
City of Florence
Planning Commission Meeting/Workshop Minutes
250 Hwy 101, Florence, OR 97439
March 8, 2022

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Phil Tarvin called the meeting to order at 5:32 PM.

Commissioners Present: (Videoconference) Chairperson Phil Tarvin, Vice Chairperson Sandi Young, Commissioner Eric Hauptman, Commissioner Andrew Miller, Commissioner John Murphey, and Commissioner Clare Kurth
Excused Absence: Commissioner Ron Miller

Environmental Management: Lisa Walter-Sedlacek and Erick Oshel
Advisory Committee (EMAC)

Staff Present: (In House) Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell, Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston, Administrative Asst. Peighton Allen,

At 5:32 PM, Chair Tarvin opened the meeting, Peighton Allen did a Roll call. All members present except Comm Ron Miller. Commissioner Chair Tarvin led the flag salute.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Start Time: 5:33PM

Action: Approved

Motion: Vice Chair Young

Second: Comm Hauptman

Vote: 6-0

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

Reviewed Title 4 Chapter 6 Vegetation Preservation. A workplan topic.

Commissioners, EMAC, and staff; presented their ideas on a jamboard regarding the issues that they had regarding vegetation clearing.

Wendy FarleyCampbell addressed two items on the agenda: Vegetation Preservation Code.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: A packet containing an agenda item summary was given to all that discussed this topic. This specifically is a workplan topic that was included in the 2021-2023 biannual city workplan. This was after both the Planning Commission and EMAC Committee included it in their respective July workplan for year one for the 2021. They will be implementing this in 2022. Subsequent to that, there is a subcommittee created by both the PC and EMAC that will be looking at this item.

Those are included in the AIS or EMAC. We have the two members on that subcommittee in attendance, as Chairman Tarvin introduced them: Lisa Walter-Sedlacek and Erick Oshel. With the Planning Commission, the subcommittee members that assigned themselves to that, I believe Chairman Tarvin and Eric Hauptman. With any code updates, specifically most importantly with land use code updates, we have an obligation under on our comp plan, because this is an element of land use to review, to consult the public and make sure that there isn't any sub community input. That is, in this particular instance, starting with the two bodies that have a responsibility for that particular code. The implementation by the Planning Commission of the processes and procedures and also EMAC, who has the responsibility of educating the populous about vegetation (of all types), and how they have to do with vegetation preservation. This includes maintenance and how it becomes a balancing act for both parties, with regards to the public and this part of the project. The goal tonight is to have you look at and explore the code, discuss it, share your ideas for it, share your issues; you might have things you like about it that you would like to share, and we're going to collect all of those ideas into several lists and then the subcommittee will have that information and you may be able to share something that hasn't been thought of yet. That's kind of what we're hoping. We also want the not-obvious ideas that we would have missed otherwise. So collectively, each of you represent this city as a volunteer on this Planning Commission as well as this EMAC body, so you therefore have to share experiences with the code, perhaps. I know the Planning Commission certainly does. So, we want to catch those ideas collectively, but also, we want to collect those ideas and themes for your individual side as well. You each have your own individual experiences, and we want to collect those as well. So, you don't have to just wear your Planning Commissioner hat or just your EMAC hat; feel free to wear your, "Hey, I used to live there," hat, or "I used to do this," or "Hey, I've got this great tree that I planted," hat. You can wear whatever hats, because this is a legislative issue, meaning it's not quasi-judicial, so you are representing yourself and others within the community. That being said, the community will also have the opportunity to provide an update on the code. Tonight, we're hoping to explore a wide variety of ideas and perspectives and we're using this work sessions an opportunity to brainstorm the topic, because like I said, solutions are often reached better with a group, than a single person, like the staff writing the code, or a single individual that is on a subcommittee proposing something. I probably don't need to say this, but everyone does have various perspectives, so I want everyone to feel free to share their ideas without fear of judgement, and I just ask that everyone listen to everyone else's ideas and try and not judge because someone may have a different opinion than you or a different experience than you. We want to create an open environment for people to feel like they can share. That concludes my introductory topic. This is of course made with the assumption that everyone is familiar with the topic, or with the vegetation code, I believe everyone should be; my only question would be Clare, because you're just so new. But I believe most everyone else is familiar with it. Chairman Tarvin, that concludes my comments.

Chairman Tarvin: With that, staff will now ask questions of all of us participants, and afterwards, we'll have three (3) minutes to jot down our ideas, questions and responses to the questions asked.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: The first question is an observational question. I want you to think about, if you had the opportunity to look at the code either before this meeting or in the past; if you've looked at the result of a property that received a vegetation clearing permit, share what jumped out at you. I want you to take three (3) minutes and just jot down as many things as you can think of that you would like to share with the group. And then what we'll do after that is, in turn, we'll go around and say one thing until we have all exhausted our list of things they would like to share.

THREE MINUTE TIMER ELAPSES

Wendy FarleyCampbell: As you provide your response, I just ask that you don't provide preamble as to why you are saying what you say; other people please don't provide solutions to that problem, and you don't have to justify what you are doing. Just give your answer. What's going to happen is that Peighton is going to type it out to the best that she hears you say it. If she doesn't get it quite right, feel free to make corrections as needed. We want to make sure we get it correctly, and you have something that is the same as another person's idea or thought, then you can feel free to say so, as long as you're comfortable with it being the same. If it's the same, feel free to share your differences. With that, I'll turn it over to Chairman Tarvin, thank you.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, and I'll be calling on each member present in turn...-

Wendy FarleyCampbell: -One quick thing, we are also having staff participate in this and I don't think I included that in your script.

Chairman Tarvin: Once I go through all of the members of the panel, then I will turn it over to staff to go ahead and present their ideas also. I will go ahead and start out since I am at the far left of my screen. When conditions are attached to permits, the resulting clearing often times seems to be in excess of what was aligned out. I will now call on Commissioner John Murphy.

Commissioner Murphey: When the vegetation permit is given, they clear a good chunk of the property, then the intended use has changed and they do not follow through. When the property goes up for sale, half of it is cleared and the other is an "eyesore."

Vice Chair Young: We allow clearing too early in the process, with the result being that we clear more than we wish we had, often.

Commissioner Andrew Miller: Just viewing some of the cleared lots, some of them are quite ugly but other lots, you know, they've taken great effort to try and protect as many native species as they can, particularly the coastal pines. I think that needs to be something that's really important, to try and maintain as much as they can. Sometimes, they do more than they should.

Commissioner Hauptman: I've got issues with the code where there are exceptions to the requiring of a permit. I think it's way too broad. Someone could not get a permit under those exceptions and decimate a forest and we've seen that happen in Fairway Estates. It's confusing. I think we need to require a clearing permit as soon as any interest in a property is shown, regarding a potential development, and I think it need be inspected, prior to any clearing. I believe certain vegetation needs to be tagged so as to not be removed. We then should have someone follow up after the clearing to make sure this has been abided by. (4.6.3 A1 – B4)

Commissioner Kurth: Some of the lots, when being cleared, there is erosion control measures in place, and when there are salt fences in place, there seems to be a lot less debris that falls off trees and vegetation on the roadways and it seems they keep the streets a lot cleaner. In the flat lots, maybe not but for the most part.

