

**PORT ORFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, PORT ORFORD CITY HALL
REGULAR MEETING, PUBLIC HEARING and WORKSHOP
Tuesday, October 13, 2020
3:30 PM**

How to Participate:

Planning Meeting October 13, 2020
Tue, October 13, 2020 3:30 PM - 5:30 PM (PDT)

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/441634605>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States (Toll Free): [1 866 899 4679](tel:18668994679)

United States: [+1 \(571\) 317-3116](tel:+15713173116)

Access Code: 505-654-389

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/505654389>

1. Call to Order
2. Additions to the Agenda
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes: August 11, 2020 & September 8, 2020
5. Comments from the Public
6. Public Hearing

None
7. Planning Matters

- Reduce the Allowable Building Height in All Zones.

Other Business

A. Announcements and Communications:

- City Planner Comments
- Planning Commission Comments

B. Old and Continuing Business

- Sign Ordinance

9. Public Considerations
10. Adjourn

CITY OF PORT ORFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday, August 11, 2020, 3:30 p.m.
Regular Meeting
Port Orford City Hall, Gable Council Chambers
555 W. 20th Street
Port Orford, Oregon

Date Draft:

Date Corrected:

Date Final:

1. Call to Order.

Chair McHugh called to order the regular meeting of the City of Port Orford Planning Commission Tuesday, August 11, 2020 at 3:31 p.m.

Those members present were: Chair McHugh, Commissioner Nieraeth, Commissioner Stetson, Commissioner Jezuit, Commissioner Berndt, Commissioner Schofield.

City staff present were Planner Crystal Shoji and Planning Assistant Patty Clark.

Others present were Ann Vileisis, Steve Lawton, and Greg Thelen.

2. Additions to the Agenda: Chair McHugh wanted a brief review of the ordinance on Conditional Use Permits added to the agenda. After hearing no objection, a review of Conditional Use Permits is added above the sign ordinance in Planning Matters.

3. Approval of Minutes:

Commissioner Stetson made the motion to approve the minutes of Port Orford Planning Commission meeting dated June 9, 2020 with subsequent modifications with Commissioner Nieraeth as second. All approved the motion.

4. Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner McHugh asked consensus to approve the agenda for the meeting of August 11, 2020. Passed by consensus.

5. Comments from the public.

Greg Thelen, Port Orford resident, expressed his appreciation for the commissioners' work on the Dark Sky ordinance. Information will be presented during the public hearing.

Anne Vileisis expressed her appreciation for the commissioners' work on the Dark Sky ordinance. She speaks on the height limit for the lighting fixtures. Information will be presented during the public hearing.

Steve Lawton, Port Orford resident, has information from City of Waldport and City of Florence about their design and light standards. Information will be presented during the public hearing.

6. Public Hearing: Outdoor Lighting Code

Chair McHugh opened the public hearing on Chapter 15.17, Outdoor Lighting Code accepting testimony from the public for those who support the code.

Steve Lawton, Port Orford resident, supports the Outdoor Lighting Code. He contacted the City of Florence director of public works who informed Mr. Lawton that the ODOT lights were set on 27 feet poles at 26.5 feet. The City of Waldport city manager reported their Highway 101 corridor light fixtures are set at 20 to 25 feet. Mr. Lawton advised the ODOT lighting policy and guidelines dated 2017, states that on non-freeway state highways within city limits, the design and maintenance are the responsibility of the city excluding ODOT specific lights, which are lights owned and maintained by ODOT, in which case ODOT will reflect the standards of the city, and there can be an intercity governmental agreement to determine the appropriate design. Commissioner McHugh stated at present all of the streetlights in Port Orford are either owned or leased by the city with the exception of some private lights. This was confirmed by Mr. Neavoll and will be confirmed by Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative next week.

Steve Montana, Port Orford resident, supports the Outdoor Lighting Code. He expressed his appreciation for Mr. Steve Lawton obtaining valuable information from ODOT about limiting the height of the poles. Mr. Montana feels the height of the pole is critical even if the light has a cap. He would like to see the height limit at 20 feet. Mr. Montana appreciates Anne for her comments and the work she has done. Mr. Montana asks if council has discussed how neighbors will approach neighbors in violation of the code. He suggested a form.

