



AGENDA

Phone: 541-682-5481
www.eugene-or.gov/pc

Meeting Location:
Sloat Room—Atrium Building
99 W. 10th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401

The Eugene Planning Commission welcomes your interest in these agenda items. Feel free to come and go as you please at any of the meetings. This meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing impaired, FM assistive-listening devices are available or an interpreter can be provided with 48 hour notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hour notice. To arrange for these services, contact the Planning Division at 541-682-5675.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2016 – REGULAR MEETING (11:30 a.m.)

11:30 a.m. I. PUBLIC COMMENT

The Planning Commission reserves 10 minutes at the beginning of this meeting for public comment. The public may comment on any matter, **except for items scheduled for public hearing or public hearing items for which the record has already closed.** Generally, the time limit for public comment is three minutes; however, the Planning Commission reserves the option to reduce the time allowed each speaker based on the number of people requesting to speak.

11:40 a.m. II. APPEAL OF HEARINGS OFFICIAL DECISION: CHAMOTEE TRAILS PUD (PDT 15-1) – DELIBERATION/ACTION

Lead City Staff: Erik Berg-Johansen, 541-682-5437
erik.berg@ci.eugene.or.us

12:10 p.m. III. PARKS AND REC SYSTEM PLAN

Lead City Staff: Carolyn Burke, 541-682-8816
carolyn.j.burke@ci.eugene.or.us

12:50 p.m. IV. CELL TOWERS CODE AMENDMENT UPDATE

Lead City Staff: Anne C. Davies, 541-682-8447
anne.c.davies@ci.eugene.or.us

1:15 p.m. V. ITEMS FROM COMMISSION AND STAFF

- A. Other Items from Staff
- B. Other Items from Commission
- C. Learning: How are we doing?

Commissioners: Steven Baker; John Barofsky; John Jaworski (Chair); Jeffrey Mills; Brianna Nicoletto; William Randall; Kristen Taylor (Vice Chair)

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY
February 22, 2016

To: Eugene Planning Commission

From: Erik Berg-Johansen, Assistant Planner

Subject: Deliberations: Chamotee Trails PUD (City File PDT 15-1)

ACTION REQUESTED

To continue deliberations and take action on an appeal of the Eugene Hearings Official's denial of the Chamotee Trails PUD (PDT 15-1).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Extensive background information on this proposal and the previous Hearings Official (HO) decision is included in the full record provided separately, as well as the prior Agenda Item Summary (AIS) for the public hearing, and the AIS for the deliberations that took place on February 8, 2016.

During the first round of deliberations, the Planning Commission (PC) discussed the three assignments of error presented by the appellant. Based on a series of approved motions, the PC ultimately decided to uphold the HO's decision to deny the project. Discussion was focused on the "19-lot rule" (EC 9.8325(6)(c)), and also EC 9.8325(3) which requires implementation of a landscape buffer. Through these deliberations the PC found that the HO correctly analyzed and applied the 19-lot rule, and that the HO correctly interpreted EC 9.8325(3) regarding the landscape buffer.

NEXT STEPS

A City Attorney Memo (attached) is provided to help guide the Commission through the third assignment of error (regarding the landscape buffer criterion).

With the previous motions, the PC has already decided to uphold the HO's decision to deny the proposal. Pending further deliberation and direction from the commission, staff will prepare a Final Order for consideration and final action.

ATTACHMENTS

A. City Attorney Memo

The full record has already been provided to commissioners separately, and is also available to the public on the City's website at:

<http://pdd.eugene-or.gov/LandUse/SearchApplicationDocuments?file=PDT-15-0001>

A hardcopy of the complete record can also be made available for free inspection at the Atrium Building, 99 West 10th Avenue, between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Copies may also be obtained at cost.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Please contact Erik Berg-Johansen, Assistant Planner, City of Eugene Planning Division, at 541-682-5437 or via email at erik.berg@ci.eugene.or.us



Date: February 17, 2016
To: Planning Commission
From: Anne C. Davies
Subject: Chamotee Trails PUD (PDT 15-1)

An issue arose during Planning Commission deliberations last week that triggered the City's legal counsel to question whether the Planning Commission has authority to address some of the issues raised by the appellant. The city attorney's office has concluded that the Commission does not have authority to determine a provision is not clear and objective.

