

---

**City of Florence**  
**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**250 Hwy 101, Florence, OR 97439**  
**September 27, 2022**

---

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

Chair Young called the meeting to order at 5:31 PM.

Commissioners Present: IN HOUSE: Chair Sandra Young, Vice-Chair Andrew Miller, Commissioner Eric Hauptman, Commissioner Ron Miller, Commissioner Phil Tarvin  
Excused absence: Commissioner John Murphey

Staff Present: Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell. Assistant Planner Clare Kurth, Planning Technician Sharon Barker, Management Analyst Shirley Gray, Management Analyst Peighton Allen, Roxanne Johnston, contract Planner

At 5:31 PM, Chair Young opened the meeting, Barker gave the Roll call. Commissioner Tarvin led the flag salute.

**1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Start Time: 5:32PM

Action: Approved

Motion: Comm. Hauptman

Second: Ron Miller

Vote: 5-0

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

**2. Introduction of new Planning Commissioner Kevin Harris**

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: September 6, 2022**

Start Time: 5:34

Action: Approved

Motion: Comm Phil Tarvin

Second: Comm Andrew Miller

Vote: 5-0

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

No public Comments:

---

Vice Chair Young relayed basic instructions regarding the proceedings and asked if any member wished to disclose a conflict of interest, ex-parte contact, or biases and the right of the public to challenge any commissioner's ability to hear this matter.

Vice Chair Young asked the Commissioners if they would like to declare a conflict of interest, ex-parte contacts/communications, or bias. There were no declarations of conflicts of interest.

There were no ex-parte contacts declared: *Comm Tarvin declared that he did a site visit today.*

There were no bias declared.

No citizen present wished to challenge any Commissioner.

Vice Chair Young: 5<sup>th</sup> Item on the Agenda Public Hearing for Resolution PC 22 04 SIR2 01

**5. RESOLUTION PC 22 04 SIR2 01 – 56 Shoreline Dr. Phase II Site Investigation Report: PUBLIC HEARING Continued from September 6, 2022:** A Phase II Site Investigation Report (SIR) submitted by Todd Larsen related to slope stability in order to build a single-family residence at 56 Shoreline Drive for property shown on the Lane County Assessor's Map # 18-12-16-41, TL 00700; in the Low Density Residential (LDR) District regulated by Florence City Code Title 10, Chapters 10 and 7.

**Hearing resumed from 9/6/2022 at 5:42PM – September 27, 2022**

Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell presented the staff report. The first meeting for this item was held on September 6, 2022, staff presented the staff report and you heard the applicant's report and you heard testimony from one citizen who spoke to you a little bit about the rip rap. It was recommended at that meeting that the application be denied or that you continue the hearing to a date certain of so that the applicant's engineer could provide more information. The applicant requested that the PC allow the continuance, and applicant waived 120 days. The hearing resumed tonight and the Planning Commission will decide either to continue the hearing, or close, or deny.

FarleyCampbell presented an updated staff report, stating, "Because the hearing is still open you can receive information from the applicant or the public on the new evidence that has been provided to you." The type of hearing was explained and why: "The Commission is reviewing the site investigation report the Phase II application form that the applicant has provided. The responsibility for any risk and any future things that happen on this site it resides with the engineer not the with the City of Florence. If there is information that needs to be provided the Commission needs to bring that up." A site aerial was displayed on the screen and explained: "The site is the Southern part of Shelter Cove subdivision with the Siuslaw River on the West side of the lot." Multiple drone images were shown demonstrating slope failure. FarleyCampbell explained that the slope failure is happening about 50' back of the property of the home to the North and that the applicant has provided in the record Exhibit F: Phase 1 Site Investigation Report, Exhibit D Phase 2 SIR – erosion recession site assessment, which included a memo dated July 8, 2022, Exhibit D2: Recommended Setback ad Slope Retreat Mitigation Measures, dated 9/19/2022; Exhibit D3 Recommended setback & slope retreat mitigation measures- revised, dated September 26, 2022; and Exhibit G geotechnical Site evaluation, dated June 18, 2022. The September 19<sup>th</sup> and the September 26<sup>th</sup> memo specifically references the June 18, 2022 memo. A more definitive statement regarding the rip rap and the under cutting of the slope was requested by staff and a drawing submitted to the Army Corp of Engineers was shown. The rip rap that was supposed to have been installed previously is no longer there or was never installed.