Anne Vileisis would like the Park Commission to reconsider the height limit for the lighting fixtures that was changed at the last minute of the last meeting. She would like to see the height standard lowered closer to 20 feet. Ms. Vileisis is concerned that the ordinance may need the verbiage "dark sky" since the comprehensive plan says that the policy is to minimize

light pollution and maintain dark sky at night through implementation of the city's Dark Sky Ordinance.

Commissioner McHugh reviewed that the name was changed from Dark Sky Ordinance to Outdoor Lighting Code since the verbiage dark sky can sound ominous to some residents that might interpret it as no outdoor lighting. Commissioner McHugh questions if the comprehensive plan can be changed. Planner Shoji advised it would be easier to make a change in the code and suggested adding the terminology "dark sky" in the purpose. Commissioners agree to the change to 15.17.020 Purpose first paragraph to read, "Conserving energy to the greatest extent possible, promoting traffic and pedestrian safety, minimizing glare, light trespass, obstructive lighting, light pollution and sky glow; and preserving the dark sky of the natural nighttime environment."

Greg Thelen, Port Orford resident, expressed appreciation to the commissioners who have worked on the Outdoor Lighting Code. Mr. Thelen reported the 20 feet height level seems to be a standard at the coast and working in some cities. Mr. Thelen noticed that the lights from the Port are escaping to the sky and not being used by the boaters and feels they should have coverings. Commissioner McHugh reported the City of Port Orford's municipal code does not apply to the Port; however, the city can ask the Port to make modifications to their lights.

Commissioner McHugh invited testimony from the public for those who do not support the code. Hearing none, Commissioner McHugh closed the hearing to public comments.

Commissioner McHugh would like the below changes:

Section 15.17.030 definitions: "In the case where the definition of a term is found to be in conflict with a definition or a term in any other city ordinance regulation" should read "ordinance or regulation."

Same paragraph, "the more restrictive definition will apply" changed to "the more restrictive definition shall apply."

Definition for Kelvin: "Typically ranges from 2700K to 5000K." Comm. McHugh would like to change 2700 to 2000K, because the lowest easily available lamp is rated at 2000 Kelvin. First word in nonessential lighting is a typo that needs corrected.

Patty Clark advised the grammar and typo errors will get corrected.

15.17.090, Street and Highway Lighting Standards, paragraph B: Maximum height shall not exceed 35 feet. There is public testimony that Florence ODOT project lights were set at 26.5 since the pole was 27 feet and Waldport used 20 to 25 feet in their standards. Comm. McHugh

reported ODOT standards are 35 feet not exceeding 40 outside of municipalities. Commissioners agree with light height standard at 20 feet.

Commissioner Stetson moved to approve the Outdoor Lighting Code with the change made to standard height of 20 feet and the change of adding “preserving the dark sky with natural nighttime environment” to the purpose with Commissioner Berndt as second. ***Motion carried 5-0***

Discussion: None.

Comm. Jezuit	<u>Yes</u>	Comm. Nieraeth	<u>Yes</u>	Comm. Berndt	<u>Yes</u>
Comm. Stetson	<u>Yes</u>	Comm. McHugh	<u>Yes</u>		

7. Planning Matters

Conditional Use Permits – Chapter 17.32 of Port Orford municipal code, section 17.32.060, time limit on a permit for conditional use. Commissioners are advised they cannot discuss this, and it cannot be on the agenda, because the last conditional use is being appealed and the time limit is the subject of appeal.

Sign Ordinance – Political signs have been removed from the sign code. Patty Clark suggested each commissioner take a section for review and research for legal updates. Planner Shoji reported commissioners need facts and legal requirements presented in order to make changes not based on opinion.

Commissioner McHugh moved to table discussion on the sign ordinance until the city attorney is present at the next meeting with Commissioner Nieraeth as second. ***Motion carried 5-0.***

Discussion: Planner Shoji will offer a presentation pending authorization of the City Administrator at next meeting. Patty Clark will communicate with Legal Counsel Kudlac to see if she has time to present printed documents in the next meeting packet.

Comm. Jezuit	<u>Yes</u>	Comm. Nieraeth	<u>Yes</u>	Comm. Berndt	<u>Yes</u>
Comm. Stetson	<u>Yes</u>	Comm. McHugh	<u>Yes</u>		

8. Other Business.

A. Announcements and Communications.

- City Planner Comments: None.
- Planning Commission Comments: Commissioner McHugh requested commissioners look in section 15.16.260, Violations and Penalties, to get familiar with it and consider changes.