In reviewing a decision of the hearings official, the Planning Commission may affirm, modify or reverse the hearings official's decision. The Planning Commission is often called upon to review a hearings official's interpretation of provisions of the Eugene Code. For instance, this appeal involves a determination of the meaning of the 19-lot rule. In this case, however, the applicant is also requesting that the hearings official and Planning Commission declare that code provision inapplicable because it violates state law. (ORS 197.307 requires a local government must provide an approval track under which an application for needed housing is only measured against approval criteria that are clear and objective.)

The City Council adopted the 19-lot rule and the remainder of the needed housing PUD criteria by ordinance. Section 48 of the Eugene Charter provides that "all acts by the city or any of its officers, employees or agencies shall be presumed valid . . . Any action by this charter committed to the discretion of the council, when taken, shall be final and shall not be reviewed or called into question elsewhere." At the time the 19-lot rule was adopted into the new land use code, the statutory "clear and objective" requirement was in effect. The council is presumed to have known of this requirement and adopted a provision that was in compliance with it.

Further, the Planning Commission does not have the authority to declare an act of the City Council void or of no effect. In its quasi-judicial capacity, the Planning Commission can interpret a provision of the code (or rather review a hearings official's interpretation of the code), but it does not have the authority to determine that a code provision that was adopted by council cannot be applied. The City Council can do that, LUBA can do that through an appeal of a local land use decision, or a circuit court of this state could make such a declaration through a declaratory judgment action. But the Planning Commission cannot.

Because the applicant argued that the 19-lot rule is not clear and objective, it may be able to get a determination from LUBA on the issue, even though the Planning Commission cannot directly address it. An applicant who questions the validity of one of the City's needed housing approval criteria could also file suit in the Lane County Circuit Court, asking the court for a determination that a particular criterion violates ORS 197.307.

What this means for the remainder of your deliberations is that you do not need to determine whether the landscaping criterion (EC 9.8325(3)) is "clear and objective." You have already decided that you agreed with the hearings official's interpretation of that provision. Accordingly, you may simply affirm the hearings official's decision.

ACD:abm

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY
February 22, 2016

To: Eugene Planning Commission

From: Carolyn Burke, Parks and Recreation Principal Planner

Subject: PARKS and RECreate Needs Assessment

ISSUE STATEMENT

This work session is an opportunity to review the process and findings of the PARKS and RECreate Needs Assessment.

BACKGROUND

PARKS and RECreate: Picture. Plan. Play. is a community conversation to help the City identify priorities for the next 10-plus years of Parks and Recreation in Eugene. The resulting plan will serve as a road map for capital investments, put into place mechanisms for sustained maintenance, and renew or identify new partnerships for enhanced services to the public.

The PARKS and RECreate process has set out to ensure that plans for the future are responsive to the community's values and aspirations. The first phase in the planning process is complete. This phase entailed the collection of information from many sources to gain a thorough understanding of the current state of parks and recreation in Eugene. Traditional public outreach tools were combined with new innovative approaches to reach out to more individuals than ever before. Approximately 7,000 voices were heard.

In addition to community engagement, a variety of technical analyses were conducted to help us better understand the system of today and opportunities for the future. These analyses included equity mapping to show geographic distribution of facilities; benchmarking of Eugene's system against other comparable cities; trends analysis; and facility assessments.

The Needs Assessment Report synthesizes the collected information and identifies key findings. The full version 90-page Needs Assessment Report can be found here: <http://issuu.com/cityofeugenerecreation/docs/parksrecneedsfinalprint?e=2105189/32713414>. Or the executive summary can be found here: <https://eugparksandrec.atavist.com/parks-and-recreation-system-plan>. Both of these documents are accessible from the project website, www.eugparksandrec.org.