A slide was shown describing the location from 2005 – 2019. The 2019 photo shows the slope failure to the lot to the north. FarleyCampbell explained that the placement of the rip rap on the north lot was not the same as all the other lots. A drone image from May/June 2022 shows the lot failure was presented. Branch did explain in their memo the possible undercutting and a more definitive statement about rate or the amount of the undercutting underneath the visual vegetative line.

A September 6<sup>th</sup> Power Point was discussed and the information that was missing at that hearing. FarleyCampbell reviewed the September 19<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup> and June, 18, 2021 memos provided by the applicant and Branch Engineering, and stated that all the missing items have been addressed. She further explained that the information falls into 2 categories - the first being data research and the 2<sup>nd</sup> is mitigation, or risk measures. The information identifies that if a house is built, would it cause any hazards to itself or to other properties.

The applicant's proposed site plan slide was shown. The top of bank line was pointed out by FarleyCampbell. She further explained that there is a retaining wall on the south property line. The 50' setback line was explained, and FarleyCampbell stated that Staff has submitted a condition that the top of bank will follow the top contour. The contour would change the proposed floor plan. This is a condition that is different than what the Engineer has proposed. The recommended mitigation was discussed, which included grading, drainage for development, vegetation removal, retention and replacement, placement of structures, driveways, protecting surrounding area from adverse effects of development, and engineering for home construction (foundation, retaining walls). The applicant's engineer is stating that the home, as it is proposed, will not endanger the neighbors. The applicant's engineer is predicting a 1-foot erosion rate for every year, and with that erosion rate the home could be expected to survive, or stay where it is at and not be at risk for slope failure for 50 years and that is without any new mitigation of the slope. The engineer stated that the vegetation on the slope needs to remain and be enhanced. Staff needs to know what this means because it is in the Shorelands criteria in Title 10 Chapter 19; everything on the flat will need to be replanted with native vegetation and is a Condition. The Conditions of Findings, (Slide 15) note these are not Conditions of Approval, were shown and explained. Staff recommended that the applicant follow all the recommendations provided by all the engineers reports that are applicable, to make sure that there is not any situation where staff missed or something changed. There is an expiration date of one year from the date of adoption of the Resolution tonight if foundation is not inspected by the Florence Building Official. Staff recommendation is that staff finds the submitted materials contain the information required by code and recommends that you adopt with the change to that one condition that was listed. Alternatives were listed (Slide 17).

There were no questions of staff.

Todd Larsen, General Contractor, and Ron Derrick, Branch Engineering gave in-person verbal testimony. Property owner Scott Hancock attended virtually. They stated they have read and understood the Staff Report and the Findings of Fact.

Larsen said that the one thing he wanted to address is the top of bank, that was shown. He stated that the bank, the top of bank that staff is questioning, the line of the topography of where that strip that slopes down, where it actually says it is top of bank, he wishes that the topography went out farther and would show a little bit farther. "I had Rob Ward go out and he provided the survey that is being displayed, and he came to the conclusion that the top of bank doesn't follow that contour line, that is actually man-moved material that was put there to flatten out that lot, to make it a buildable lot. It comes up along that retaining wall to the south there where the trees drop down, you can tell that this is not natural, that material was pushed into there, that is how Rob Ward came to the conclusion that the top of bank is really kind of inline with the lot to the south, and the lot to the north. Even with the setback that we have, we are actually farther back then both of those houses. The top of bank doesn't actually follow that contour that goes around."

Comm Tarvin: "It seems that Mr. Larsen is representing that the natural, before the fill, that the lot was at a lower elevation then it is currently, so therefore it would be pushing out to sea the top of bank, farther away from the road? Top of bank to me is top of bank where ever it may be. It sounds like you are going back in time to pick a previous top of bank, before the fill was put in."

Todd Larsen: "It is considered the top of bank."

