

OUR COASTAL VILLAGE, INC.
PO BOX 108
YACHATS, OR 97498-0108

November 4, 2024

Community Development Department
Attn Wendy Farley-Campbell
Community Development Director
City of Florence
250 Hwy 101
Florence, OR 97439

Re: Elm Park PUD, AR 24 04 DR 03 Elm Park (Apartments Only)

Dear Wendy Farley-Campbell,

This letter responds to your NOIC dated October 18, 2024, relating to the design review application for Elm Park Apartments. It also identifies the revised and new exhibits provided to support this response, which are designated as Supplemental Design Review (“DR”) Exhibits. The text of the NOIC appears below in italics, and our responses are bold.

Thank you for submitting Land Use application AR 24 04 DR 03, a request for a design review of the Elm Park Apartments; a 32-unit apartment complex and associated development on the property as part of the Elm Park PUD. The project property is located on Lane County Assessor’s Map Ref 18-12-27-31, Tax Lots 01100 and 01200. After reviewing the application materials, the application was deemed “incomplete” and needs the following information:

Due to the code exceptions requested for decreased separation between Building B and Buildings A and C, reduced front and side yard setbacks, and parking demand analysis requested, the multi-unit dwelling will require a Type III design review or for this application to be run concurrently with the PUD application. If the project is to run concurrently with the PUD application, then provide the information not already provided in response to the NOIC for the PUD. Annotate in your NOIC for this application response when that is the case.

- *FCC 10-3: Off-Street Parking and Loading*
 - *FCC 10-3-3-D: Electric Vehicle parking*
 - *A minimum of 6 parking stalls are required to be installed with conduit capable of supporting a level II EV charging station. This was not included with the residential unit design review application.*
 - *This information was included on sheet C200: Storm and Utility Plan as part of the NOIC response for the PUD. This information will be required on revised plans for the EPA unless these applications are run concurrently.*

Response No. 1: The DR and PUD Applications will proceed concurrently so no further detail is provided.

- *FCC 10-3-9: Parking Line stripping shall be double line stripping 2 feet on center with a minimum 4 inch stripping. Please include these details on revised plans.*

Response No. 2: The revised plans, Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheets C1.0 and C4.0 (detail 8).

- *FCC 10-3-5: Provide the width of the required access aisles for the ADA parking.*
 - *2 ADA parking stalls are required and 2 are provided.*
 - *1 ADA stall is required to have a minimum 96 inch wide access aisle.*
 - *1 ADA stall is required to have a minimum 60 inch wide access aisle.*

Response No. 3: The revised plans, Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheets C1.0 and C4.0 (detail 8).

- *FCC 10-3-8-L Parking lot plan requirements*
 - *Provide examples of all proposed parking lot signage.*
 - *This should include, but not be limited to ADA parking signage, bike parking, and informational or directional signage.*
 -

Response No. 4: The revised plans, Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheets C1.0 (Sign Legend) and C4.0 (detail 10).

Curb height or wheel stops are required to be a minimum 6 inches in height. Please provide details of the wheel stop dimensions for staff review.

Response No 5: The revised plans, Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheet C4.0 (detail 9).

- *FCC 10-6: Design Review. Design review criteria of FCC 10-6-6 apply to this project. Additional details of building dimensions will be required to ensure articulation requirements are met in accordance with FCC 10-6-6-3 (building facades) and additional finish material details will be required to review criteria of FCC 10-6-6-4 (Permitted visible building materials) and FCC 10-6-6-5 (material applications and configuration). FCC 10-25-5 Design Criteria also applies to this project.*
 - *Articulations are required every 30 to 40 feet using either a recess with a minimum 4 feet on depth or an extension minimum of 2 feet running a minimum of 4 feet horizontally.*

Response No. 6: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, show conformity with the wall articulation standard in dimensioned floor plans at Sheets A101, A103 A105, A107, A109, and A111. To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

- *FCC 10-6-6-5-B-7 requires roof eaves to extend a minimum 12'' and be visibly supported.*
 - *Provide additional details of the eave overhang dimensions.*
 - *Provide additional details of components used to provide visible eave support.*

Response No. 7: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain the eave overhang dimensions in the Elevation Legend (Roof) at Sheets A102, A104, A106, A108, A110, and A111. Eave overhangs are 18'' at gable roofs and 12'' at shed roofs. Typical eave support and exposed rafters are shown in Sheet A101 (detail 4). To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

Elevations that may need additional articulations

- *Building A: north, south, and west elevation*
- *Building B: east, west, and north elevation*
- *Building C: south, north, and east elevation*
- *Building D: north and south elevation*
 - *The west elevation may require additional articulation per floor.*
- *Building E: south and north elevation*
 - *The east elevation may require additional articulation per floor*

Response No. 8: No additional wall articulations are required. The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, Sheets A102, A104, A106, A108, and A110, show dimensioned floor plans with articulations every 30-40 feet. To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

FCC 10-25-5-A requires wall offsets including projections, recesses, and changes in floor level and shall be used to add architectural interest and variety to massing of a building.

