
**City of Florence
Planning Commission Action Item
250 Hwy 101, Florence, OR 97439
December 12, 2023**

CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Meeting called to order at 5: 37 PM.

Commissioners Present: Chair Sandra Young, Commissioner Laurie Green, Commissioner Debbie Ubnoske, Commissioner Renee LoPilato

Commissioners Excused Absence: Vice Chair Kevin Harris, Commissioner Eric Hauptman, Commissioner Wendy Krause

Staff Present: Planning Director Wendy FarleyCampbell, Assistant Planner Clare Kurth, Contract Planner Roxanne Johnston (Virtual)

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Start Time: 5: 38 PM
Action: Approve agenda as presented.
Motion: Comm. Green
Second: Comm. LoPilato
Vote: Unanimous

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF June 27, 2023

Start Time: 5:39
Action: Approve minutes as presented.
Motion: Comm. Green
Second: Comm. Ubnoske
Vote: Unanimous

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

This is an opportunity for members of the audience to bring to the Commission's attention any item not otherwise listed on the agenda. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per person, with a maximum time of 15 minutes for all items. Speakers may not yield their time to others.

Start Time: 5:40 PM
Commenter: none

Chair Sandra 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.

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.

Commissioners Ubnoske, LoPilato and Green declared that they have been monitoring social networks and have read several of the comments and posted a link to the meeting that is before us tonight and encouraged others to come before the Commission to speak.

There were no bias declared.

No citizen present wished to challenge any Commissioner.

4. RESOLUTION PC 23 08 DR 02: Hwy 101 Dollar General Design Review

Continued from November 14, 2023... An application submitted by Kirk Farrelly, PE, of Capital Growth Buchalter as represented by Charlie Severs, PE, JSA Civil, LLC, to request a Design Review for a +/- 10,640 sq. ft. Dollar General retail store on an undeveloped parcel, Assessor's Map #18-12-23-22 Tax lot 06800 located north of the 35th and Hwy 101 intersection. The proposal includes considerations of the store's exterior architectural features, color palette, parking, lighting, landscaping, pedestrian walkways, access, utilities and more. The property is zoned Highway District, regulated by Florence City Code Title 10, Chapter 16.

This meeting was opened on November 14, 2023 and continued to this meeting date.

Re-Opened hearing: 5:47 PM
Closed 6:40 PM
Discussion: As follows

Contract Planner Roxanne Johnston delivered a staff presentation on the continuation and that on November 14th the criteria were read into the record along with slide show presentation. No public testimony in regards to the criteria was received. The applicant submitted revised meeting materials on December 1st including Exhibits C1 and E1 and then on December 5th the applicant submitted revised elevations Exhibit D1, the documentation requested from the hearing on 11/14/23.

Johnston gave an explanation of how the proceeding were going to be held and that some Commissioners have mentioned that concerned citizens do not believe this proposal is a good fit for the City at this time. It was explained that staff relies on the Florence City Code and that the Code. Zoning is a regulatory tool and if the use is listed in the zone, then it is allowed. ORS 227.215. The City follows state statutes and zoning code.

Johnson pointed out that the proposed location is between Chen's and Burger King, near the intersection of 35th St. and Hwy 101 and that the applicants submitted changes to their bicycle parking plan, in order

to protect bicycles from vehicular incidents and have added the bollards in sheet CG01 of Exhibit C1 to address Condition 4.6. Also submitted were changes to the 4' recess in the front. The applicant opted for the 4' entrance that recesses inside, sheet A-1 of exhibit D1. Applicants color palette, will be a bronze framed store front, the cornice is mocha madness and is metal, trim color paper white, added spandrel glass paper white faux windows, the awnings bronze aluminum, the applicant provided this information staff struck out some of the Conditions in the Resolution as shown in the packet. A new building articulation was added to show a false store front to the south side and a change in roof line. Landscaping plan shows detail on the plants that applicant will be using. Such as a tree to each parking isle, plants to be used are a sunset maple and crepe myrtles. Condition 7.5 was removed because of the changes. An updated lighting plan was provided by applicant. Staff also took a look at the Burger King lighting plan and the highest lumen on the Dollar General property is 0.4 that typically is along the 101-access area. The property will be graded so may change. Applicant will update the lighting plan. The elevation exhibit, there are now lights over the signage, the sign is letters and is no longer lighted this will need to be reevaluated in the photometric plan.