Ron Derrick: "What Todd is trying to explain. is that the top of slope whether that be natural or manmade, is different than the top of the actual river bank, as what was pointed out from the house to the south, is that there is a vegetation line right there, top of river bank, and because these lots were graded you have a stair-step effect that top of river bank is to follow that same trend- it just happens to go stair-step its way up. The same argument could be made that the house to the north curves around as well at that head, because there is a slope right there down to Lot 37, top of river bank, so top of river bank can be considered different than the top of a slope.

Comm. Tarvin asked Mr. Derrick that as the responsible engineer does he support moving the top of bank to the location that was on the previous slide? Derrick answered, "Yes, because I have no problem. The consideration here is the erosion that can be incurred by the riverbank, not the erosion incurred by a manmade or native slope bank that is more direct to the south onto the neighboring property.

Comm. Hauptman asked if they had inspected the integrity of the retaining wall on Lot 38? Larsen and Derrick said they had not, in the scope of what they were doing. Hancock said he was there to answer technical questions. He said that he has read the staff report and findings and that he understands them.

FarleyCampbell said that one of the things that I did not include in the Conditions list is that Condition 3 is the one that contains the requirement that contains the 50' setback and modifying it to the 100' contour, I didn't include it in the list, I did mention it in my presentation, but didn't include it in the list, since the engineer has made a recommendation to develop it as the site plan, and gave a presentation of where the top of the bank is and how top of bank is different than top of slope, Condition #3 would be modified if you choose, to say the building shall be setback a minimum of 50' from the top of bank as it was described on the site plan presented as Exhibit B. Staff recommends adopting the Resolution as presented with the modification to Condition 3, as mentioned and a modification to Condition 5 that just says as indicated in the engineers' reports.

There was no reason to keep the hearing open. Hearing was closed at 6:26pm

Applicant waived his right to keep the record open for 7 days for final written argument.

Comm. Tarvin moved to adopt PC 22 04 SIR2 01 – 56 Shoreline Drive Phase II Site Investigation Report, continued from September 6, 2022. It is a Phase II Site Investigation Report submitted by Todd Larsen related to slopes buildability of slopes in order to build a single-family residence at 56 Shoreline Drive as recommended by staff with all Conditions except modifications last discussed related to Condition 3 and Condition 5.

Comm R. Miller: second

Roll Call:       Comm Hauptman: yes  
                  Comm Harris: yes  
                  Comm R. Miller: yes  
                  Comm Tarvin: yes  
                  Vice Chair A. Miller: yes  
                  Chair Sandra Young: yes  
                  Motion Carried 6-0  
                  Time: 6:28

---

**6. RESOLUTION PC 22 11 CUP 03 — Florence Christian Church First Step Temporary Housing Program.** A Public Hearing for: An application from Paul Pearson and First Step of Florence, for a Temporary Conditional Use Permit for placement of three recreational vehicles on the northern portion of the existing parking lot of Florence Christian Church to serve as temporary housing. The site location is 990 W. Second Street, Assessor's Map 18-12-27-34, Tax Lot 10900 within the Medium Density Residential District, south of the intersection at Rhododendron Dr. and Ivy St.

Hearing opened: 6:43pm

Assistant Planner Clare Kurth presented staff report and explained that this is going to be a temporary Conditional Use permit, a Type III decision. Introduction slide was shown. FCC Title 10, Chapter 4, Section 12-A – RVs are allowed as temporary housing through a conditional use permit at places of worship. A Housing Needs Analysis & Economic Opportunities Analysis slide was presented and explained. Staff received 22 testimonies: 1 neutral, 5 opponents, and 16 proponents. Referrals were sent on Sept 6th to the Florence Police Department, Public Works, WLFEA, and Central Lincoln PUD and we have received no responses as of this date. Chief Schick of the WLFEA was contacted and asked about the fire hydrant and he stated that the number of hydrants and the locations are adequate according to OFC.

Kurth explained the difference between transitional housing (FCC 10-2) and temporary dwellings (FCC 10-29 Coast Village). "We are using temporary dwelling definition because they are going to be RVs and there is

nothing proposed in the definition to obstruct or block them from being easily removed. They are not proposing any temporary or permanent RV pads in this application. A dwelling is a building with temporary provisions for living eating, food prep and sanitation (FCC 10-2). The applicant is not proposing this as a permanent facility it is being proposed as a temporary facility.” The criteria for a temporary Conditional Use Permit were explained (10-4-12-A) by Kurth. Places of Worship may apply for up to 3 RVs or Park Models for sleeping or living purposes. A minimum 15’ buffer is required from adjacent residential uses. The Conditional Use is limited to 2 years and one 2-year extension. ORS 203.082 allows camping by homeless on property of religious institutions.