- *Wall offsets through projects and recesses are used.*
- *Consider architectural details at changes in floor levels to meet this criterion as well as the criteria from FCC 10-6-6-3.*

Response No. 9: Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, Sheets A102, A104, A106, A109, and A110, show the addition of a belly band at the highest floor level, a change in color above the belly band, and the addition of white, vertical fiber cement panels between all larger (5' 4" wide) windows. Previously the white, vertical fiber cement panels appeared only on one elevation of each building. For wall offsets, see Response No. 8 above. To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

- *FCC 10-25-5-B states buildings on corner lots shall be considered especially significant structures and shall be built with additional architectural details and embellishment. As this relates to Elm Park Apartments all buildings with the exception of Building A are essentially corner buildings.*
- *Additional architectural detailing is required. The example below shows a variety of siding and a belly band that may be solutions to meet this Code criteria.*



Garden View Apartments

Response No. 10: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, at sheets A102, A104, A106, A108, and A110, show the introduction of a white belly band at the highest floor level, a change in siding colors above the belly band, and addition of white, vertical fiber cement panels between all larger (5' 4" wide) windows. Previously the white vertical fiber cement panels were provided only on one elevation of each building. To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

- *FCC 10-25-5-C requires Buildings facing internal open space or in public view shall be architecturally emphasized through window treatment, entrance treatment, and details.*
 - *Provide additional detailing and emphasis around windows and entrances on internal facing elevations.*

Response No. 11: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, at Sheets A102, A104, A106, A108, and A110, show the introduction of a white belly band at the highest floor level, a change in siding colors above the belly band, and addition of white, vertical fiber cement panels between all larger (5' 4" wide) windows. Previously the white vertical fiber cement panels were provided only on one elevation of each building. To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

Provide additional details of exterior building materials for staff review

- *Width of door and window trim*
- *Dimensions of patio/balcony posts (min. dimensions 5 ½" cross section)*

Response No. 12: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this information in the Elevation Legend detail at Sheets A102, A104, A106, A108, A110, and A111. To the extent this is deemed to be less than full conformity with the standards, we request a modification under the PUD ordinance.

FCC 10-10-9: Multi-Unit Dwellings

- *Minimum 30 feet of separation for buildings that are not situated end to end. Building A and C are proposed to be 18' 7" from Building B. These buildings are situated face (A and C) to end (B). This is not outright approved, but can be requested as a modification through the PUD review process*

Response No. 13: This is covered in the NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, pp. 13-14, 21. As stated there, buildings A and C are not "multi-unit dwellings" because each contains only four units, less than the five required for a "multi-unit dwelling." Staff describes the relationship between Buildings A and C with Building B as "end-to-face." No minimum distance between buildings is required for "end-to-face." We also request an alternative modification under the PUD ordinance if the Planning Commission views Buildings A and C as "multi-unit buildings" that are "face-to-face." Because the DR and PUD applications will proceed concurrently, we do not provide further details here.

- *Fencing materials not submitted. Proposed materials should be submitted for review and approval.*

Response No. 14: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheet A003. CMU fencing with wall caps and corner column caps is proposed (detail 1), with approved alternates of steel (detail 2), and wood (detail 3).

- *Mechanical equipment? Please provide the location of any and all mechanical equipment and proposed screening materials.*

Response No. 15: All mechanical equipment for the apartment buildings will be inside the building envelope. The community building will have two small split system condensing units (35” W x 13” D x 35” H) located on the north side of the community building, as shown on Sheet A111 of Exhibit 9 of the Supplemental DR Exhibits. The location is not public-facing, so no screening is required under FCC 10-6-6-5-G-3.

Parking reduction. This can not be approved through a Type II Design review. Approval will be required through a Type III Quasi-Judicial review process.

Response No. 16: We requested a parking adjustment under three separate provisions in Title 10 Chapter 3. NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, pp. 10-12. Because the DR and PUD Applications will be processed concurrently with a Planning Commission hearing, no further detail is provided here.