Noteworthy Revised Conditions of Approval.

- Exhibit A is not exhibit A1
- Condition 4-3 rain garden it does include the 6- fencing the applicant has agreed to maintain and possibly replace the fencing.
- Condition 5-3 On December 12, 2024 is the approval expiration date.
- Condition 11-5 adds a change for a pipe inlet design for stormwater. Applicant has been conditioned to provide a revised storm water plan to meet City code.

The Alternatives were read and explained with the staff recommendation being Alternative 2 approve as amended. Unless the Planning Commission had some conditions, they would like revise or to add.

- Exhibit C1 was shown and explained as showing a new false front on the south side of building.
- Comm. Green mentioned that Crepe Myrtle is not on plant list wondering if applicant meant Wax Myrtles. The Commissioner would like to change description on the inlet pipe from less than to deeper than.
- FarleyCampbell said the goal is to make sure it goes to the infiltration chamber first before it goes off site.
- Comm. Green said the they need to make sure that we give good directions to the applicant, it needs more clarification.
- Comm. Green asked if the new FEMA maps that at coming out will affect this development.
- FarleyCampbell said that she did not think that it would.
- Comm. LoPilato asked about the revised lumens and how they compare to the nearby businesses with the lighting stand out or will they blend in with the area.
- Johnston: Clarified the question and that it is up to the Dollar General to keep the lumens on their property up to code.
- Staff will go out and make sure the lighting is meeting the code.

- Comm. LoPilato asked is the proposal that the tribe weighed in on. The tribe thinks there are cultural artifacts that might be in this area.
- Johnston that notices were sent out asking for referrals to agencies in the area and is not quite sure if this affects this area.

Applicant Kirk Farrelly and Charlie Severs attended hearing virtually

- Farrelly stated that they can change Crepe Myrtle to another preferred tree that is on the list. Artifacts will be watched for and if found reported. The photometrics should be at or below what the Burger King lot has currently. They will be changing the signs to channel letter and that letters on building will not be lighted they will have goose neck lights illuminating the letters.
- Comm. Lopilato asked why they choose to build on a vacant piece of property, instead of updating an existing building.
- Farrelly replied that sometimes they do look for buildings to retrofit, in this case this is a vacant property that fit applicant's needs and a budgeting standpoint.
- Comm. Ubnoske two lights above the awning they appear to be down lighting and they are going to only provide lighting to the top of the awning and do not light the sidewalk.
- Farrelly they are high enough where they will be providing some output along the front side and the parking spaces and will work in conjunction with the free-standing pole.
- Comm. Green states that she has read the description about the new bollards and would like some detail on how the applicant is going to protect the bicycles parking.
- Farrelly there are going to be 3 bollards on parallelling and protecting from the parking spaces from the south area.
- Comm. Green asked if they would be concrete.
- Farrelly answered that they will be concrete.
- Charlie Severs said that the bollards are 4' tall steel bollards, 2 feet into the ground cemented so 6' long 4 feet above grade.
- Comm. LoPilato asked about the number of parking spaces and if there is space for overflow parking.
- Severs we have studied parking in several Dollar Generals and do not expecting overflow parking.

Chair Young asked if the applicant has read and understands the FOF and the Resolution.

Applicants have read and understand the FOF and the Resolution

Public Testimony (2)

Chair Young explained that the testimony had to be related to the criteria.

- Kathy Carmer of Florence, questioned why Dollar General is being built here and that she objects to them coming to Florence and wanted to know where they were going to be loading and unloading their trucks.