Guiding themes are a distillation of what we've learned and will serve as criteria for prioritizing projects and draft recommendations. They are:

- ***Serve the entire community***- Provide equitable and welcoming access to parks, recreation facilities and programs regardless of geography, culture, ability or income.
- ***Care for what we have***- Ensure that basic amenities are provided and that they are safe and clean. Be responsible stewards of current assets and infrastructure by making the best possible use of what we have.
- ***Grow responsibly***- Understand where growth of the system is required to meet the needs of the community. Focus on quality of life and build on existing strengths.
- ***Integrate with other systems***- Make regional connections and recognize the inter-dependence of Parks and Recreation with public health, transportation, land use, green infrastructure, education, art and culture, and economic development.
- ***Invest in partnerships***- Continue to leverage Eugene’s assets and expand services to the community through effectively partnering with public agencies, non-profits, the private sector, and community volunteers.

NEXT STEPS

Six public workshops have been held in different planning areas of the City in early February to present the needs assessment findings and get early input into recommendations for the future. Following these workshops, recommendations will be drafted that identify priority capital investments and define future maintenance and operation levels. These recommendations will be shared for community input and feedback over the summer. A final plan is anticipated for council adoption in the winter of 2016/2017.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Carolyn Burke, 541-682-8816, carolyn.j.burke@ci.eugene.or.us

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY
February 22, 2016

To: Eugene Planning Commission
From: Anne C. Davies, City Attorney's Office
Subject: Cell Tower Code Changes

ACTION REQUESTED

This work session is an opportunity to provide the Planning Commission with an introduction to a package of land use code changes to the City's requirements for siting cell towers.

BRIEFING STATEMENT

Late last year, City Council directed staff to initiate code changes to the city's telecommunications ordinance. The proposed changes are intended to provide further protections to residential areas from the adverse impacts of cell towers, while complying with federal regulations designed to protect telecommunications companies from certain local government regulations. In particular, local government regulations may not prohibit or have the effect of profiting the provision of wireless services. That is, the telecommunications companies must be allowed to construct facilities where such facilities are needed to fill a "significant gap in service."

The City Council identified four specific areas for revision, based on the City Attorney's review of recent changes to the City of Glendale, California's cell tower regulations. Those four areas are outlined in the City Attorney's memo to the City Council, dated October 21, 2015, provided as part of Attachment A. In summary, the Council directed staff to revise the cell tower provisions to:

1. Prohibit cell towers in residential zones except through a process, such as a variance, as required to comply with federal law;
2. Tighten up application requirements and approval criteria to better address a significant gap in service;
3. Include a requirement that all applications for new cell towers include an alternative configuration analysis;
4. Adjust height limits to clearly prohibit heights greater than necessary to fill the identified service gap.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Anne C. Davies: 541-682-8447, anne.c.davies@ci.eugene.or.us

ATTACHMENT

A. City Council Agenda Item Summary (AIS) for November 9, 2015

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Work Session: Cell Towers

Meeting Date: November 9, 2015
 Department: Planning and Development
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: A
 Staff Contact: Steve Nystrom
 Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-8385

ISSUE STATEMENT

This work session is an opportunity for the City Council to discuss a memo from the City Attorney's office concerning cell tower regulations.

BACKGROUND

This item is a follow-up to the work session the council previously held to discuss cell towers. That work session focused on the City's regulations, federal telecommunications standards and regulations of other select cities. At the conclusion of that work session, the council asked whether there was anything more the City could do, particularly within residential areas. The City Attorney offered to discuss this matter with the City's telecommunications consultant in Washington D.C. Based on his feedback, the City Attorney's office provided additional research and prepared a memo discussing those findings. Planning staff and legal counsel will be available at the work session to discuss this memo further.