The Planning Commission is to review “new construction” through a “Type III process consistent with FCC 10-1-1-6-3 before issuing a building permit” unless “otherwise directed by the underlying zoning district or subsection B below.” FCC 10-6-3-A. The Planning Director or designee shall review applications for “multi-unit housing in any zone” through a “Type II process consistent with FCC 10-1-1-6-2 before issuance of a building permit.” FCC 10-6-3-B-a-ii. So, the design review of the EPA should be through a Type II process by the Planning Director.

- *FCC 10-25: Professional Office Residential Mixed-Use.*
 - *FCC 10-25-4-D-1 Minimum front and street side yards are a minimum 20 feet.*
 - *10 foot setbacks are proposed on west, north, and south, street facing lot lines. This is not outright approved, but can be requested as a modification through the PUD review process*

Response No. 17: We requested this modification in the NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, pp. 8-10, 21. Because the DR and PUD Applications will proceed concurrently, no further detail is provided here.

- *Setback from Buildings E and D on the south property line is not included on the plans, but appears to exceed the minimum 20 feet. Please include this dimension on the site plan.*

Response No. 18: The revised plan, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, Sheet A001, shows the requested setback dimension at 33’ 6” from Buildings D and E and 25’ 6” from the greenhouse.

Maximum Residential building height is 35 feet in residential districts, 40 feet in High Density Residential (HDR).

- *2 of the 5 apartment buildings are proposed at 30' 1 ½'' which meets maximum 35' height limit*
- *3 of apartment buildings are proposed at 39' 1 ½'' which exceed the maximum 35 foot height limit. This is not outright approved, but can be requested as a modification through the PUD review process.*

Response No. 19: This is covered in the NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, p. 10. For affordable housing, a state statute adds 24' to the 35' limit in POI. We are under the resulting 59' height limit. Because the DR and PUD Applications will proceed concurrently, we provide no further details here.

- *Accessory structures are limited to a maximum 20 feet in height.*
 - *Please provide the total height for the community building and the green house building*

Response No. 20: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, Sheets A002 (detail 12) and A111, show the community building and the greenhouse building do not exceed 20' in height.

- *No exterior elevations were submitted for the greenhouse. Please provide this for City review.*

Response No. 21: The revised plans, Exhibit 9 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheet A002.

FCC 9-5: Stormwater Management Utility. Stormwater Management Report: The statement in the stormwater report seems to be conflicting with the Civil Plans.

- *Stormwater and Utility Plan Sheet C 2.09 indicates a plan to use infiltration rain gardens and infiltration soakage trenches for managing post development runoff. The Stormwater Management Report indicates a plan to use a presumptive approach with infiltration rain gardens and stormwater planters.*
 - *This will need to be corrected to resolve conflicting information.*
 - *Rain gardens and planters are both approved facilities for the presumptive approach on private property.*
 - *The soakage trench indicated on the Stormwater and Utility Plan is not an approved presumptive approach facility.*
 - *Soakage trenches not used exclusively for residential roof area run off require a permit from DEQ. Please provide evidence that DEQ will not require permitting for a multi-unit residential structure such as the one being proposed.*

Response No. 22: The revised plans, Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheets C2.0 and C2.1; and the revised Stormwater Report Exhibit 10 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, provides a revised narrative at p. 3.

The landscaping plan submitted with the NOIC response includes a planting list for these facilities. However, a soakage trench is “a shallow trench in permeable soil that is backfilled with sand and coarse stone and lined with filter fabric. The trench surface may be covered with grating, stone, sand, or a grassed cover with a surface inlet.” The landscaping plan or this facility type should be revised.

Response No. 23: The revised plans submitted as Exhibit H(2) in the Supplemental PUD/Replat Exhibits submitted on 11-1-24 contain this detail in Sheets 8 and 11.

- *The Civil plans C 2.0 appear to have stormwater collecting in an infiltration rain garden then being discharged into a future stormwater main. The Stormwater Management report does not indicate this.*

Response No. 24: The revised Stormwater Report, Exhibit 10 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contains additional narrative (p. 3) saying that the overflows are emergency overflows as required by the Florence SWMM.

Additional grading and drainage information is required for the parking lot and alley to determine where post development run off will be collected and treated.

Response No. 25: The revised plans, Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheets C2.0, C2.1 C3.0, and C3.1.

The site will rely on a piped system to collect runoff from the building downspouts and site features. The site runoff will be piped to both infiltration rain gardens and stormwater planters. The parking lot runoff will be routed via curb cuts to the stormwater planters located in the parking lot.