- Comm. Green explained that the unloading of the trucks was addressed by the Commission at first part of this hearing in November.
- Carmer stated that the in and out onto Hwy 101 is dangerous and that the applicant is not providing a turn lane.
- Comm. Green explained that their decisions are based on code.
- Chair Young explained the process that the Planning Commission uses to hear proposals.
- Pam Martin of Florence had concerns about the noise levels, and would like to know the allowed construction times for the project. Also concerned about the condition of the fence and asked if the fence could be taller. The delivery trucks are also a concern and wanted to know about the lighting in the back of the building.
- Staff provided the construction time to be 7:00am to 10pm, and that the limit on fence height is 6'.
- Chair Young asked the applicant if they would like to rebut;
- Farrelly said that there is 6' the maximum of fence height but if they could they would make it taller and that if it is falling down, they will replace the fence. The back wall has 3 wall pack lights.
- Comm. Green asked if the lights will be on after business hours.
- Farrelly replied that Dollar General has 2 dusks to dawn lights are on for safety and they can make sure they are on over the front door as well.

Chair Young asked staff for their recommendation.

Johnston recommended Alternative 2 as amended and as discussed tonight and that they shall comply with the storm water plan.

Close hearing: 6:40 pm

Discussion and Decision

Discussion: Comm. Ubnoske: did not think that this development meets the code, and thinks that the west elevation does not comply, because there are not windows, design setbacks not setbacks. Permits primary and dayglo colors, none of this is allowed in the Highway District.

Comm. Green Motioned to approve

Second: Chair Person Young

Vote: Comm. LoPilato – yes
 Comm. Green – yes
 Comm. Ubnoske – no
 Chair Young – yes
 Motion Carried 3-1

Break

5. Fifth Item on the Agenda:

RESOLUTION PC 23 25 PUD 01– Myrtle Glen Final PUD: An application submitted by Mike Johnson, on behalf of the applicants William Johnson Construction, Inc. and property owner David J. Bielenberg, for final planned unit development (PUD) plan review. The PUD proposal consists of extending 37th St., and constructing 25 townhomes, parking, stormwater, open space and recreation space on 3.34 acres of property as shown on the Lane County Assessor’s Map # 18-12-22-11, TLs 01200 & 00200 located west of the 37th and Oak St. intersection. The property is zoned High Density Residential, regulated by Florence City Code Title 10, Chapter 10.

Hearing reconvened at 7:06 pm

Assistant Planner Clare Kurth presented the staff report and explained that the Preliminary PUD was approved June 2023, and that tonight hearing is a request for final PUD approval. Third step in the process will be final subdivision plat. This project is for 25 attached units on owned lots.

Staff included a list of a couple of conditions that weren’t fully met.

- Condition 4.4 for the double line striping not met and Condition 7.3 required norther buffer vegetation.
- Condition 4.4 is just requesting the applicant to provide a site plan showing the double line striping vs single 24” striping.
- Condition 7.3 The applicant needs to inventory the trees and shrubs on the northern property line so that we can verify the minimum vegetation requirements are met.
- Condition 7.1 variation in individual building facades and exterior design. The Commission needs to clarifying what the Planning Commissions intent on that was how many facades and external details for individual building groupings either alternating paint combinations does that meet the requirement for external design differences on Condition 7.1 and then just specifying at the Planning Commissions discretion if different facades for the four-unit buildings versus the 3-unit buildings meet that condition or if they need to be each individual building.
- Condition 7.7 Open space a tentative concept plan with development amenities for the recreational area needs to be determined supporting both active and passive recreation shall be submitted with final PUD... this needs to be determined a recreational need and amenities be required or require fee-in-lieu for recreational open space. There are specific criteria if the applicant requests fee in lieu of. There is a lot to consider with the fee in lieu. It is just not we need 6,000’ of space paid for it’s the space paid for it is space plus amenities. The most recent parks plan identified a need.