While Eugene's ordinance has generally achieved the primary goal of minimizing the construction of new towers on residential lands (none built to date), there has been more recent interest from a couple of cell providers to locate a few towers in residential areas. As staff understands it, the cell providers have established the majority of their cell tower networks. However, a few pockets of poor service remain. It is this circumstance that has prompted the council to discuss whether there is more the City can do to regulate new towers in residential areas (primarily the R-1, Low-Density Residential zone).

As was discussed at the previous work session, the Federal Telecommunications Act stipulates the extent to which a local government may regulate telecommunication facilities. One of the key provisions of this federal act states that local government regulations may not prohibit, or "have the effect of prohibiting," the provision of personal wireless services. The City was successful in prohibiting cell towers in all residential zones except R-1 when it first adopted its ordinance. Given that the R-1 zoning district comprises the majority of land in the City, it was not legally possible to prohibit new towers in this zone as well.

Given these circumstances, the City Attorney's memo attempts to identify other possible actions

the City could consider. These suggestions generally include measures requiring cell providers to provide further analysis and justification that a proposed tower is necessary in the R-1 zone, and that all reasonable design alternatives have been considered. The memo also discusses other efforts underway by staff to encourage the use of emerging technologies which could help reduce visual impacts to neighborhoods.

Staff would note that while there currently is no capacity to undertake a code amendment process at this time, the City has begun a process of identifying potential amendments such as this which can be prioritized by the council in the future, as staff resources become available.

COUNCIL OPTIONS

This matter is before the City Council as a discussion item. No action is required.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

No recommendation is necessary as this is a discussion item.

SUGGESTED MOTION

None.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Memo from City Attorney

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Steve Nystrom
Telephone: 541-682-8385
Staff Email: steven.a.nystrom@ci.eugene.or.us



Eugene City Attorney's Office

Memorandum

Date: October 21, 2015
To: Mayor and City Council
From: Anne C. Davies
Subject: Cell Tower Update

In December of last year, staff provided council with a brief summary of the City's regulations related to siting cell towers. Staff outlined the limitations that federal law places on the City and what measures are embodied in the current Eugene Code that serve to protect residential neighborhoods from the impacts of cell towers. Councilor Taylor requested that staff outline measures that are not currently in the code that could be added to provide further protections. Interested citizens pointed to the City of Glendale in California for possible guidance.

As suggested in that December 8th work session, we contacted the City's consultant in Washington D.C. to inquire whether he was aware of any other local jurisdictions, nationwide, that had regulations that Eugene could adopt that would provide greater protections to residential neighborhoods. The consultant was not aware of any specific local governments that stood out, but commented that generally New York and California were viewed as the states with local governments that had the most protective regulations. We have also reviewed relevant code provisions from Palo Alto and Davis, California.

Summary of Eugene's existing regulations

Before addressing the possible changes that might be made to Eugene's code, it is worth summarizing briefly the measures that Eugene already has in place to limit impacts from cell towers in residential areas. The Eugene Code currently creates a preference for collocation. Collocation on existing buildings, structures and utilities is favored over citing new cell towers in the code because collocations generally require less restrictive processes and approval criteria. In general, new towers are not allowed if cell service can be accommodated by collocation on existing towers. Where a new tower is necessary, the applicant must demonstrate that the new tower has the ability to accommodate future collocated antenna in order to minimize the need for additional towers.

The Eugene Code also has a strong preference for siting new towers in commercial and industrial zones over residential zones. New towers are not permitted at all in R-2, R-3 and R-4 zones. New towers are permitted outright in E-1, E-2, I-2 and I-3 zones, and are allowed in the R-1 zone with a conditional use permit. New towers are currently not allowed within 2,000 feet

Mayor and City Council

October 21, 2015

Page 2

of an existing tower. Further restrictions, including height limits, required buffering and camouflage, are intended to limit the adverse visual effects of cell towers.

