm. Murphey: There is T-111 siding that you could paint the color of the pool building.

Chair Tarvin: It sounds like we may consider keeping the meeting open and reconvene the meeting later on and if we do then we are going to have to give the applicant instruction on what option or options we want to see, my comfortable with John you were looking at 4, 5 6 & 7?

Comm. Murphey: Then #4

Chair Tarvin: So, 5, 6 & 7

Vice Chair Young: 7 says the trees would be inside the fence, do we want the trees outside the fence?

Comm. R. Miller: That would be on Falcon St.

Chair Tarvin: I don't know that we want trees any place except to screen the building, I think the applicant should be the one to give us a plan that we would approve, not to design it for him.

Commissioner R. Miller: 7 says just on Falcon Street.

Commissioner Murphey: Is the storm water swale inside the fence or outside the fence?

In audible

Vice Chair Young: If the plants are on the outside, it would break the severity of the fence.

FarleyCampbell: Martin I have a question. The fence that is on Falcon Street - is it property line tight, or does it set back off the property line?

Alletson: Off the property line. It is setting almost next to the building, and we built that because more for security, because we had people trying to break into the sump pump and steal the motor out of it, so we erected the fence.

FarleyCampbell: I just wanted to let the Planning Commission know whether if you are plan to screening on the outside of the fence, the street side of the fence, whether that was going to be in a public right-of-way or your own property?

Alletson: My own property, there is quite a big setback from the road, between the building and the property line. That is where the trees are now that are dead.

Vice Chair Young: So #5 and #7 with the trees on the outside of the fence?

Chair Tarvin: ok, to review one last time, the concept that we have right now is to resume the hearing at a future date, to get the applicant directions to bring to back plan review and elevation renderings on options #5 and #7.

Comm. Murphey: I have a question. If they bring that back to us, and the Planning Commission doesn't like it, what is the next step? The options are here. We don't like any of the other ones.

Chair Tarvin: What would you prefer Commissioner Murphey?

Comm. Murphey: I would like to just approve 5 & 7 tonight and have it go to staff to be sure it meets all of the correct plans, and the staff thinks it looks good, and go with it.

Chair Tarvin: I would defer with that.

Comm. Hauptman: Are you ok with that Wendy?

FarleyCampbell: I could - that would be a landscaping plan amendment which is a Type II, which you have the opportunity to call and review.

Comm. R. Miller: That would eliminate the problem, let's decide.

Chair Tarvin asked the applicant if tonight we approve the option #5 and #7 of the alternative solutions, are you prepared to participate with Planning Department and get a solution of this whole matter, and move on with it this time?

Alletson: yes

Chair Tarvin: It looks like we are not going to continue the hearing, we will recommend that it works as a Type II application review, so therefore, I will now close the hearing at 6:59 pm.

Applicant waived his right to offer final written argument.

Deliberation: no deliberation Commissioner Murphey made a motion.

Motion to approve: Comm. Murphey with alternative #5 and #7 to come back to the Planning Department for a Type II review, to meet their approval for landscaping, with the trees on the outside of the fence, by Falcon Street.

Second: Commissioner Ron Miller

Open Hearing: 6:12 pm

Close Hearing: 6:59

Motion: Commissioner John Murphey

Second: Commissioner Ron Miller

6-0 motion carried

No Commission items to discuss

7. We do have another meeting this month scheduled for August 24th and as you heard earlier from Mr. Englander, it is the Cannery Station final plat Phase 1. We had the extension before we had the other application that is why they are on top of one another, Eric Hauptman asked "that will be on the 24th" FarleyCampbell said "Correct". We know that NW housing is chomping to get going, but they are presently incomplete. Commissioner Hauptman asked what NW housing is, FarleyCampbell replied that it is the housing development south of the Presbyterian Church that approached the Commission about a parking study , a deviation of the parking code We are in the process of working with a contract planner to fill in the vacancy with Dylan. Dylan was going to be doing NW housing and he did the completeness review on it but we have a contract planner who will be reviewing the materials and then preparing your Findings

for the review and making the presentation to you, that will either be the 14th or the 28th but they need to hurry if they are going to try and make the noticing deadline for the 14th, or by the 28th we have a couple items that will be ready by then to go to, you have meetings scheduled for the 14th and the 28th because it is the 2nd and 4th Tuesday. Comm. Murphey will be out of state on the 14th.

Aleia Bailey gave a quick summary of the 25th Anniversary of the Florence Events Centers celebration will be held on Wednesday the 25th of August. Lane County is back in business with their household hazardous waste disposal events. They had a small event last month and it has as many people as they have with a regular event and all the accepted was paint and light bulbs, they will be here August 20th and 21st over at Florence Transfer site, 12-5 on Friday and 8-2 on Saturday and Commissioner R. Miller said they will only take big fluorescent light bulbs. Businesses can enroll to take things on Friday. Today the County board of Commissioners, acting as the board of health announced mandatory masks indoors and the city has set its policy to the City's Mandatory masking will be starting tomorrow, it is anticipated that we will go back to implementing the other guidelines that are all covered under the board of health, the governor is expected to come out with more specifics tomorrow I believe and that would include rolling back to gotowebinar meetings, so we may not be meeting in person again, they said staff can do internal meetings with masks and distancing but our public meetings would go back to being GotoWebinar, we have already noticed the City Council meeting Land Use items for all of the annexations requests that you have recommended approval for, actually your last meeting those are scheduled for City Council at their next meeting on the 16th, in the interest of not having to re-notice everyone, if there is someone that cannot absolutely participate remotely then we will try to accommodate them in the building, but the notices did go out that the meeting was going to be a hybrid in person meeting and we will accommodate as needed in person. On the 23rd we have another item for the mural that has already been noticed for City Council and ditto for that one. And then the meeting on the 24th, I will confirm this with you as information is available, you will be resetting to a meeting wherever you were meeting before.

Comm. Hauptman: So we will not be meeting in person? FarleyCampbell: probably not, I can't confirm that because it has not been made official but that is my understanding. Staff will be meeting remotely too and Sharon will be staffing the Gotowebinar in the Council Chambers.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM.

ATTEST:

Sharon Barker, Planning Technician

Phil Tarvin, Chairperson