B. Old and Continuing Business: None.

9. Considerations from the public: Anne Vileisis would like public input when discussing the sign ordinance. Patty Clark advised it will have to go through the process of meetings and a public hearing.

10. Chair McHugh adjourned the meeting at 4:54 p.m. `

CITY OF PORT ORFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING

Tuesday, September 8, 2020, 3:30 p.m.
Regular Meeting
Port Orford City Hall, Gable Council Chambers
555 W. 20th Street
Port Orford, Oregon

Date Draft:

Date Corrected:

Date Final:

1. Call to Order.

Chair McHugh called to order the regular meeting of the City of Port Orford Planning Commission Tuesday, September 8, 2020 at 3:58 p.m.

Those members present were: Chair McHugh, Commissioner Nieraeth, Commissioner Stetson, Commissioner Jezuit, Commissioner Berndt, Commissioner Schofield, Commissioner Leonard.

City staff present were Planner Crystal Shoji, Legal Counsel Kudlac and Planning Assistant Patty Clark.

Others present were Steve Lawton, Mr. Gurnee.

2. Additions to the Agenda: None.

3. Approval of Minutes: **No minutes available.**

4. Approval of Agenda:

Commissioner McHugh moved to approve the agenda for the meeting of September 8, 2020 as written with Commissioner Stetson as second. Passed by consensus.

5. New Business.

Rowland Willis was Vice Chair for the Planning Commission and is no longer in the position. Commissioner Stetson nominated Commissioner Nieraeth for vice chair position.

Commissioner Nieraeth declined due to scheduling issues. Commissioner McHugh nominates

Commissioner Leonard for vice chair position, seconded by Commissioner Stetson. ***Passed by Commissioners.***

Objections: None.

6. Comments from the Public.

Mr. Gurnee: Commented on the planning matter about allowable height in all zones. He is in favor of the planning commission attempting to do this and expressed his appreciation.

Steve Lawton supports the reduction of the allowable building height throughout the community. He feels it is critical to protect the small-town ambience, community livability and maintain the feeling of a small coastal residential town. Three story buildings would be disproportionate adjacent to homes generally one to two stories high. Mr. Lawton states a three-story building would likely be seasonal and would be a challenge with fire protection, parking and water volume. Mr. Lawton supports using planning ordinances to control the city's water flow and sewage problems currently. Mr. Lawton recommends two stories with a maximum of 30 feet.

7. Public Hearing – None.

8. Planning Matters

- A. Reduce the Allowable Building Height in All Zones; per City Council direction: Legal Counsel Kudlac advised the City Council wants the Planning Commission to start the process of reviewing the building height in all zones without providing specific instructions. Council has some concerns about larger scale buildings coming in and is hoping to be proactive. Council would like to see an allowable building height consistent across all zones.

Planner Shoji referred commissioners to their packet for current definitions and information. Most fire departments have 35 feet access. She suggested commissioners review the zones and the purpose of each zone to be sure the propositions fall into the purpose of the zones and review the uses of the zone and what is allowed in each zone. Ms. Shoji informed commissioners of the timeline, about three months.

Commissioner Jezuit would like a frame of reference of building height. She would like a definition of three-story and two-story and how split entry falls into the two-story building. Steve Lawton, Port Orford resident, agrees the number of stories need defined. He suggested reviewing other communities' policies and definitions. Mr. Lawton addressed the frame of reference of building height. The Redfish Restaurant and Gallery is under 30 feet. An example is, floor built at 1 foot above the ground, 8- or 9-foot wall for the first floor and another one-foot for the second floor, floor and another 8- or 9-foot wall. Depending on the width of the house, a 4-12 roof is 4 feet and 12 feet with a center

foot rise on the roof is 30 feet. He suggested using the combination of stories combined with height due to lofts and split entries.

Commissioner Nieraeth asks if there will be a variance application. Planner Shoji answered that a variance is normally something that has to do with a property opposed to something the person wants. A variance is when a person feels they do not have the same rights as other people due to the property layout or topography, etc. Commissioner Nieraeth would like an example of other similar sized city's codes as a reference.