As explained by staff, federal regulations do create some road blocks to the City's attempts to impose significant restrictions on the siting of new cell towers. Most importantly, under federal law, local regulations cannot have the effect of prohibiting the provision of wireless service. The City's current code addresses this federal prohibition – both the site review and conditional use permit criteria require an applicant that is proposing a new tower to demonstrate that collocation is impractical and fails to meet the needs of the service area before a new tower can be added.

Summary of Glendale's provisions

The City of Glendale's code was mentioned as a potential good example to consider. In reviewing Glendale's recent code revisions, a few points stand out. Glendale sought to strengthen the application requirements and limit new towers as much as possible to those towers and the characteristics of towers that were required to fill a service gap. The following are some elements of Glendale's code that are not present in Eugene's code.

- 1) Stronger application requirements: In Glendale, an applicant proposing to site a new tower must identify the geographic service area for the subject installation, including a map showing all of the applicant's existing sites in the local service network associated with coverage gap that the proposed tower is meant to close. The application must describe how the proposal will close that service gap.
- 2) Least intrusive means: In Glendale, a proposed tower cannot be taller than is necessary to serve the gap. In other jurisdictions, an applicant must demonstrate that the proposed tower is necessary to fill a significant gap in coverage or capacity shortfall and is the "least intrusive means of doing so."
- 3) Maintenance and Monitoring Program: Glendale's monitoring program includes the ability to require maintenance of landscaping and other mitigation measures.
- 4) Alternative Designs: In Eugene, an applicant for a new tower must perform an alternative sites analysis to study alternative locations to ensure there are no other sites more suitable; *i.e.*, available sites with preferable zoning. In Glendale, the alternatives analysis does not only include alternative sites, it requires the applicant to demonstrate that it has considered alternative configurations (*i.e.*, system and tower designs) so that the proposed tower is the least intrusive possible.

Possible revisions to strengthen Eugene's wireless regulation

- 1) Towers in residential zones: New towers are allowed in the R-1, Low Density Residential zone under Eugene's code, although they are disfavored, as explained above. Davis, California prohibits new towers in residential zones. Given the amount of City land zoned R-1, if Eugene were to prohibit siting new towers in this zone, it would have to

Mayor and City Council

October 21, 2015

Page 3

provide a variance process to allow new towers where necessary to fill a significant gap in service.

- 2) Application requirements: Although an absolute prohibition in residential areas is not possible, the application requirements and approval criteria could be amended to clearly require a demonstration of a significant service gap and how the proposed tower is needed to fill that gap. However, it should be noted that the few recent proposals submitted for residential areas did demonstrate a significant gap in service. Therefore, it's not clear that such an amendment would affect future proposals in residential areas.
- 3) Alternatives analysis: Eugene could add a clearer requirement that the applicant include an alternative configuration analysis.
- 4) Tower Height: In Eugene's code, the height of a tower is merely limited to the maximum height allowed in the particular zone. Both Davis and Glendale require the tower to be no taller than is necessary to fill the service gap.

Additional Measures

In addition to reviewing the telecommunication regulations of other cities, staff is currently exploring other emerging technologies which may help minimize the need for new towers in the future. "Small Cell" technologies is a newer strategy for accommodating ever increasing data demands. These facilities are much smaller in size and can be collocated on a variety of structures and utilities, with minimal visual impact. While small cell facilities don't completely replace the need for towers, they do help augment telecommunication services which can help minimize the need for future towers. Staff believes these new technologies offer a positive alternative to the typical antenna designs.

Conclusion

Federal regulations do limit to some degree the steps local governments can take in prohibiting cell towers. However, technologies continue to improve – many carriers now prefer smaller equipment (small cells) that do not completely replace the need for towers, but that do provide an alternative for filling certain gaps in coverage. It is arguable that Eugene's code is adequate to address those changes in technology, but there may be updates and revisions that could be made to strengthen and make the code more clear.