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: I'm going to go the other way with this. I think the trees are really important to save, but a lot of the time we save just one tree, or we try to save the community with the vegetation preservation on site development, but the grade becomes an issue and the trees get buried too deep or they get exposed and we're saving these trees that don't make sense. I think that it's an issue of us thinking about the topography of the area and the water and how when we ask developers to save the areas... we need to think about plants, communities and grade when we issue vegetation permits.

EMAC Member Erick Oshel: The point that comes to mind for me is one of the biggest attractions for people coming to Florence is the wild space, and the sense of nature we have around us; that you can look out your window from most of the homes and see the trees and the nature around us. So, I think in the decision process, we need to keep in mind the larger goals including preserving the atmosphere that's here in Florence, what makes Florence special, we need to keep that in mind as we make decisions on planning projects.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: Maybe including more areas that do have more protection: we have Highway 101, we have parts of Rhododendron, we can identify more areas that we can be a bit more preservative, so to speak. We need to identify preservation areas in addition to what already exists.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: With some of the long-ago vegetation clearing permits where they're spreading the root matte some of those areas do grow back. It's not universal though, so the staff has been trying to implement root matte; so, what's the magic formula? Root matte does seem to be effective in some areas. How do we use that as an effective alternative?

Chairman Tarvin: We'll start the second round; I'll go first. As much information as there is in the code, we need to take a fresh look at the issues of clarity and also of enforcement. I'll state an example whereas we have both a definition of vegetation in comparison to trees, and what was trimming suitable land-surveying. The interpretation that was done by the permittee was that anything that was cut no closer than $\frac{3}{4}$ in to the ground and was left 12 inches in diameter was vegetation and free game and everything was perfect. Reassess and fortify the code language for clarity and enforcement purposes.

Commissioner Murphey: We run across a lot of issues that everybody answered in their last question. No matter where we end up in the code, I think a way to resolve it is the city of Florence bring in our own building inspector and be able to use them in the capacity to check on all these permits and follow up on everything. Then, if they're not doing it, then we can follow up with a stop order and then move forward. The city should consider hiring an inspector/utilizing our existing building inspector. "Double Duty."

Vice Chair Young: Very briefly, I would be speaking for Michael, who is not here to speak for himself anymore, but Michael was a person who believed in the preservation of native species. We are the city of Rhododendrons and I think we don't do enough to effectively save the native rhodies. People replant them, people plant other rhodies, but our native rhodies are part of what makes Florence, Florence, as Eric was talking about earlier. I think we need to figure out a way, particularly, to save and preserve (honoring Lisa's comments) and do it in a way that they will actually prosper. We can't cut everything around them and leave one. They're an understory shrub. We need to really work harder to

save our namesake native species. We are so blessed to have them. You just have to be nice to them and they'll be happy.

Commissioner Miller: I think that what Eric proposed, as far as having pre-site and post-site inspections is a great idea. A lot of the stuff that we're talking about could be better addressed if we had those types of inspections.

Commissioner Hauptman: This goes along with the enforcement that John was talking about, and Phil. Wendy and I talked about this in the past, about putting a value on various native vegetation. How much it's going to cost if somebody takes them down illegally; I think there was a situation where the area was clear cut and the penalty, I believe we assessed, was about five hundred (\$500.00) dollars a day, which was really chump changed compared to what the developers sold the logs for. I think we need to put some teeth in this, in the enforcement, and levy fines on the vegetations that we value and if they're illegally removed, they should be costly. And I believe, according to Wendy, that the county has some sort of tally sheet of sorts, assessing a certain value for particular types of vegetation. And we've got to enforce it.

Chairman Tarvin: We might add a three-word description. A fairly comprehensive schedule of values

Commissioner Kurth: I do like that there's a requirement for maintenance in the code, rather than just planting and forgetting about it. I thought I saw when I was reading through it that there was something in there about a timeline; if they clear it, they have to replant it if the lot is not developed. Those things are great and if we could just keep going with enforcement and maintenance.

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: There's a new type of machine being used these days that kind of scares me; it's this thing that goes in and it tears everything up. Then, when people are done, it's left looking pretty brutal and I didn't see anything in the code, somebody kind of mentioned this, but what the end result would be—that it shouldn't be left like that when it's visible. Maybe they should need to add... I think it's removal methods, and whether that causes more to the plant roots in the communities that we're trying to preserve... maybe that's what I'm trying to get at. It used to be, when we cleared, we'd go back through with a metal bladed weed-eater and it would be nice and flat and so then the slough would come up and it would be a cleaner cut. Those thrashers are ripping things and maybe it's not good to tell people that they have to clear a certain way, but I've been concerned about watching the plants get ripped and the stems getting ripped because I think there's more chance of disease when it regrows. The option would be to require some sort of organic fertilizer or compost to put on afterwards, was what I was thinking, if you were going to mow it down. But maybe they don't want it to grow, I don't know. Like the LCC; there was a point to clearing it all, but maybe they could encourage it to grow with fertilizer or something, in a nice, slow state.

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: What Lisa said about protecting the soils, I think that's the big thing for any kind of regeneration. You've got to protect your soils and heavy equipment just tears it up, especially on these dune sands that we have. I just wanted to shout out to that; wanting to protect these soils, as well as the original water flows that we're not really changing. There's an awareness of how the water's flowing through and that's incorporated into the plan, so it's not eliminating water flow, or redirecting it somewhere that it shouldn't be going. I think that's something we want to do, maybe something with the inspection process will tighten up what's happening. I agree that we should be doing work to protect the soils and the water flows. I also wanted to support Commissioner Kurth's

point about timelines. One of the things that's really bothered me is seeing some of these properties that have been cleared and opened up, and they're now basically farms for scotch broom. It's been open land for long enough, that the scotch broom has grown up for a year or two, and we now have a weed problem that's spreading that we didn't need to have. So, I don't know why there was such a time delay for the properties I've seen around town, I'm not very connected yet, but I do see that being an issue. I can think of a spot across from Fred Meyer that for a while, had a sign in front of it that said: "Land Use Pending," and it still had all of these scotch brooms growing behind it. I was kind of wondering, "Why are we still approving this if we're not taking care of the land, and they're starting to grow weeds instead of whatever building they were planning to put there?" I think that was mentioned earlier.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: I'm in solution mode now, but in FTC 4.6.3 A2, it states, "...Removing native vegetation from any parcel for which a valid permit (building permit) has not been issued..." So, I'm a little unclear on that. I know I've spoken with Wendy on this before, but what's coming to mind is there was a church that wanted to remove some vegetation, and they don't have a current building permit, because they didn't plan on it, so they have a forest instead of a lawn for example. So, I guess if we're looking at the code itself, I'm a little unclear on it. So, let's say I want to do something besides having trees that might blow onto my storage units; so, maybe a little more clarification... So, I guess what I'm trying to say is elaborate more on that code section. Thank you.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Three of the other items on my list have already been said by others, so I'm not going to repeat those. I'll say, with regard to the code, is there are items in the definitions that are not used within the code and there are words in the code that are not defined. So, we need to know what tree felling is, and what's been using it somewhere, and then what's removing? Removing is not defined, but clearing is defined. And it includes "remove," and it's... The definitions need to match the sections in code to help staff out. I didn't include 4th Avenue as an example in your packet, but it went into great length to try to explain within the staff report, to the applicant, what I understood this application to include and not include and that really could've just been clearer, if the code had been clearer. That's the only item that I have left on my list, so my list is now exhausted. Thank you.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, for our final round, you all have exhausted my list completely. So, I will pass to Commissioner Murphy, if he has anything additional.