Commissioner Berndt reviewed Lane County's Allowable Building Height regulations which states, shall not exceed 2-1/2 stories or more than 35 feet in height, which pertains to Florence. She suggested possibly consulting with other Port Orford city services such as fire protection and water to see how a height change would impact the services. Assistant Planner Clark understands that the fire department cannot fight a fire over a two-story height due to the ISO requiring adequate water volume and pressure and the ability to reach inhabitants. The current city fire department cannot reach over two floors.

Commissioner Leonard is in favor of getting to task. She is not sure why Port Orford has to compare the town to any other town. She feels commissioners should make ordinances to fit into a description best for Port Orford. She suggested going through the zones and current standards and start changing the numbers.

Commissioners can do research before the next meeting and make changes if necessary. Commissioners agree to this plan.

Commissioners review definitions:

Height of a building: Vertical distance from grade to highest point of coping of a flat roof or deck line of a mansard roof or to average height of the highest gable of a pitched or hip roof. Commissioners agree to the use of this definition.

Grade or ground level: Average of the finished ground level at the center of all walls of the building. In cases where the wall is parallel to or within five feet of a sidewalk, the ground level shall be measured at the sidewalk. Commissioners agree to the use of this definition.

General Exceptions to Building Height Limitations: Chair McHugh suggested these exceptions might need reviewed as commissioners progress.

Residential Zone 1R: Height of Building Accepted in Code section 17.20.050 states in a 1R zone no building shall exceed 35 feet in height. Exception 17.20.050 will need

reviewed. Maximum number of stories are not currently addressed. Planner Shoji advised that stories should not be addressed, since people can do what they want with the height they have. Commissioner McHugh suggested the number of stories can be addressed after review of ordinances for other cities' ordinances. Assistant Planner Clark suggested reviewing the Planned Unit Development section and address the height.

Mr. Lawton advised that Yachats recently mandated 30 feet across commercial and residential. He uses Yachats as a community that is thriving and prospering currently with a mix of residents and tourism. He feels this is appropriate for the size of Port Orford and the concerns he has for increasing the infrastructure for water and sewer and density, especially without on-street parking requirements. Port Orford does not have development fees like other communities have to enhance infrastructural improvements to serve a tall building.

Commissioner Berndt suggested the ordinances need to address the view. Legal Council Kudlac advised a city can pass ordinances to protect views with different height restrictions, such as Bandon does. They have a 24-foot height on the west side and 28 on the east side so those houses can see over. They have view corridors, such as separations between houses. Planner Shoji suggested a view shed ordinance could be time consuming and controversial and difficult to define. She feels it is more prudent to reviewing limits across zones and consider the view shed ordinance when there is more time.

Commissioners will research other communities' ordinances and relay the information to Assistant Planner Clark after which a special meeting will be called in order to accommodate the aggressive timeline. Planner Shoji offered a chart showing findings on the research.

B. Announcements and Communications:

City Planner Comments: None.

Planning Commission Comments: None.

C. Old and Continuing Business:

Sign Ordinance: This will be addressed at a later meeting.

9. Considerations from the public: None.

10. Chair McHugh adjourned the meeting at 5:16 p.m. `



City of Port Orford
555 W. 20th St.
P.O. Box 310
Port Orford, OR 97465

Staff Report

To: Port Orford Planning Commission
Port Orford City Council

Prepared by: Crystal Shoji, AICP, Port Orford Planner

Subject: Proposed Zone Text Amendments to modify building height restrictions within in the City of Port Orford

Date: October 8, 2020

Scheduled Hearings:

- **Planning Commission Public Hearing – November 10, 2020; Via Virtual Meeting at 3:30 p.m.**
- **City Council Public Hearing – November 19, 2020; Via Virtual Meeting at 3:30 p.m.**

Words within this Staff Report respond to the criteria of the Municipal Code. Language quoted from the Port Orford Municipal Code and the Statewide Planning Goals is shown in *italics*. Findings and comments provided by the City Planner are shown in regular font.

Port Orford Municipal Code, Chapter 17.40, Amendments to Zoning and Comprehensive Plan

17.40.020 Application for an Amendment

An amendment to this ordinance in the text or the map may be initiated by the city council, the planning commission, or by application of a property owner or his authorized agent.

Finding: This proposed text amendment has been initiated by the Port Orford City Council.