The vicinity map was shown and explained by Kurth. The fire hydrant is required to be at least 250’ from the site and this fire hydrant is 200’ from the furthest RV. The Site Plan and the RV/Trailer Sites were shown and explained. The 20’ setback on the North of the property only shows a 10’ setback on Ivy Street but if you look at the scale, Kurth explained, there is more than enough room. Utilities are required with this temporary conditional use permit. If it’s approved, they will be putting water, sewer and a temporary electric connection through that utility section to the North of the RVs.

Kurth pointed out the driveway cut outs. The lighting plan was explained. “There is not a lot of lighting on this light currently, you will see one on the North of the lot closest to the RVs, there is one below it in the corner and then a couple near the front of the building that are maintained by Central Lincoln PUD. The only two lights that are owned and maintained are the apex of the building that is fully shielded,” Kurth said.

The light plan for the rv sites was displayed and explained. Kurth: “Because of the ways that the RVs are going to be oriented with the entrances on the east side of the property, they should be shielded to the street, so there shouldn’t be a lot of light spilling into the public right of ways. We did put a condition in where we address lights meeting codes and bringing current lighting up to compliance. The minimum parking requirements, churches and other place of worship are required to have one space per 50 square feet of main assembly area, so based on the calculations, the church is required to have 74 spaces and 3 ADA spaces. The church has 6 ADA stalls and 83 standard stalls. Currently, they have 94 and the RVs will take up about 11 parking spaces. The applicant is not proposing any changes in landscaping or any removal of vegetation. There is a fence that is screening the residential property to the North and a vegetative screening for the properties to the east. One of the conditions that we are asking for is to have the driveway closest to the proposed RV sites, blocked because the Rvs will be very close to the driveway and it is a safety concern. Some of the other considerations with this application is that the FCC 10-4-12-A says that the RVs must be part of a self-sufficiency program. This site is near the Commercial District, with necessary services nearby.”

FCC 10-4-9, revocation of the permit was discussed. Kurth explained that if approved, this temporary CUP will be valid until September 27, 2024. The applicant will be able to apply for one two-year extension in writing before the expiration date. Failure to place the RV/trailers within 12 months shall deem the temporary CUP expired unless an extension is grant by the PC, which is what the current code says now. Conditions of approval were discussed. Condition 4.1: The temporary use will expire. Condition 4.2: The RV/trailers shall be dimensions that fit in the proposed area. Condition 5: Open space. Condition 5.1: Minimum of 100 square feet of open space per dwelling unit or a combined area of 300 square feet provided for tenants. Condition 6: Lighting. Condition 6.1: Proposed new lighting to meet the code within nine months of approval and existing exterior on-site lighting shall conform to the requirements of FCC 10-37. Condition 7: Landscaping. Condition 7.1: Allow for the applicant to place a 6-foot-high fence if needed for screening and privacy during the duration of this temporary CUP. Condition 8: Access and Circulation. Condition 8.1: Blocking northern driveway/curb-cut to vehicle access for the duration of the temporary CUP as proposed by the applicant and approved by the Community Development Director or Planning Commission/Design Review Board. The alternatives were displayed and explained.

Kurth stated that staff recommendation is Alternative 1: Approve the application with the conditions of approval as proposed. One adjustment that has been discussed is maybe setting a time frame if the Planning Commission

feels like it is it's needed, is to maybe require a one year check in or code enforcement update, maybe that would help ease some of the concerns of the neighbors. That is something else that we could have conditioned.

Comm. Tarvin said the traditionally he is thinking that a buffer is combination of vegetation and fence or if no fence an extended buffer of vegetation. "Do we have a condition for the back area, that is adjacent to the neighbor's house?" Kurth answered that staff does not; that area is going to be where the utilities are going to be installed. Vegetation may interfere with those utilities. The way the code is written is the utilities for the water and sewer are supposed to be removed when this application expires, that is going to be another question, if we put in that vegetation will it then cause problems when they have to remove lines. There are no conditions currently but we can talk about conditioning that though.