Commissioner Murphey: I just have a comment to go along with Lisa, Eric and Sandy. It depends on what we issue of vegetation clearing permit for; issuing a permit for safety reasons, or to stop non-recreational campers from being in there. We need to figure out, like they say, a better way to cut it, and leave the natural vegetation one or two feet tall. The natural rhododendrons will grow and bush out, instead of getting tall. Soon, I think we ought to determine what we're giving the permit for, and then have different clearing limitations, if it's just for safety.

Vice Chair Young: This one is code related. We're talking about 4.6.4 C1; Section C are the criteria for approval, and 1 is extremely broad. You could very easily drive a clear cut through it. And we really need to revise that, perhaps more along the order of what John's talking about; dividing it into sectors, for safety, for this, for that. But, right now, it's so wide open that it would be hard to be very protective of vegetation under those criteria. It's way too broad.

Commissioner Miller: I don't really have anything to add at this point. A lot of good points have been made.

Commissioner Hauptman: I really think John hit on something regarding the various types of clearing permits that we issue. I think we should subdivide those a bit. That makes a lot of sense, so that we're able to kind of go in before, take a look, see what needs to be done, and then follow up afterwards for the specific purpose of the reason that the property is being cleared. I feel like we really need to break it down and subdivide the permits.

Commissioner Kurth: I think the last thing would just be that while the permitting requirements are great, if we have people moving into town that don't know what our native vegetation is, and what the permitting requirements are, just maybe making very clear to new residents what is and is not allowed without a permit as well as what is and is not native. That would be the last thing I have.

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: I had that, and I'm not sure if this is this part of the code deals with this, but as on the other side of watching a lot of development going in and being part of the design for the landscaping. It seems like the preservation credit isn't... it's ambiguous and it changes, and I'd like to see it more standardized, and possibly given more weight. Maybe that would help with preserving communities of rhododendrons and manzanita. Manzanita is amazing, and groupings of plants. So, I'm just not sure where the vegetation preservation credit, if it was more standardized, so it gave people more incentive. There's nothing in the code that talks about spraying herbicides, which impacts clearings, and I'm not sure where that should go with this, but that part of vegetation removal is spraying. So, I wasn't sure if we should have that in there. That was it.

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: I've got more, but I'll only do two. One of them is standards that we need to specify when we say "revegetate," ... to what degree? That goes with the inspection, I guess, some of that will have to be hammered out. The other part of that is, along with the landscape preservation, there's a time element that we need to keep in mind; that we can replant the trees, but it will take a long time for them to come up, or, we could leave them there and develop around them, and then you've saved yourself 40 (forty), 50 (fifty), 100 (a hundred) years, I don't know. The idea of having some sort of standard, that we need to agree on and then the idea of including the time in that standard as well. Then my second thing, was echoing some of what we've heard before about just the importance of communication and clarity. I'd like to just call out that somewhere in the code, maybe we can build some connections between the developer... to enforce the communication, as well as enforcing the action; that we have communication from the developer, through the city commission, through the various city committees, to the builders on the ground that are building the machines and working the structure and to the residents through signage or whatever. The communication and clarity of communication is going to resolve 70% (seventy percent) percent of this. So, standards of some sort and communication all the way through the process. I didn't really see either of those in the code, particularly.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: I don't really have more to contribute, I have answers for some of these, so I'm just going to go onto the next question when it's ready. Thank you.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: I'm kind of like Roxanne; I could chirp on about things people have asked, and provide some clarity for you, but that's not the purpose of this, so... There's a ton of stuff that needs to

be done in this code so I guess I will say that while there are criteria in the code, the necessity to remove, which Sandy has said is extremely vague, agreed, you could just say the latest craze right now is everybody wants to clear it so that the homeless don't have camps there. So just about everything you see that's being cleared, that's the reason for it. And then there's other things related to drainage and stuff, but what I'm trying to get with this is that what this code needs are criteria, like the real criteria that have conditions assigned to them. What you're seeing presently in the ones that were in the packet, is the conditions are just a lot of times, things that staff tries to find ways to mitigate a circumstance, but that's not really a type two (2) staff review kind of thing. That's more of a Planning Commission kind of thing. So... really, super clear criteria within the code, so that it can continue to be a type two (2) process, which is a staff review, if that's important. There are simply not enough criteria in this code. That concludes my comments. And I'll mention that we had several questions, but the way that people chose to answer this first question, really have nailed down some of the other questions, so we won't have as many questions, as I had listed out.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, so we will go ahead and move on to the modified question list.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: So, my next question for everybody is kind of a devil's advocate question, if you will... How can we think about the code changes, from a developer's or the owner's or the applicant's perspective? So, we all know what we need on our end... what do you think that they need on their end? What kinds of things should we be considering for a code update, as it relates to a developer's or an owner's perspective? We'll take a few minutes for everybody to jot down an idea and so for this round, just think about like two things that are the most important, that you think that we should be thinking about with regard to code changes from a developer's, owner's, or applicant's perspective.

THREE MINUTE TIMER ELAPSES

Wendy FarleyCampbell: So, the time is complete, and I would like to mention something that... So, Alan is kind of in the wings of watching how all of this is going down, and he's recommended that someone think about... if you would like, go ahead and type in the chat your comments and then Peighton can copy and paste them. That doesn't mean you won't still verbalize them, but that would save Peighton some time perhaps, in having to retype everything that is being said. So, you don't have to do that, you can just say it, but if you would like, you are more than welcome to pull up your chat bar in the GoTo Webinar, and type your answer to either everyone, or to Peighton, and then when your turn comes up, you will still verbalize it, and she can just copy and paste it.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, I'll start and Peighton I'll go ahead and verbalize it and I'll give you a shortened version of it. Coming from where I came from, we only had a couple of species of trees left, and it was easy for us to save them. I had a hard time understanding why the developers wished to come in and essentially clear cut the lots. I've come to find out that for the most part, it seems that first, it seems, they want to minimize move-ins, and I want to pay a subcontractor once, and I want to get it all done the first time. Second thing, is they want to maximize their profits from wood, timber, and/or pulp. So, the thing to type down, Peighton, is that we need to realize that there is little or no economic motive for developers to do any preservation, whatsoever. Okay, that sounds good, we'll move on to Commissioner Murphy.

Commissioner Murphy: Are we going to have more than one round on this one, or do you want both of mine at once?

Chairman Tarvin: Let's take both of yours at once.

Commissioner Murphey: Okay, I'd like to see us figure out how to use more natural vegetation for storm water runoff, like we did on Mr. Farnsworth's project, and I believe that would help developers and contractors with costs, that have to put in swales, if we can use natural vegetation. The other is just more concise code, what the can and cant's are, and that they clearly understand what they can do and more strict ramifications if they don't. That's it.