The alternatives were read with staff recommending Alternative 4

4. Continue deliberations and continue hearing to a date certain if additional information is required to issue a decision.

Kurth explained that the conditions are written in the draft resolution, except for Conditions 7.1 and 7.7, regarding the façade and exterior design (7.1), and open space amenities (7.7), staff felt that there needs to be more Planning Commission discussion, and recommended Alternative 4 to continue deliberations and the hearing to a date certain.

- Comm. Green asked for information on the fee in lieu and what this would mean for this development, the understanding is that there is a Phase 2 planned and that would include 37th St. and extending south so the 37th as you said in the meeting materials would essentially remove 85% of area A.
- Kurth clarified potential developing of the southern property and extending 37th Street and that in a previous meeting the applicant was willing to have some flexibility in future development on that 37th St.
- FarleyCampbell: Explained how fee and lieu works.
- Comm. LoPilato: asked about the fastest process is to deliver recreational open space to the public that live in these areas.
- Kurth; said that through the stipulation of the recreation area and because the requirements for the fee in lieu would be at some later date that is not defined as a date certain. PUDs are required to have the open space within a certain time frame.
- Comm. Ubnoske: asked about the extension of 37th being this open space being the majority of this open space is determined to be at the terminus of that street right now and if there is an extension of 37th Street we are going to lose the open space.

7:45 the applicants representative Hailey Sheldon, Sheldon Planning, began her presentation.

Sheldon: Refuted a few of the claims made in the staff report and would like Director FarleyCampbell's comments.

Applicant Hailey Sheldon explained the reasons the applicant needs a PUD being.

- The hillside's configuration and the difficult topography.
- 2. The request for variance to the side setback.
- 3. The recreational open space. The PUD code requires that over 20% open space and of that open space 25% is recreational space and was met through the preliminary PUD process. The applicant says they are providing 33% more space than is required, and that each unit has backyards and that they do not want to provide the total 25% of recreational space.

The applicant would like the Planning Commission to tell them exactly what kind of recreational amenities that they should have.

Applicant read a portion of the application that was submitted to the city and described what the recreational areas could be used for and that they had provided lots of materials to City describing this.

- The applicant addressed the facades issues for this PUD and the other reason you do PUD is to be able to vary these development codes to make a better development. When the applicant went through the preliminary PUD hearings, they didn't have full architectural plans, but we have provided a detailed table that shows how we meet all Main Street and Down Town standards. The one standard we unable to make is, on Main Street/Down Town it asks for the garages to be rear facing, right, we said but this is a residential zone and the garages are usually facing the street, so we can meet all of these standards, except the one garage facing the street and we point out how we exceed those standards. The applicant states that they exceed a few items and that they have attempted to meet the façade variation differences and that the Johnsons are here to explain that to the Commission.
- Chair Young asked if there were questions of Ms. Sheldon
- Comm Green: asked if the back yards were going to be fenced in.
- Sheldon: the sides of each unit have a privacy fence between each one, so each unit actually has 5' of porch in the back and another 5' of yard beyond that.
- Comm. Green: asked if the privacy fence goes all the way to the back of the fence and if it is more of a screen than a fence.
- Sheldon: yes, so once you are past that you have your 5' of lawn and then you have that densely vegetated buffer.
- Comm. Green: asked if the fenced back yard was different than what was heard in the preliminary PUD.
- Chair Young asked if there were other questions for Ms. Sheldon, there were none at this time.

Mrs. Johnson, Wanda Johnson – of William Johnson Construction introduced themselves and gave their construction background and pointed out how the roofs on these units were made. Their homes are their own designs and have professional drawing. The colors were addressed. They like to see the design blend in with the scenery and habitat. Beauty is important to them and that they want whoever is going to buy the units to really going to enjoy living in their space.