Comm. Tarvin: "The removing of the utilities will that just be the connection points in the public right of ways or do they need to remove the entire lines from property lines inward to the termination point?" Kurth said that is something we would have to discuss with Public Works.

Comm. Hauptman commented that utilities are on Ivy Street. Kurth said that they will be making the connection from Ivy. FarleyCampbell, asked if they wanted to know if the lines could be moved.

Comm. Tarvin asked, "Do the onsite service lines need to be actually physically need to be removed, or is it simply the corporation connection? It seems to me that requirement is to remove the water meter so there is an air gap at the back of the lock area and the sewer would be severed at property line and plugged with concrete or something." Comm. Tarvin further said that he is trying to get clarity on if the utilities will have to be removed. FarleyCampbell said that typically when a use no longer existed the property owner will need to cap the sewer.

Vice Chair Miller asked, "Why is the development at the far end of the north end of the property? I am worried about the buffer to the north." Kurth said that she is going to let the applicant take that question, because that is not addressed in Code.

The applicant, Paul Pearson, said that he has read the staff report and the findings of facts and that he understands them. Mr. Pearson explained why the church is undertaking the project of providing temporary housing for the homeless. Mr. Pearson stated he is here to represent Florence Christian Church but is working with Florence First Step Program. First Step Program is a program that are trying to help families with children. If this is approved, then all three of these trailers will be for families with kids. This is not going to be a homeless camp. First Step Program has very strict rules for the applicants. There is a big demand for housing. This project is in direct relationship with the Comprehensive Plan. To answer the Commissioner that wanted to know "Why is the project area subjected on the north?", the reasoning was that it is the area that is the easiest to get utilities to and would have the least disruption on parking. If we had the location closer to the church it would take up many more parking spaces. In regards to removing existing lines, there has been a locate performed and we have had one contractor come out and they talk about digging a ditch and installing the connections. The contractor said that the sewer line is 10-12 feet deep in Ivy Street. Pearson said, "If we are granted this, when we install it, we will probably have to get Ray Wells with one of those great big shoring metal retaining walls for the safety of the workers to get down into the trench, so removing that would be extremely difficult."

Vice Chair Miller: "The sewer line runs up Ivy Street, so it seems like the access to the sewer should be the same no matter where you put the development on the lot. You have more parking than you actually need. You could set it back a little bit. I am just concerned more with the property to the north than to the west. Mr. Pearson, if we have the site and we moved it south down the parking lot closer to the church, then we would have to come up with some type of buffer on the north side and possibly on the south side." Vice Chair Miller further said that he thinks there should be some type of landscaping. "If you are going to have children then you should have someplace for them to play." He also said that he is concerned with the neighbors and needing

some buffer between those units: “I want them to look nice and to fit into the community. Mr. Pearson said that he had not even considered a fence on the east side, staff came up with that idea, but I think it is a good idea. If this is approved and there is a one-year checkup, we could revisit that.”

Testimony.

The first to speak is Melanie Green First Step Advocate and case manager. Ms. Green wanted to clear up the misconceptions about the program. The family have guidelines that they have to follow, they have a contract that they sign. Ms. Green stated that she is the person that is with the tenants every single week walking them through the program. She wants to assure anybody that has any questions about our program before they put up their conditions or concerns.

Comm. R. Miller said that he is familiar with the setup at the Presbyterian Church that it is always kept very clean, and has no problems since it has been put in there.

Norma Wood, proponent, currently serving as Secretary of the Board for First Step: “I think that we need to do a better job with educating the community as to what First Step is and how it works. This is a program with an intention. Our model is housing first that alleviates when people have secure housing a lot of their other issues. First step focuses on people with families. Vice Chair Miller asked if priority for applications is for people that have lived in Florence? Ms. Wood said, “Yes, it is, and that many of the people are already working in Florence but can’t afford housing.” Comm. Tarvin said that he is familiar with the current First Step Program, “Do you have a letter of understanding with them saying that you will stick with them?” Ms. Wood: “Absolutely.”