17.40.030 Process for Zone Text, Map or Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

- A. *Any amendment to the zoning ordinance text, the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies, and/or the comprehensive [sic] Plan /zone map is subject to a two-step approval process:*
 - a. *The Planning Commission holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the City Council.*
 - b. *The City Council holds a de novo public hearing and makes a final decision.*
- B. *An amendment shall be adopted by (Ordinance [sic]).*

Findings: The City is following the procedures set forth in Section 17.40.030 of the code.

17.40.040 Criteria and Approval for Zone Text or Map Amendment.

An amendment to the zoning ordinance text or map is appropriate when there are findings that all of the applicable conditions exist:

- a. *Either the original wording or designation was made in error, or the amendment is justified due to changing circumstances.*
- b. *Any amendment must comply with the Port Orford Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies.*

Findings: The proposal to amend height restrictions is justified due to changing circumstances. It has been many decades since the height restrictions within the code were put in place. At this time, the City Council and Planning Commission have determined that the City of Port Orford will be best served by maintaining a small-town ambiance with human-scale buildings that are compatible with existing development within the City.

At the time that the bulk of the existing height restrictions were put into place, the City of Port Orford was more reliant on heavy industry that was part of the timber industry, the fishing industry and local services to support the industry. The timber industry currently employs fewer people, and tourism is a growing segment of the economy.

City of Port Orford Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies (Amended July 18, 2019)

STATEWIDE PLANNING GOAL 9: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

City Goals

1. *Provide opportunities throughout the city for a variety of economic activities that are important to the health, welfare and prosperity of the citizens and community of Port Orford.*
2. *Diversify and improve the economy of Port Orford, while protecting the natural environment that makes the city a unique and inviting place.*

City Policies

6. *Encourage human-scale amenities within commercial areas and adjacent to trails and lookouts to encourage tourism and enhance the city's sense of place.*

City Goals

STATEWIDE PLANNING GOAL 17: COASTAL SHORELANDS

3. *Provide for water-dependent and water-related uses, and for nondependent nonrelated uses, in the city, compatible with existing or committed uses.*
4. *Provide for water-oriented uses that provide for enhanced views or access to coastal waters in conjunction with water-dependent and water-related uses.*

Findings: The selected goals and policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan that are addressed above within this Staff Report may be deemed applicable. To approve the proposed amendments, it is appropriate to have findings to confirm that the proposed amendments are consistent with the goals and policies of City's Comprehensive Plan. Below are a few areas suggested for consideration.

- A. Determine whether the height restrictions as proposed in industrial, marine, commercial and shoreland areas are consistent with providing opportunities throughout the city for a variety of economic activities that are important to the health, welfare and prosperity of the citizens and community of Port Orford.
- B. Determine whether the proposed height restrictions are consistent with diversifying and improving the economy of Port Orford, while protecting the natural environment that makes the city a unique and inviting place.
- C. Adopt the finding that the proposed height restrictions will encourage human-scale amenities within commercial areas and adjacent to trails and lookouts to encourage tourism and enhance the city's sense of place.
- D. Determine whether the proposed height restrictions are consistent with the needs of water-dependent and water-related uses, and for nondependent nonrelated uses, in the city, compatible with existing or committed uses. The following definitions from the *Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines, Definitions* may be helpful:

Water -Dependent. *A use or activity which can be carried out only on, in or adjacent to water areas because the use requires access to the water body for water-borne transportation, recreation, energy production, or source of water.*

Water Oriented. *A use whose attraction to the public is enhanced by a view of or access to coastal waters.*

Water-Related. Uses which are not directly dependent upon access to a water body, but which provide goods or services that are directly associated with water-dependent land or waterway use, and which, if not located adjacent to water, would result in a public loss of quality in the goods and services offered. . . .

Staff Recommendations:

If the decision-making body makes the determination that amending the height restrictions throughout the City as proposed in the attached draft amendment document are consistent the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies, the following finding is appropriate.

Finding: The proposed height amendments are consistent with the language of the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies as presented within the Staff Report.

If the decision-making body makes the determination that there the height restrictions could provide adverse effects in any of the zones based upon the determinations from (A) – (D) above, a particular zone could be excluded from new or amended height restrictions, or specific exceptions could be provided within the City’s zoning ordinance.

The Proposed Amendments are provided beginning on page 4 of this staff report.

**Proposed Amendments to Building Height Restrictions
within the City of Port Orford**

Format of Proposed Zone Text Amendments in this section:

Titles of chapters and sections are shown in *bold font italics*.