- Sheldon addressed the question about 37th Street going through.
- Chair Young asked if there were any questions of the Johnsons.
- Comm. Green: Asked about the facades, and in talking about colors the white garage doors clash with the muted shades that the applicant has everywhere else.
- Mike Johnson: we can paint the garage doors, and give it a different look on every garage door.
- Comm. Green: asked about the gables on the garage.

- Mike Johnson; all the dormers that we have are functional dormers on these. They are not façade they are functional up there and the gable ends are wrapped to prevent the shingles from blowing off and gives architectural form. Mr. Johnson said that they can have a different look on every garage door, and that the front door could be different as well.
- Comm. Green: asked about only having the trees in the small recreational space.
- Johnson: said he thinks about is a gazebo is something he could put in
- Comm. Green: said she would like more discussion on access to the open space, and what it would look like.
- Johnson: explained that the barricade on 37th Street that open area is probably not going to go any farther because of the water towers being directly to the west.
- Comm. Green: asked the applicant what they would like to see in the open space.
- Johnson: said maybe a 10' x 30' gazebo that is covered with a floor, not on dirt, maybe raised.
- Comm. Green: asked the applicant if they are talking about using native grasses.
- Johnson: said that they could have bark or something durable that can be walked on and maybe a firepit.
- Comm. Green: The area would need to be HOA maintainable.
- Johnson: We could make it a non-grassy area

Chair Young asked if there were any other questions.

- Comm. Ubnoske had a question on the garage doors and the front door all being different, is that physical differences or just paint?
- Johnson: said that he received the drawings today. for the physical differences. The garage doors can be different, and they wanted lights, lights being windows across the top there will be a different look on each door.
- Comm. Green: and I think if they are painted to blend in with the other colors, I like the tans and the beiges and greens.

Chair Young: asked for questions.

- Comm. LoPilato: said that along with the gazebo and the firepit that people well-kept trails to walk on.
- Mike Johnson: said that he understands the importance of walking and that a gazebo with a park around it would be nice.
- Mrs. Johnson: said there is going to be sidewalks and a lot of city walking and a lot of destination walking from that location.

Chair Young asked if there were any other questions.

Lisa Walters-Sedlacek spoke as the applicant's landscaper. Brought up a few things about the project and her experience with Oak Commons. The Myrtle Glen project has a lot of native vegetation. The northern area is solid with wax myrtle and pines. The east area, the open area B, the reason why there are 4 pines

trees stuck in the middle of that is because it is all regrowing. The whole purpose for not putting a lot of open space to the east is to shield the existing house that is there. They plan on saving the native grasses on the western side of the property. Many people are removing their gazebos due to maintenance issues.

Kurth: Condition 7.1 is about the facades of the buildings that condition includes a diversity of building materials and colors and did specify a variety of garage doors as an option. The plans for the differences were not available for this meeting. As presented by the applicant the windows are listed as options in Condition 7.1. Things like different windows like on 9th street, some have the square panels and some have no panels, so it doesn't have to be the roof pitches like were shown in the pictures. The design the changes in front doors and garage doors is at the Planning Commissions discretion. Staff wants a description of the amenities

- FarleyCampbell: The setback for attached housing, it is 5' on the side that is not attached the side that is attached is zero and that can be found in 10-10-4-D. The applicants are building 19' wide townhomes so it would require 25' wide townhomes and in order to meet the minimum lot width, they have chosen a design of townhome that necessitates the use of a PUD process. The applicant has provided the minimum open space provided by code. The Planning Commission decided that quality over quantity is ok, and what they would be looking for from staff was to either, have them beef this up, do fee in lieu and come back and provide the calculations.
- Chair Young: Stated that the Commission was not specific enough and that the Commission can turn it back to staff for more specificity.
- FarleyCampbell: Yes, if the Commission needs to see more details and if you wanted to continue then they are going to need to provide a waiver for the 120 days.

Young: asked if there were any questions of staff.