Troy Carter spoke: “I am going to read what I have printed up, I have already crossed off some of the things I wanted to know after hearing some of the testimony. My name is Troy Carter and I am here to object to recreational vehicles being permitted down the street from my home this will attract vagrancy, vandalism to come to our area, the church’s planned actions will create an unsafe environment for those that live and conduct business in the area. I bought my house in this neighborhood several years ago, this is a quiet and crime free area. I moved to Florence to get away from the crime and homelessness in the city. I have my whole lives saving wrapped up in my property, this will lower my property value and decrease my ability to sale my home in the future. I have an elderly mother who has expressed that she will not feel safe walking around the neighborhood any longer. This park will be intrusive and unsafe. Some of my concerns include the church has taken no consideration of the neighborhood or it’s residents that are involved in the site plan. Are all trailers donated, what is the condition of these trailers, do they have tarps over them are they a public nuisance, I don’t know. Which church members are responsible for the 24/7 monitoring of the proposed site? Who do the neighbors call if there is an issue with the tenants? It is also my understanding that a Conditional Use Permit shall void after one year, but I think that was answered and I understand now that it could be up to 4 years. After reviewing the application guidelines 10-4-11 general conditions and regulation of noise, vibrations, odors and sightliness. Sightliness is what I am concerned about in regards to the fence. 10-4-12 -4-E the property owner shall hook up available connects for water, electricity and sanitary sewer line which was addressed a little while ago. 10-34-5 fences and walls design of fences and walls include the allowable height and materials for security and privacy aesthetics. I understand that the church’s intentions may be well meaning however, I do not feel that the residents of the neighborhood have been afforded any consideration. I love my home and my community and I ask the Commission to consider denying the request for approval of this project in the interests of the long-time residents you have undertaken to represent as your constituents. I am not opposed to First Step. I am opposed to the location for this application, that is why I am here. I have been to the Presbyterian Church and looked at the property and it is well kept and clean but it is hundreds of yards away from the nearest residences. The lady that lives north of this property - this is going to be 30’ from her house, when I spoke to her on Sunday, she had no idea this was even happening.”

Norman Mendonca said he would like to commend First Step for the job they do, “But I am opposed to the location of this project and I don’t think this is a good investment for the church.”

David Mills: "I live right across the street from this potential development, and I am absolutely in favor of the project. My wife and I did a little bit of work on the trailers that were placed at the Presbyterian Church, there is a sense of community in these three trailers. First Step makes a real difference to the children that live in these homes. This is not what you see under a bridge. If everyone one on our street was screened as well as the folks are than we would have a much better neighborhood. I think this will make our neighborhood better."

Kurth said that the one thing she would like to mention is that talking about landscape and vegetation on the fence line, it is a two-year temporary permit, possibly four, and that is not enough time to let vegetation mature to the point that it would give us the buffering that you are desiring. "I think a lot of times we give people five years for their vegetation to mature. The rules and the policies are in the packet and the website. I did focus on the negative comments. The conditions that we want to focus on, if this is approved, is making sure that this project is as compatible as possible with the residential uses around it. We give the applicants an option to build a fence, we don't require it, but we would like to Condition to allow one, if it is needed later."

Chair Young asked the applicant if he had any rebuttal. Mr. Pearson said that he did not have a rebuttal but did offer a few clarifications. He does not want to cause stress on his neighbors, but that the people out there need the Church's help.

Staff recommendation is Alternative 1: Approve the application with the conditions of approval as proposed.

Hearing closed: 7:53 pm

The applicant waived his right to submit his final written argument.

## **Deliberations**

Comm. Hauptman stated to the First Step program members that they should do a little PR to get their message out to the community about the good things that they their program does.

Vice Chair Miller said that he is still hung up on what this project is going to look like, since there are no conditions for landscaping, just that they have 300 square feet of open area. "We have no idea what it is going to look like when it is finished." He said that he does not know what the RVs are going to look like, are they new RVs? Chair Young said that the Commission could add conditions, if he would like to.

Vice Chair Miller said that he would like a fence on Ivy Street and add some landscaping. He said that it will have to be something that even if the trailers are removed in 2-4 years, it is still going to look nice.

Comm. R. Miller said that fence heights on the street fronts are regulated, they can only be 4'.

Vice Chair Miller said that he still thinks it would not be unattractive.