Vice Chair Young: I'm sorry, I think I'll pass right at this minute, and maybe I can come in at the end.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, we'll come back to you. Commissioner Miller?

Commissioner Miller: This has been touched on before, but I think what they'd be looking for is clarity. They want to know what is expected of them, you know a clear view of what they need to do. I think that's the most important thing that they're looking for.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, would you have any secondaries you'd like to cover on this current round?

Commissioner Miller: No, I'm good.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Commissioner Hauptman?

Commissioner Hauptman: I just have to mention, I have another zoom meeting to attend in a few minutes, so I just want to say, I'd love to see maybe this group get together again in an in-person situation now that the COVID rules seem to be relaxing. I think this is an area where we really need to get a lot of input. We've got an excellent panel here, so I want to take advantage of that. So, again, I would love to see a subsequent meeting of the same folks so we can carry this on a little bit. So, I have to go, thank you.

Commissioner Kurth: Sorry Peighton, I was trying to type it up to send it to you. I think, like I mentioned with the last question, and kind of touching on what Commissioner Murphy said about the bio-swells and vegetation for storm water run-off, just really clearly written definitions and codes for those of our residents that are moving in from out of town. Storm water management, as someone who lives in Arizona, where it doesn't rain, is going to be completely different than here. So, just... I guess that's what you're asking for, is more clarity, but I think that's exactly what we need... more clarity, regarding the criteria and the definitions to people, as if they're moving from out of town, and really have no idea about the rain situation or the storm water situation is like here. We can all agree that scotch broom is obnoxious, but someone from out of town might think it looks nice and they might not know.

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: I just wanted to add onto you, Commissioner Kurth, that I have people come in all the time in the spring, into the nursery and they go, "What's that beautiful yellow plant? I want to buy it, it's so pretty!" Because they just moved here from Arizona, so yes, people don't know about that plant. I think my biggest takeaway as being that I am on the other side quite a bit, I've

listened to the developers talk about the process time and again about how we have the most stringent process code and development planning on the coast, and that it's confusing to people. Showing up, I'd love to see more clarity on what has to happen. There are people who clear, and who do a good job, there are people who clear who just annihilate things, so I think if there's clarity, and if there's consequences, it helps everybody play in the same ball game. So, clarity, and the process... I am worried about having additional staff requirements to look at sites, judge them, and then come back with recommendations. You're adding \$1,000.00 (a thousand dollars) to each process with that requirement, and also delaying things for another month. And I think we should be careful about... there might be a better way, we could maybe look at vegetation ahead of time, identify key areas, EMAC has talked about that, important plant communities... instead of making people have staff go out to look at sites before and after. I'm just worried about the costs and the delays.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, anything else, or did you want to hold on until another round?

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: I'm fine.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Roxanne and I will chime in.

Chairman Tarvin: We have to get to Eric and Commissioner Young, also.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Yeah, I misunderstood; you were just asking Lisa if she had anything left.

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: I'm throwing my comments in the chat, so they can be grabbed there.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, we'll tail back to Commissioner Young, would you like to add anything?

Commissioner Young: Well, I guess all was when we were talking about the code changes from the developers' point of view, the home owners' point of view, we need to be looking at the costs of those and the time required to do them. And not that we shouldn't do them, if they have a cost or a time, it's just we should work to minimize the cost and the time to the extent that we can, while we're doing code changes that work to address all the concerns that we talked about earlier tonight. It's a hard mix sometimes to do that, but I think it's important. It makes the code changes more acceptable, if we can make them reasonable in cost and time. Not all is possible.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: I have pulled up 10 FCC 10.34.2.2, which talks about native vegetation, and it's nice in the codes when we go to do the... and this isn't the question, the question is "What would the developer think?" But, if they do have to go through and give their findings on anything, it's nice to have a comment somewhere in the codes, linking related codes. And, sometimes we have that and sometimes we don't. So, 10.34.2.2 links very well with Title 4, Chapters 7 (seven) or 6 (six) or whatever we were looking at tonight, so it gives some more clarity on preservation of natural, or native vegetation. So, cross-referencing the code, it'll help the developer as well.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: I've put a couple of things in the chat. Just wondering what a reasonable time frame is for requiring replanting, if they don't act on a development, so staff just takes a stab... Commissioner Kurth mentioned it and said she'd seen it—well, not in the code, it's in our findings. We just establish a time frame for replanting because the applicants never do, because if it was up to them, they would never replant and just let it sit. What a surveying purposes mean, that was the other

one. Every developer out there will say that they can't get in there to survey, and I have to admit, there have been some that have been very, very dense, but not being familiar with the surveying process... I don't really know... You know, they get out there with all of their surveying equipment and their lasers and all kinds of stuff now. Technology is different than what it was, back in the day when this code was probably written. So, I think that making sure that our codes are implementing whatever technology is in effect presently for surveying purposes. I guess I just feel like they're blowing smoke most of the time, so I don't... I've never had a surveyor saying that they can't get in there... It's like, "Hey, I can't get in there, I need someone to clear this before I can go in to survey this area." Maybe it's true, but they have not said it to us.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: It's true, we don't have any of the local folks saying they can't get in there.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Another thing, just developer-wise, from thinking from the developer's perspective, well the answer is that the applicant assumes responsibility but a common theme that we're starting to hear is that, "Well, my contractor has cleared it," and they put the blame on their contractor. My answer is, well, you're the applicant, you're the owner, and so you're the responsible party but should there be penalties for a contractor who violates... should it be double-duty? Double penalize? Like, some of the penalties in 4.6.6 D just really don't apply to anybody. I mean, nobody is getting a building permit, nobody's got a business license, there's no building inspections, so none of that even applies to them when they're clearing for speculative purposes, or for avoiding the homeless camp issues... so, there need to be penalties that can be applied across the multiple different types... not so much from a developer's perspective; they wouldn't want any penalties. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Lisa, did you have something that you wanted to add?

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: Wendy said it; when I see the biggest problems on jobs, it's because, "Oh, I didn't know, I didn't know," You have some engineer or a developer from out of town, that's been dealing with the city and then they just send people out. I think that if I know I can lose my license because I've done something that is against code, I won't do it. So, I think we should hold subcontractors accountable and if they know that there are certain regulations, then they will be more careful and do more that is required of them.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, would anyone like a second round on this issue?

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: I just wanted to verbalize one of my comments, if I may. Actually, I'd like to do 2 (two). From the contractors' perspective, as was said earlier, I think the idea of having a point of contact and knowing how to access code and where to find it and who to contact if they have any questions, I think that's got to be way up front. Along with that, some expected timelines in the code would be important. The comment I had, had to deal with kind of pushing back on the contractor a little bit, and asking the contractor to consider—this could be done through incentive, or we could find some other ways—but, to consider multiple functions, within their development; that its serving other goals the city is trying to accomplish and just kind of considering the purpose. And really trying to maximize that, we can stack purposes and we can, perhaps, a development that stacks 3 (three), or 4 (four), or 5 (five) purposes might get more priority than one that has just a single purpose. I think that is something we can think about. The other comment on that, is that we do have some ability to

choose who we do business with. The contractors are there, but those aren't the only people that are there, and we can choose contractors that are more benevolent, or that use better practices. We can choose not to use people that, for whatever reason, have in the past or through their work, have shown that they're not someone that we would want to have developing. Just kind of keeping that from the business perspective, you get to choose your customers a little bit. Now, granted we are a city, so I just wanted to keep that idea that... who are we recruiting to do our development? Depending on what we would like to have happen, then that can change. It's not a fixed population; that's an international group; some people have wealth, some don't, they have different purposes. As we try to write the code, we need to keep in mind that some developers will be wealthy and some home owners that are developing will not be. That's all I wanted to... just a reminder that there's a diversity out there, and to keep the diversity in mind as we write these codes.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, any follow up from any of the staff on this question, Wendy?