- Comm. Ubnoske: I have a question. On 37th Street, is it a dedicated easement, if so is that something that could be vacated as part of this approval so that we can ensure that the open space there into perpetuity?

FarleyCampbell: 37th Street, the area at the end, that area would then be dedicated as a tract.

- Kurth, it required a reserve strip
- Ubnoske: can we do away with that reserve strip?
- FarleyCampbell: yes, because we just adopted our TSP and 37th St. is not proposed to extend through here.
- Ubnoske: I would just like to get it off the books so that we know that open space is going to stay there and it won't be affected any time during the future.
- FarleyCampbell: This land use decision is what is before you, you have had a TSP land use decision that did not include an extension of 37th St. you could have this land use decision make that determination for the extension of 37th St.
- Young: are there any other questions of staff, none, we are asking for the staff's recommendation, it sounds like it could be A or B at this point.

- Kurth: the recommendation was to continue to a date certain if the Planning Commission at their discretion feels the details or conditions for the couple of conditions that haven't been met yet can be ironed out then the staff is comfortable with moving the recommendation to Alternative 1, so it depends on the Planning Commission's discretion.
- Comm. Green asked if the Commission provides specific conditions, then the applicant can bring their final plan to City staff for approval?
- FarleyCampbell: Staff will be checking the against the Conditions that the Commission sets.
- Comm. Green thought that the Commission was ok with the Conditions of the facades but would like to see more specifics from the applicant on the concepts for open space areas A and B.
- Young: if we want to see more stuff we will have to continue. The applicant will need to come back.
- Ubnoske: I would also like to see the elevations for the different doors and the different garages, I would like to see all that.
- Young: alright so what I am hearing is that you would like to continue, so that you can see the doors, the garage doors the front doors, the specifics of the recreation areas, those two things. Is there anything else you would like to add. And also, whatever they are going to do for the smaller buffer as well.
- Comm. Green: asked if there are any time constraints.
- Staff determined that there were not time constraints and that the next meeting is January 9, 2024
- FarleyCampbell: 120 days is March 1, 2024

Chair Young asked applicant if they are ok with January 9th 2024,

- Chair Young we are thinking that we will continue to January 9, 2024
- Sheldon: the small recreational space that is adjacent to the homes, first there are amenities in the larger recreational space that elevate that space would the Planning Commission consider of allowing us to leave the recreational space next to the homes with the trees as Lisa stated because they don't have a lot of space and since they are boosting the amenities to our 4,700 sqft area, will the Commission consider leaving that other space, as is , or should we be looking to make changes in that other space.
- Comm. Green: asked if they could add benches.
- Hailey: the thing is they would be next to somebodies back yard. Hailey: The larger open space if we had elevating amenities, instead of putting more amenities into small space as well. I am asking, if that would be something you would consider or we be trying to load up that small space with amenities too.
- LoPilato: would like some amenities maybe something very simple for your small space would maybe a bench? Nothing fancy at all but just some use of that space because people at that end would use that space.
- Young: so, having that clarification I think that we are on the track to continue.

Lopilato made a motion to continue this hearing to January 9th, 2024 for further discussion

Second: Ubnoske

Young: particularly for more clarification of the recreation amenities and to see the façade differences that the applicant was talking about in their testimony tonight.

Roll Call:

Comm. Green: yes

Comm. LoPilato: yes

Comm. Ubnoske: yes

Chair Young: yes

Motion passes: 4-0

Reconvened: 7:06 pm 12/12/2023

Close: 8:49pm

6. 6th Item on the Agenda:

RESOLUTION PC 23 29 TA 05 – HIP Phase 2 Housing Code Update #2

Consider a city-initiated amendment to Florence City Code Title 10 related to transitional housing and emergency shelters.