Chair Young asked if it is being suggested to put landscaping in the area where the utilities are going to be installed, "Do we need to make that area bigger so that the open space does not have trees on it?"

Vice Chair Miller said that he is having a hard time envisioning how big that area is going to be, that grassy area is going to be. Chair Young said, "If we want to add conditions, the Commission can do that. If we do that, do we want to require another 10 feet to say additional open space?"

Comm. Tarvin he stated his concern about the neighboring house to the north. He believes that the trailers will be elevated over the grade compared to their neighbor to the north, and since RVs are usually off the ground, it makes a 6' fence pointless when they are standing on the stairs and the neighbors have to look at each other



over the fence. Comm. Tarvin stated that he believes that the fence along Ivy Street is a good idea. He doesn't know if the Commission will condition a fence but that he would urge the applicant to install a fence there. "Our neighbors to the north there are a 20' setback from the fence. I do not think that I would advocate for more vegetation, but if the applicant were to plant them it would look good in the future." Comm. Tarvin said he would advocate for a line of trees along the fence. Chair Young asked if he meant trees or shrubs? Comm. Tarvin said he would like to see fast growing trees. Chair Young asked if staff had anything to add to the discussion.

Kurth said that if the Commission wanted to condition, we could put in a condition to install evergreen landscaping along the northern fence line where the utilities are going to be installed; along the northern fence that is going to be in compliance with FCC 10-34, that we can write something up regarding landscaping if that is what the Commissioners would like.

Vice Chair Miller said that he thinks for the fencing on Ivy Street is a safety factor, so he would like to add fencing for the length of where the RVs are located.

Comm R. Miller said that he thinks that planting trees is another expense for the applicant and won't reach maturity in 4 years.

Applicant Pearson said that he agrees with Comm. R. Miller that the planting in four years would be difficult to get something in there unless 6-8' tall trees were planted. "We will work with the staff to come up with something, we want to be flexible and do what the Commission says. If there is a condition about the fence on Ivy I would like a little bit more clarification as to the height, is it 4' or 6', we also need to know the length of the fence. If you want the fence we will put in the fence, but we will need a little bit more clarity." The Commission agreed on a 4' fence.

FarleyCampbell said that in the criteria there is a Condition in the Resolution for the opportunity for a 6' fence, but that if the Commission is not wanting them to have the opportunity for a 6' then the Commission would like to indicate that with this process. The Commission came up with a minimum of 4' high fence for the length of the area of where the trailers are going to be situated. FarleyCampbell asked if the Commission had a material requirement. Commission said the applicant can't do chain link. FarleyCampbell asked for some clarity so that people know what they are voting on, we have some plantings on the North, a requirement for a fence on the East, for the length of the RVs. "What about the landscaping that Vice Chair Miller has mentioned?" Vice Chair Miller said that he would like to see that even it is going to only be there 4 years, on the north, not on the east, only the fence on the east.

Comm. R. Miller made a motion to approve PC 22 11 CUP 03 Florence Christian Church First Step Temporary Housing Program, application for Paul Pearson for a temporary Conditional Use Permit for the placement of three recreational vehicles on the Northern portion of the existing parking lot for the Florence Christian Church, with Conditions 1 and 2 as stated.

Vice Chair A. Miller: seconded 8:12pm

Chair Young: "With the existing conditions, plus the two?" Comm R. Miller: "With the conditions as stated." Chair Young; "The conditions would be a minimum 4' fence on Ivy for the distance on the RVs and landscaping along the North end, with no requirement to move anything?" Comm R. Miller: "Yes."

Comm Harris: yes

Comm R. Miller: yes

Comm Hauptman: yes

Comm Tarvin: yes

VC A. Miller: yes

Chair Young: yes

Motion carried 6-0

8:13pm

**Reports and Discussion Items:**

Comm. Tarvin provided a Vegetation Preservation update.

Vice Chair A. Miller provided a reminder about the housing Open House on Thursday; there will be a survey about short-term rentals.

FarleyCampbell provided the Director's report and mentioned upcoming open house.

Calendar: One item to be heard on October 11, 2022, the Nopal Street Mezzanine.

The meeting adjourned at 8:22 PM.

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra Young, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Barker, Planning Technician