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnson: I kind of just did some answering in the comments; it's important to know our process, in a way, but maybe it's not so important. But yeah, we try and educate the contractors that are here. They are fairly aware of what is going on, and I think lately there's been a big magnifying glass on cutting the whole vegetation clearing permits and whatnot; which have helped, sometimes accidents make for a really good learning experience and the word gets out in the community, so... anyway, I could just go down a rabbit hole, so I'm going to stop.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, I do have one question, Wendy, for some clarification for me, and this is going for when I think we'll meet as a subcommittee for my discussion with them: Is our jurisdiction in the practice of requiring any conditions of approval to be incorporated on the permits, instead of drawings?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: So, there are times when we require a revised set, you know, a revised signing plan or clearing plan; I did that for 4th (Fourth) Avenue most recently, but it's not... it's typed into the findings. That's where the conditions live.

Chairman Tarvin: I've dealt with a lot of jurisdictions, mostly throughout the sunbelt, that seem to be—and it works very well for them—say, for instance, we get a conditional use permit, and it would have conditions attached to it, and the jurisdictions would require those to be on their own sheet as a part of the permit plans that were being looked at by the contractor and all of the subcontractors. So, there was no excuse not to know that they were supposed to clear this tree or that tree, when we're talking about vegetation. It goes to all things in the conditions... and it just sounds like we don't and basically, it's a plan sheet that has a bunch of 8 ½ (eight and a half) by 11 (eleven) copies on it... of the final findings and the resolution.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: You bring up a great point, I've seen how Lane County does their application process and they've got a set of findings, which is a whole bunch of yak, but then they've got a cover sheet that says, "Here's your approval," and it's like, boom, boom, boom, you know. Number one, number two, number three, number four, so they don't have to fish for it...

Chairman Tarvin: And it also eliminates the... you know when they have that, they can make all the excuses they want about, "...my contractor did it," or this, that, or the other. But there is no excuse. You developed the permit plan that has all of the conditions in it... Okay, that's the clarification I was

looking at to try to build on when we start our subcommittee introductions. Let's go ahead and move on to any more questions that you might have?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: I think it's time for a brief break, but I guess I would just say a speed round; if there is anything that is just burning up and you have not had the chance to say it, that needs to get added to the list.

Chairman Tarvin: Take 10 (ten) minutes, and then we'll come back at about 7:18 (seven eighteen) – 7:20 (seven twenty).

TEN MINUTE TIMER ELAPSES

Wendy Farley Campbell: Alright, so our ten-minute break is up, and it looks like we're just waiting on Andrew and Sandy to rejoin us.

Chairman Tarvin: Wendy, did you want to move on with one final little lightening round on this?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Yeah, it's just if anyone had anything that just didn't get said, that they really need to say and want to say. Certainly, anybody specifically that's not in the subcommittee; the subcommittee will have time to brainstorm amongst themselves, as well as come up with additional items. Not to discourage anyone from participating, but... you know.

Chairman Tarvin: And at some point, I'd like to get together with our EMAC companions and kind of set up how we'd like to meet, and structure ourselves and look at what kind of goals or what kind of incremental we'd like to set. Eric or Lisa, which one of you should I get in contact with first?

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: You can get ahold of me. Wendy will send you my contact information.

Chairman Tarvin: If I can get an email address for both of you from Wendy, then we can start our own little chat on the side there. I can start tomorrow morning, or next week. How are your guys' schedules configured for starting the process?

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: I'm leading another meeting tomorrow, so...

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: What are you asking?

Chairman Tarvin: If you're available to at least start a little bit of dialogue, via email, or if you want to hold off until you get a couple of other projects done first?

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: I'm pretty busy, but you can start the email. As long as I get a little bit of time to respond, I'll do good.

Chairman Tarvin: Like I said, it won't be anything highly structured, a day or a week is all the same for us. We're going to be talking about this for quite some time, I think.

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: Yeah, I work so-so, and Eric is on a few committees, so a lot of times, they do stuff on the weekends.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, I'll kind of structure the schedule around the understanding that it might be until the weekend before you actually get time to sit down and think about something. We'll try to have a Monday morning email response query or something like that. So, with that, Wendy, is the staff ready for me to start this round?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Yes, go ahead.

Chairman Tarvin: If there's anything that you'd like to add or get out there immediately, then let's go ahead and do that and get our last thoughts on all these issues and kind of wrap it up. I'll start with Commissioner Young, if you have any final thoughts.

Commissioner Young: No, I think not.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Lisa, anything from you that you would like to add?

EMAC Member Lisa Walter-Sedlacek: It was just more structural, that I felt the native vegetation should be listed in Latin and the list should be more comprehensive, and there's some misspellings there.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Eric, any of your parting thoughts?

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: My last thought, I threw it on the chat there, was the idea of... are we doing anything to train the contractors, or are we requiring any kind of training? And then the other one was... are there any requirements for when we revegetate; when we have the revegetation come in, is there any source requirement that it be local vegetation, or is it coming in from Pennsylvania, or Costa Rica or wherever it's coming from? Those are the only two ideas that come to mind.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, sounds good. Do we have that note being taken?

EMAC Member Eric Oshel: Do we have any skills or a knowledge requirement?

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, we can go ahead and save that comment; Commissioner Murphey, any parting thoughts from you?

Commissioner Murphey: No.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, moving on to Commissioner Kurth...

Commissioner Kurth: On Wendy's comment about the contractors, I would be in support of tying some of the penalties to the contractors; they're licensed in the city, so they should know what's expected of them. And then also, with the revegetation that I brought up, I'm sorry, I guess it wasn't in the codes but I guess just finding some sort of balance with the revegetation. I think it's still a good idea to put it in there, but not overwhelming the staff; so, maybe have... if they've cleared more than half a lot, then they have to revegetate, like if building permits aren't pulled, or tying it to the building permit. So, it's

like if building permits have expired, within you know, 180 (one hundred and eighty) days, or one year from the expiration, they need to start revegetating. Maybe something like that, I guess, those are my comments.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Commissioner Miller, any parting thoughts?

Commissioner Miller: No, I don't have anything else to add.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, and then we will rotate to staff to get any final comments?