Hearing opened at 9:05 pm

- FarleyCampbell gave the staff report the proposed Title 10 Chapter 11 was distributed to Commission along with Attachment 2 which includes the 3 definitions and the proposed Code amendments to enact 10-11-3 in 10-11. The code sections have all added to their conditional use sections. Attachment 8 from the work session last December 4, 2023 at the FEC, which may or may not be an exhibit to this record. Attachment 8 is the exhibit code amendment related to the lot size and width for the MDR district.
- Changes from when the Commission met with the City Council on December 4, 2023 were discussed including the changes to Chapter Title 10 Chapter 11. The creation of a Chapter 11 was explained.
- The explanation of the created sections that are typical in other codes. Operations and Management section was added. Siting section is the same as what was in the matrix that was distributed. The Marine Zone and the Water Marine Zone are regulated by Shoreland Protections and related to protecting those river industrial uses, and were not included because they are too close to down town.
- FarleyCampbell explained that Councilor Carp is concerned with camping within 500 feet of the uses.
- Chair Young asked about siting about any public property is there a list of property where people can't be?
- FarleyCampbell That is for camping not emergency or transitional, this is more housing.
- Farley if you would want more clarity this is the time to make sure everything is as clear as possible.
- The Commission discussed the transitional housing.

Public Testimony:

Brenda Gilmer: Was concerned about the lack of ability for the public to participate and that the subcommittee was set up interest for humans and the people that are sleeping in the forest have not been represented. She was not aware of what was being initiated. I do feel that the definition for faith based should be struck because it discriminates. She states that there are 625 individuals in Florence that are homeless and that the City is in a real emergency and that the City has done nothing for these humans. She is begging for help for these humans.

Planning Commission:

Comm Green motioned to initiate Resolution PC 23 29 TA 05 HIP Phase 2 Housing Code Update #2

Point of Order: FarleyCampbell asked for direction on Residential Code FCC 10-10. The homeless and camping discussion is not a Planning Commission action item.

Green: I would include Title 10 Chapter 10 with the modification of the single unit detached dwelling lot minimum dimensions and square footage as proposed.

Chair Young has added this to her motion.

Roll Call:

Comm. Green – yes

Comm. Ubnoske – yes

Comm. LoPilato - yes

Chair Young: yes.

Motion passes 4-1

Time: 9:41:31

FarleyCampbell explained that tonight's meeting is the initiation and that if the Commission has anything they want to add or have a suggestion bring them, we can make those edits at the hearing on January 23, 2024. If the Commission is good with everything at the January meeting, then the Commission will make a recommendation to City Council on February 5, 2024. However, if the Commission is not satisfied or want more information and want to keep the record open that is your prerogative and you will make your recommendation to City Council you are ready at a later date.

Comm. Green asked if the City Council is working on the camping code.

FarleyCampbell, explained that they don't have anything at this time but are proposing to hear the camping code in a work session on January 10th, or 11th.

Comm. Green: Will we be running in parallel with that?

FarleyCampbell: yes, that particular code is not land use. It's just like code it's Title 10 and Title 11 are yours and they require very specific land use procedures. Because they were related that is why we included them together. The intent was for people to see that they really were a continuum of what people will move through their journey to finding a general consistency between the two.

Chair Young: The Council and Commission will work together.

FarleyCampbell explained that one of the edits that needs to happen is that nonprofits need to be added to the proposed code and that there will need to be more work done on the definitions.

7. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS & DISCUSSION ITEMS DIRECTOR'S REPORT & DISCUSSION ITEMS

8. PLANNING COMMISSION CALENDAR

Director Report: Next meeting January 9th, 2024 we will be continuing Myrtle Glen and also what we are trying to get ready to go is Siuslaw Bay View (formerly Butter Clam) or a Design Review for David Twombly warehouse buildings on North Hwy 101. On January 23, 2024 you will hear the housing and anything else that is ready at that time.

Kurth announced that LTD has received their second bus, it is not operating yet but that it soon will be.

Meeting adjourned at 9:58 PM.

ATTEST:

Sandra Young,

Chair

Sharon Barker, Planning Technician