Current code language is in regular font.

Language proposed to be removed is shown with ~~strike through~~.

New text language proposed to be added is shown in **bold font**.

Notes from the Planner are in italicized regular font.

Port Orford Municipal Code Chapter 17.04

17.04.030 Definitions

“Height of buildings” means the vertical distance from the “grade” to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or to the deck line of a mansard roof or to the average height of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof.

Port Orford Municipal Code Chapter 17.12

17.12.010 Residential zone (1-R)

G. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in a 1-R zone no building shall exceed ~~thirty-five (35)~~ **twenty-five (25)** feet in height.

17.12.020 Residential zone (2-R)

G. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in a 2-R zone no building shall exceed ~~thirty-five (35)~~ **twenty-five (25)** feet in height.

17.12.030 Commercial zone (4-C)

F. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in a 4-C zone no building shall exceed ~~forty-five (45)~~ **twenty-five (25)** feet in height.

17.12.040 Industrial zone (5-I)

Planner's Note: There are currently no restrictions in the 5-I zone. The following height restriction is proposed.

F. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in a 5-I zone no building shall exceed twenty-five (25) feet in height.

17.12.050 Controlled development zone (6-C)

Planner's Note: There are currently no restrictions in the 6-C zone. The following height restriction is proposed:

D. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in a 5-I zone no building shall exceed twenty-five (25) feet in height.

17.12.060 Marine activity zone (7-MA)

E. Height of buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.12.050 in a 7-MA zone, no building shall exceed ~~forty-five (45)~~ **twenty-five (25)** feet in height.

Planner's Note: This section (above) currently refers to the requirements of Section 17.12.050, which is the 6-CD zone, but there are no height restrictions in that zone. There is reference to a Conditional Use Permitted under Chapter 17.32, which would allow public utility facilities, communication facilities, structures for recreation activities, etc. See Section 17.20.050 language on the next page of this document.

17.21.070 Public facilities and park zone (8-PF)

Planner's Note: There are currently no restrictions in the 8-PF zone. This zone allows city utilities and infrastructure. The following height restriction is proposed:

D. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in an 8-PF zone no building shall exceed twenty-five (25) feet in height.

17.12.080 Shoreland overlay zone (9-SO)

Planner's Note: There are currently no restrictions in the 9-SO zone. The following height restriction is proposed:

G. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in an 9-SO zone no building shall exceed twenty-five (25) feet in height.

Planner's Note: This zone outlined in this section has permitted uses including those in the underlying zone, water-dependent commercial and recreational developments and single-family dwellings. This zone includes conditional uses that include water-dependent commercial and industrial uses, residential uses, and other.

17.12.090 Battle Rock mixed use zone (10-MU)

B. Uses Permitted Outright

15. ~~Any permitted use where building height exceeds 35 feet shall be subject to site plan review to comply with the provisions set forth in Chapter 17.33, Site Plan Review.~~

Planner's Note: When the language in #15 above is removed, the following numbered reference in the code, #16, will become #15.

H. Height of Buildings. Except as provided in Section 17.20.050 in a 10-MU zone, no building shall exceed ~~forty-five (45)~~ **twenty-five (25)** feet in height.

Chapter 17.33 Site Plan Review

3. No signage shall be displayed on building above ~~thirty-five (35)~~ **twenty-five (25)** feet.

17.20.050 General exception to building height limitations.

The following type of structure or structural parts are not subject to the building height limitations of this title: chimney, tank, church spire, belfry, dome, monument, fire and hose towers, observation tower, mast, aerial, cooling tower, elevator shaft, transmission tower, smokestack, flagpole, radio or television towers and other similar projections.

17.32.050 Additional standards governing conditional uses.

B. Church, Hospital, Nursing Home, Convalescent Home, Retirement Home.

2. A church, hospital, nursing home, convalescent home, or retirement home may be built to exceed the height limitations of the zone in which it is located to a maximum height as determined by the State Fire Marshal if the total floor area of the building does not exceed one and one-half times the area of the site and if yard dimensions in each case are equal to at least two-thirds of the height of the principal structure.

17.46.080 Evacuation Route Improvement Requirements.

D. Tsunami Evacuation Structures: Tsunami evacuation structures are not subject to the building height limitations of this code.