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnson: I have none, thank you.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: I've got a couple that... the 30 (thirty) day timeline is just simply... we can't need it. Maybe it can be needed with better requirements, and a better code, to make the resulting conditions document easier. But, with the 14 (fourteen) day notice period, the review period, it's tough to make the 30 (thirty) days. I'm not saying that it isn't doable, but if we're super busy, it's not doable. Which, that's where we're at right now. Right now, we're about 60 (sixty) days out and so far, nobody has filed to (*unintelligible*). It's not achievable. So, what that means, Peighton is that the 30 (thirty) day processing timeline... we need something else, it needs a different process. Especially if it says that the Planning Commission can call it up, then we really can't make the 30 (thirty) days. I guess that's it... that's the one burning thing, the timeline.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, well unless I'm missing anything, I think we can close this item out. I thank everyone for participating, and I look forward to working with you on the other committee and getting a good rework of this code, so that we have something that's more manageable and communicates better about what it is. I thank you all for that, and with that, we'll go ahead and move on to our next item if that's okay.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Thank you, Lisa and Eric, the next item has to do with buildings, so thank you for joining us.

Chairman Tarvin: The second item on our agenda is Commercial/Industrial Metal Building Architecture Alternatives. I will be presenting a little bit of research done to date, and have some questions for you about how we might wish to move on. We'll kind of streamline this, just with the time that we've taken so far; if we could pull up that first slide, it would be appreciated...

Wendy FarleyCampbell: What first slide, which would you like pulled up?

Chairman Tarvin: This would be 10.6.5.1, the general criteria. So, when we put this item on our task list-- the original task and I think our base task-- is to add some steel structure or metal building specific architectural details that we can add to the list. That will show up on the next page, but the first thing we have is general, non-residential development criteria. I pulled a few items in, that have something to do with this metal building issue and they are first, architectural quality and appearance and also colored buildings, materials, and external appearance. Kind of subjective criteria, not really a whole lot of definition in there. The last item I highlighted in this, is something I'm going to harp on, probably to a revolution by the Commission. Bonds are in our per-view under the design review stat codes, and also that shows up in the CUP's, I believe. I think this is a tool, in a lot of cases, across a lot of issues we

ought to start to look at using, somewhat. It adds some incentive to comply with the conditions of approval that we set down. If we could pull up the non-residential time requirements page... downtown architectural would be great. As far as metal buildings, in particular, concern... the only place they're given any real attention is indirectly in the downtown architectural design standards. Pretty much, that steel or metal siding, or vinyl siding is not permitted. It doesn't stop you from doing a steel structure with other cladding on it, but it's still quite sparse on anything with metal buildings. When we get to what's next, only particular to Main Street and Old Town developments. All the other districts have a common criterion, which is even more sparse than this. That is the item that we are probably going to be improving, is the list of 6 (six) items that the contractor needs to choose 3 (three) of, to put on his/her buildings. We can skip past that sheet for non-residential, and the next code excerpt, is just in the interest of speed and move on to the pictures, if we could.

SHOWING 'METAL BUILDING FACADES'

Chairman Tarvin: So, the first picture is of two metal buildings, both have metal siding, one on top is usually what we see with a "Plain Jane" metal building, complete with the ballers and no windows. Down below, is something just a little bit more improved. When I was getting these stock photos from a lot of the steel building manufacturers and builders, something came to light. One of the two things that look more traditional seem to be multiple roof lines, or staggered roof lines, or some type of elevation changes and eaves that extend out at least a foot or so from the building. A number of the gentlemen that I talked to said that it's amazing how much just putting eaves on a building improves its appearance, and makes it more palatable. We'll move on to the next picture...

PICTURE OF BUILDING WITH DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Chairman Tarvin: This is kind of an example of the staggered roof lines (*unintelligible*). One more slide forward, please.

PICTURE OF BUILDING WITH DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Chairman Tarvin: Same concept, but it's got a pretty good pitched roof, more like what we call out for minimums and maximums in the downtown zone. Nice brick work around it. All of these things are very common now in metal building... even the siding kind of mimics a board and batten kind of deal. Next slide...

PICTURE OF BUILDING WITH DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Chairman Tarvin: I like these examples in that, one thing I was informed about was is that, it used to be that siding and cladding, as they call it, was unidirectional. It was always oriented vertically. Now, there's a lot of choices in cladding that is horizontal only, or really coming forward, is a lot of cladding which can be used both horizontally and vertically, because of the space. Final picture...

PICTURE OF BUILDING WITH DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Chairman Tarvin: And then we'll get to the input that I'm trying to from you folks. This is just another variation of that, with what's called a box beam, which kind of gives you the idea of the plank siding that you'd have traditionally on things. The range of what can be done with these metal buildings is

quite amazing, nowadays. I'm not suggesting that we start telling them that they've got to do all of these things, but I'm trying to work out the basics of this first. I think there's a lot of areas in town, commercial areas, etc. that we really don't have much interest in pinning on what the buildings should look like; an old standard metal building is just as good as anything else. But, perhaps, should we look at improving the state-of-the-art of the appearance? Maybe not district-wide, but perhaps, say on particular streets, should anything in any district that faces Highway 101 (one-o-one), or a gateway area, like on Highway 126 (one twenty-six), or maybe some other selected streets or roads. Is the Commission interested in improving and having some more regulation on what those buildings look like in those areas, as opposed to just whole-fail throughout the city? I'll first ask Commissioner Young if either one of the two is of interest, or if we don't care about metal buildings too much at all...

Commissioner Young: Oh, we care. Yes, I think certainly on any place that is visible to the traveling public on Highways 126 (one twenty-six) and 101 (one-o-one), absolutely. The airport business park used to have standards, and the Council removed them, I think a couple of years ago. They used to require a wood siding on the front of the buildings and then the council removed that. You know, and that's why the buildings out there, they're not necessarily lovely, but they're better than they would be if they were just, what's called "butler buildings," where I'm from. So, I think anything we can do like this, to make a metal building more attractive, without causing a structural issue, such as the people at Driftwood Shores said would happen if they put wood over the metal siding, and these don't do that. I think any of that sort of stuff that we can do, at least in those places, and maybe anywhere, would be great. I mean, as Eric said earlier, you know, we have tried. We, the city, care about how we look and how we are perceived and everything that we do builds on that.

Chairman Tarvin: So, you would support having something that was an improvement, at least in select areas?

Commissioner Young: Well, certainly in select areas, and maybe in all commercial and industrial areas. But certainly, in select areas, absolutely.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay. John, how about you, as far as your opinion on metal buildings?

Commissioner Murphey: You know, first I'll touch on your vinyl siding really quick. Vinyl siding, to me, is every bit as attractive as cement fiber. Vinyl is a great product and weathers well on the coast. And as far as the steel siding, I truly believe that they meet the architectural guidelines with the trim and the setbacks and everything. I have seen some really attractive metal buildings that have the horizontal siding now, and they break it up with that vertical that looks like board and batten and I think it's something we ought to look at. But we need to be strict with our architectural guidelines and maybe, you know we've got to require a certain type of trim, overhang, and you know, the finer features of the building need to meet the rest of our guidelines.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, how would you feel about how broad of coverage that should or shouldn't be?

Commissioner Murphey: I think that's something we'll have to meet and talk about in person, so we all get on the same page. I'm pretty liberal as far as what zones we can do this in, as long as it meets the architectural guidelines. Like, there's nothing wrong with the appearance of that building on the screen now, nothing. And steel sighting is a good fit for the Oregon coast.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Commissioner Kurth, on the question of, “Should it be universal through all districts, or should we target certain areas?”