- *FCC 10-37: Lighting*
 - *Maximum lighting pole height in residential areas and uses is 20 feet. The Luminaire Schedule provided on sheet E101 states the proposed pole height is 20 feet. Please ensure this is the finished height of the fixture and that it will not be installed on a base that will increase the height above the maximum allowed.*

Response No. 26: The revised plans, Exhibit 11 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheet E101.

Details and specifications for wall pack fixtures including mounting heights.

Response No. 27: The revised plans, Exhibit 11 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheet E101. Wall Pack fixtures are not used on this project.

- *Also see FCC 10-25-5-E that states buildings shall be lit from the exterior and lights shall be concealed through shielding, or recessed behind architectural features.*
 - *Submit exterior wall lighting to meet this Code requirement.*

Response No. 28: The revised plans, Exhibit 11 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith, contain this detail at Sheet E101. Wall pack fixtures are not used on this project.

- *Wetland Delineation from Branch indicates wetlands in the NW corner of the property which are regulated Yaquina and Wet Area references of FCC 10-7. The drainage plan for this area may be required with this application in accordance with 10-7-3-H.*

Response No. 29: We addressed this in the NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, p. 4. Because the DR and PUD applications will proceed concurrently, no further detail is provided here.

- *Alta Survey from KPFF illustrates a top of bank (TOB). The TOB is part of Significant Riparian Reach, RAIR-B, a Goal 5 resource regulated by FCC 10-7-2-D and 4. This reach is indicated in the Wetlands and Riparian Plan, 2013 to have a 65 ft. wide buffer measured from the TOB, which extends onto the subject property.*
 - *Review the 10-7-4 code section and determine what application materials require revision to illustrate the TOB and the required minimum setback of 65 feet. The city needs to successfully acquire a land use permit as required under FCC 10-2-12-E-4 for the street and utility infrastructure on the north and west sides of the project area in order to not impact the structures and improvements proposed for in the buffer area. And depending on the location of the infrastructure improvements the project site may still be impacted by the riparian reach buffer.*

Response No. 30: We previously provided the following documents as Exhibits to the NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, which show the 65' setback: (a) Survey, Exhibit C(1); (b) EPA Site Plan, Exhibit E-1(1); and EPA Preliminary Engineering Plans, Exhibit N-1 We have reviewed all application materials and found no others that need to be revised to show the 65' setback.

We are actively collaborating with Mike Miller, Public Works Director, and Erin Reynolds, City Manager, regarding the engineering design of the Infrastructure Project. The City has now received the 50% design plans and will shortly submit its use permit application under FCC 10-2-12-E-4 for that Project, which should be heard at the same Planning Commission meeting as this application. A copy of the 50% Plans is Exhibit D(2) in Supplemental PUD/Replat Exhibits submitted herewith. We have provided comments to the City and will continue to do so as their design progresses.

The 50% design plans show the road, curb, and gutter being built directly above the drainage channel near the intersection of 11th Street and Fir Street, with those street improvements coming very close to the northwest corner of the EPA Site. Sheet 8 STA 6+00 to 7+00 (Fir Street); Sheet 11 STA 0+00 to 1+00 (11th Street). The same sheets show grading south of 11th Street entering the EPA Site and grading north of 11th Street extending northward onto the property to the north. (Sheet 11.) They also show grading east of Fir Street extending near the EPA Site. (Sheet 8.)

The 50% design plans also show the road, curb, and gutter for Fir Street being built across the entire 60-foot right of way. That sixty feet, plus our ten-foot setback from Fir Street, ensures our buildings are less than 65 feet from the TOB of the north-south riverine.

We have previously identified "public facilities" exceptions from the 65' setback requirement. So, the City will be allowed to build the Infrastructure Plan in the wetland areas included in the Plan. The construction of public facilities in the plan will physically preclude the EPA project from adversely affecting the wetlands. We have, therefore, sought a modification of the 65' setback as part of our PUD application to allow the EPA development as shown on the site plans. NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, pp. 4-5, 17, 21.

- *A TIS was submitted for the ELM Park PUD. If this application runs concurrent with the PUD application, then nothing further is needed. If they are to run separate then please submit the TIS for this application.*

Response No. 31: The DR and PUD Applications will proceed concurrently, so no further information is provided here.

- *Width and locations of all sidewalks and pedestrian walkways on the infrastructure and site plans.*

Response No. 32: We addressed this in the NOIC Revised Combined Attachment submitted 9-26-24, p. 7. We also address it in Exhibit 8 in the Supplemental DR Exhibits submitted herewith on Sheet C1.0.

Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Our Coastal Village, Inc.

By 
K. Layne Morrill, President