Commissioner Kurth: Well, I definitely have an interest in the metal buildings and architectural design. I don’t know that universal is necessarily the way go... but definitely looking at different districts and what we can require for different places, for sure. And I liked on one of these first couple of slides, that said to pick three; we give them plenty of options, there shouldn’t be any reason to complain too much about these additional requirements; if we can make it a little more appealing with a low maintenance architecture, versus a lot of landscaping requirements, it might be a really good compromise for a lot of people, too, or at least for some people.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Commissioner Miller?

Commissioner Miller: I think I would support some architectural design requirements in all areas. I mean, maybe we require more in the gateway areas than we do in other areas; but I would like to see some requirements in all areas.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, you’d like to see the state-of-the-art come up all over the place?

Commissioner Miller: Sure, I’d like to see that. I agree with Commissioner Young that we care about what our city looks like and we want to make it look as nice as we can.

Chairman Tarvin: Yeah, and that’s the ideas I’m trying to get; I think certainly, we can come up with incremental as called for, for a particular location. Certainly, we can apply some certain minimum standards. Before I move on, Wendy, is there anything you’d like to add?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: I like the ideas you’ve found for the cladding variety, I hadn’t seen that, and some certain window groupings; some people have said, “Oh, we don’t want windows, you know with people breaking in, it’s a metal building for whatever...” So, that one that is on the screen, even if it was just one panel deep, people aren’t going to be calling a lot out, even if they did break into... I mean it’s a smaller grouping, so I think the concern is less. The box beam... yeah... those are some great alternatives and I think the goal of this was to try and find some good alternatives for metal buildings, because they can’t meet the standards in 10.6 that are there; the way that we rope 10.6 is it applies to all buildings, commercial or industrial. And those don’t typically—the ones that are listed there—don’t typically work with industrial styled buildings. They require a 6 (six) foot off-set, the one you’re looking at on the screen, maybe is 6 (six) feet, but it looks to me to be more like 4 (four) or 5 (five) feet; and different eave depths, stuff like that. I think a lot of the concerns could be resolved with the metal buildings, if the people would just consult before they order them. And I think that’s the problem that’s come up the most recently, is that they don’t look at what the code requirements are, they just see something that’s on sale and they order it; so, therein creates the problem, with like putting clad on it. Two of the three industrial districts require cladding on the street side, that’s different than metal, so I would encourage folks to look at 10.31 and 10.28. Those industrial structures are required...they have standards within there, that the problem is that they still need to go through 10.6, which is the hiccup. So, we’re hoping to have something where industrial buildings will do something different than what’s in 10.6 and incorporate something that is also in their respective code sections, if that applies. Definitely agree, we want to put metal buildings on the same playing field as commercial buildings on

Highway 101 (one-o-one), so if you've got 101 (one-o-one), you know, buildings going in and somebody's doing a site-built structure that's lap (?) or something, you don't want to have less standards for a metal building. So, there needs to be something that's comparable. We don't want people putting up metal buildings just because then, they can do less. So, I definitely think all of the... pretty much any district, whether you're on the highway or even if you're not. If you're in those districts, "when in Rome," you know, you're held to the same standards with what you can do with the type of structure, so... Those are my comments.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, yeah, to backtrack a little bit on structural and utilization of a typical project like lap siding, most of the manufacturers that I contacted said that anything is possible, anything can be warrantied, you can put wood siding on, you can put caulk on, you can do whatever you want. But it also is kind of... you've got to do it before building and you have to make these things known because if the building is designed to have straight, metal ribbed siding on it, indeed it's no easy matter to put wood siding on it afterwards. It is difficult, but they of course, are promoting their metal buildings/metal products, specific, because a metal structure is built and put together a different way than your stick-built house. The studs go sideways, and the cladding is basically hung from the building, whereas a piece of siding is part of the structural integrity for a stick-built construction. My next question is: Would it be palatable to give the option to, in addition to those 6 (six), of some type of specific treatment or styles of metal cladding? Maybe have at least one direction change specified; I think in that area of six, especially metal buildings, I wonder if it would be good to have a mix of options and also 1 (one), 2 (two), or 3 (three) items that are mandatory that they have to do. And then, maybe two of the other balances of options. John?

Commissioner Murphey: Yes, I think we could have options; for an example, in my opinion, on Kingwood, the Love Tennis building, you know the two-story tennis club, where they play tennis? That building, to me, looks really "dorky," when you can drive by and see the metal on the sides, and plain 1-11 (one eleven) siding on the front. To me, the combination of vertical and horizontal metal on that building, with maybe some windows up high or even little imitation bay windows that you see on some buildings... they put a fake window up and hang curtains in it and stuff... that would look much better to me than with just all vertical T-1-11 siding

Chairman Tarvin: Well, you brought up something with the fake window, I just can't help myself, I would love to see one of my fake windows, where we have the skeleton in the window, waving at the public as they drove by

Commissioner Murphey: We have that building down on Bay Street, that the Goldstein's own, that has those types of windows in the upper-part portion of it.

Chairman Tarvin: I don't think we want to open up the... first of all, there's not much building opportunity on Old Town, Bay Street, etc. I don't know that we'd want to change any of that down there, but I think opening up options for all metal as long as it meets certain criteria and aesthetic look, and we can get examples of it somehow, that might be the way to go. Quick round of comments on... can we, or should we, look at going with metal building specific materials, but with a good aesthetic appeal, or should we want to incorporate, at least on the facing of the highways, etc. and the important (*unintelligible*) still having real, old fashioned building materials... Sandra?

Commissioner Young: I certainly don't think we want metal buildings in the main street either, which is the area between the bridge and Highway 126 (one twenty-six) ... you know, we didn't work with ODOT and spend all that money to make that beautiful streetscape to just put metal buildings there. And probably not going around the corner, to the city limits on Highway 126 (one twenty-six), either. On other places, maybe, depending on the standards. You've done a lot of research, Phil, and you've come up with some really nice pictures here, and I'm sure this is only the tip of the iceberg. I'm sure they can do even more magical things, and it may be that as we move more north out of Main Street, into that next zone, we want fairly top standards and so on and so forth, depending on the uses. I don't know, I'm thinking out loud here. I don't know... but I don't think we want metal buildings, as you say, on Bay Street or Old Town, or not in what is the Main Street section between the bridge and Highway 126 (one twenty-six). It's supposed to be a Main Street, in the traditional "Main Street" image. And we may get there someday...

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, same idea to Commissioner Kurth?

Commissioner Kurth: I support having a conversation about coming up with a list of aesthetic standards to make the metal buildings doable. I mean, I think a lot of them look great, if we could come up with a list of criteria that is minimally difficult for property owners to come up with but that also has a good aesthetic appeal, I don't see a problem with it. I think it's a good conversation to have.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Commissioner Miller?

Commissioner Miller: Yes, I'm fine with the Old Town and Main Street districts, and I think we can be creative and have certain architectural designs that are attractive.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, Wendy, any thoughts?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: What specifically was your question, so I don't ramble?

Chairman Tarvin: If outside... and I think I agree with most everybody else on the panel, outside of Old Town and Main Street... to look at allowing them to put on steel building specific materials, rather than trying to incorporate more traditional, actual wood/board and batten and things like that; to be a little bit more flexible... of course, giving more pretty comprehensive guidance on what that would look like.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Yeah, the Main Street and Old Town districts wouldn't permit this type of structure, what you're looking at on the screen; so, I mean everywhere else is doable. I think something... an additional consideration would be... you've got primary structure, what about secondary structures that are on the same lot? And how do you address those... and how do you address other kinds of weird metal things that only have partial walls, or whatever? Just some additional considerations...

Chairman Tarvin: Alright, to that regard-- I think I've seen before, but I'm not positive—do we have some type of a minimum distance from back of the street where things are a lot laxer on the metal buildings? For instance, we've got the new Pro-Lumber development where in front, they have a very traditional looking building, but their steel building is still visible but it's back off of the street. Is that quantified, that distance off the street?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: It's not quantified; I can't remember how we addressed that... there was a loophole somewhere.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, well, that kind of gives me a flavor of the structure that I want to put together then, to put in front of you... John?

Commissioner Murphey: Well, just a comment that I've never mentioned before... and someday, I'd like to have a conversation about it. When we talk about our Main Street district from Highway 126 (one twenty-six) to the bridge, why don't we ever talk about how this district should be extended from Highway 126 (one twenty-six), say up to even 35th (thirty-fifth) Street because we have just as many people entering this city through the north, as we do the east and it's kind of "goofy" to have different architectural guidelines, at least to me, where you'd just stop and change them. Someday, we'll have a conversation about it.

Commissioner Young: There were reasons, John, and we can have a conversation about that later.

Commissioner Murphey: Yeah, but those reasons were 35-40 (thirty-five, forty) years ago when the city wasn't growing north so much.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, well if there's any other advice or things you'd like to pass off, but I think we'll move on to my next phase and start putting together some actual things to look at and start tearing them down, so that's all I have

Commissioner Murphey: Well, Phil, you might want to add in all metal buildings, they have to have a beer tap and a wine tap...

Chairman Tarvin: That's in 42.38 B, I think.

Commissioner Young: And we'll have dually-advertised Planning Commission meetings there, yes.

Chairman Tarvin: And my biggest problem right now, is that I can't find the last page of my script

Commissioner Young: Can I ask Wendy a question while you're looking for that, please?

Chairman Tarvin: Well, we'll include that in reports and discussion items, ask your question. That's where we're at right now Sandy, we... do any Commissioners have any reports or discussion items that they would like to discuss right now... Commissioner Young?

Commissioner Young: Alright, that works. Well, I was going to ask Wendy... I noticed on the agenda that I'm down for the sight design stuff... so, do you have a schedule for when you want that? And you and I should sit down and talk sometime about that, as well.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: For sure, so the particular item within the work plan was the one item, and there were subsets, that's why I included you; because you and Phil had the bulk of that item, and since yours is different than his.

Commissioner Young: I just didn't know if you had a schedule for when you wanted words from me.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: So, what you guys said is that this was your year one stuff, so I was hoping to get this done, or at least a chunk of it nailed down in the first year, so... I'm happy to meet with anyone.

Commissioner Young: I'll call you and we'll set up a meeting. Thank you.

Chairman Tarvin: Any more discussion items or anything you'd like to bring up? ... Okay, well seeing none, Wendy will go ahead and move towards conclusion with any report you'd like to give in our calendar.

Wendy Farley Campbell: Sure, so, report items; the City Council last night, the mayor did the appointments for the Stakeholder Advisory Team for the housing implementation plan, so Phil and Sandy, I believe, are the two Planning Commissioners representing on that committee so I'll check that. The first meeting for that will be around April 29 (twenty-ninth) or so, the last week in April will be the meeting for that committee. April 12 (twelfth) is the first meeting, in which the Planning Commission will start meeting back in person again here at City Hall. Commissioners that are interested in continuing to not be present will still be providing that opportunity for an indefinite period of time, so if you're not comfortable meeting in person, we will accommodate and make attending remote a possibility if you're interested in that. Yeah, Phil and Sandy are from the Commission, on that Commission on that (*unintelligible*) appointment. And I think that concludes my report and discussion items, unless someone has a question about anything in particular. Absent that, with regard to your calendar, we presently don't have anything that's complete for this month, March 22 (twenty-second) meeting, so if you have that meeting, it would be a work session, if you wanted to have a meeting. So, just let me know what your interests are and if you wanted to do another work session on a different topic, or on some of the same topics, absent that you would not be meeting. And then we'll certainly have some stuff ready to go by April 12th (twelfth), hopefully, anyway, if we get some of these developers to be complete.

Chairman Tarvin: Okay, I'll add some things. Anybody here still in attendance wish to have another work session on the 22nd (twenty-second)? Or would you like to wait until we can get together in person?

Commissioner Miller: I'd rather wait for in person.

Commissioner Murphey: I agree with that.

Chairman Tarvin: Commissioner Kurth?

Commissioner Kurth: I'm fine either way, whatever is best for everyone else. I'm certainly available on the 22nd (twenty-second), but either way.

Chairman Tarvin: Commissioner Young?

Commissioner Young: I'm just trying to make my mouse work; I've got too much junk on my desk. In-person is great. You know, this works, but in-person is better. Whatever works for your schedule Wendy, if that doesn't push things too far out for you.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: It's fine, you know, more time is always better. Getting a break to get some more stuff off of our plate. Obviously, our type one and type two load are extremely heavy compared to our type three load. The more time we have to not be building packets... and we have other work that needs to get done; there are work plan tasks that need to get done, so... it doesn't get done if we don't meet... we can be meeting as subcommittees and staff could be meeting to move those projects forward.

Commissioner Murphey: Wendy, do we need to revisit what is type two and type three, to take load off of your guys' plate possibly?

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Well, things have definitely shifted; in accordance with state code, all of the housing stuff moves to the lowest common denominator, with regard to process, so there's no opportunity to move housing to be more difficult, procedurally. The... which is a lot of overprocessing right now, for instance, we have an assisted living facility design review that we just got, that we'll be processing as a type two. It's like, wow... that's huge, you know?

Commissioner Young: There must be some kink in it, where you can kick it upstairs, there must be.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: We're looking as far as we can, let me tell you... They're residential, so that moves them into the two.

Commissioner Murphey: One other comment Wendy and Roxanne might know, but I got a phone call this week; if the contractors' numbers all come in within parameter, the cannery is ready to take off again.

Senior Planner Roxanne Johnston: I get an update every Friday from the guys from the cannery, they're excited to get started. And you saw the blurb about the three-mile prairie in the paper?

Commissioner Murphey: Those inexpensive houses there took a big jump.

Commissioner Young: They were talking about that development years ago, it's amazing.

Chairman Tarvin: Wendy, I didn't know if you overheard that we were going to be trading email addresses with the EMAC members through you here in the next few days, it seems.

Wendy FarleyCampbell: Yes, I'll facilitate that and send... here's everybody's email. I'll send it to you all so you have everyone's contact info.

Chairman Tarvin: Sounds good; with that, if there's no other discussion, I will now close the meeting at 8:13 PM (eight thirteen) and I thank you all.

The calendar: April 12, 2022 Meeting In-Person

April 29, 2022 Stakeholder Advisory Team Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 8:13 PM.

ATTEST: 

Phae Latta, Municipal Court Clerk



Phil Tarvin, Chairperson