



Harrisburg Planning Commission Minutes February 16, 2016

The Harrisburg Planning Commission met on this date at City Hall, located at 120 Smith St., at the hour of 7:05pm. Presiding was Chairperson Todd Culver. Also present were as follows:

- Charlotte Thomas
- Roger Bristol
- David Smid Jr.
- Kent Wullenwaber
- Kurt Kayner
- Youth Advisor Karina Ruiz-Lopez (Arrived at 7:12pm)
- City Administrator/Planner Brian Latta
- City Recorder/Asst. City Administrator Michele Eldridge
- Public Works Director Chuck Scholz

Absent this evening was Commissioner Francisco Garcia-Mendez.

Approving the Minutes of December 15, 2015

- Thomas **motioned to approve the minutes and was seconded** by Kayner. **The Planning Commission then voted unanimously to approve the Minutes of December 15, 2015.**

The order of proceedings was read aloud, as well as the process to request a continuance and request that the record remain open.

A Public Hearing was opened at the hour of 7:08PM

There were no conflicts of interest, and no ex parte contact.

Dollar General Site Plan Review (LU 352)

Applicants Presentation: Robert Vann introduced himself as representing Cross Development, for the development of a Dollar General store in Harrisburg. His address is a matter of record with the application He said that they had no presentation; they are happy to be in Harrisburg, and look forward to being part of the community. He was there to answer questions.

- Latta noted that we did receive public testimony; there is a copy of an email for each of you that was received from Mike Lefevre, owner of JB Mini-Storage. (Please see **Addendum No. 1**)
- Chairperson Culver noted that he is concerned about the need to move the access on the north end of the property by an additional 54'.
- Vann thought it was a little less than that. We understand the concerns, and can take a look at it, and see what they can do. Does everyone understand why they had to move the access point? During our utilities survey process, we found a 16" sewer line that was going to be underneath the proposed location of their building, which was not acceptable to them or their client. Therefore, they had to review the site plan and pushed the building back, which would allow the easement for the 16" line in front of building, not under it. When they discovered that, repositioning the building also changed the location of the access point. It doesn't affect the access point on Territorial.
- Chairperson Culver asked where the access line was pushed on 3rd St.
- Vann said it was to the north.
- Latta said that if you look at the agenda packet, exhibit B.29 shows a dashed line that goes through. The sewer line is probably 20' south.
- Chairperson Culver said that the access entry still has to be approved by ODOT, correct? It will be their call.
- Vann told him yes, absolutely.
- Chairperson Culver asked if ODOT will take that in account.
- Latta told him probably not. They will look at trip generations, traffic movements, best engineering practices, and decide if the relocated access point is suitable, according to their standards. That could possibly require them to modify the site plan, if it needs to be changed. There are advantages to keep away from the radius, or on intersections. Somewhere in the middle is better. Back in mid-2000's, ODOT approved the original access for JB Mini-Storage. Since some of the factors have changed on the property now, that may have a bearing on their decision. We don't have an answer about that tonight.

Karina Ruiz-Lopez arrived at the hour of 7:12 p.m.

Kayner asked him how long it would take to build the store. Vann told him approximately 5 months. Kayner asked when they felt they would break ground? Vann told him May or June of this year. Chairperson Culver said that he appreciated the drawings, but other than the dark one, we can't see what the building will look like. Vann told him it was a manufactured product, tan in color, with a dark accent color, and a couple of canopies on the side of the building. Chairperson Culver asked if it was outside the historical district, which Latta confirmed. Wullenwaber asked if the building had any required setbacks on the corner. Latta told him no, it's outside of the historical zone overlay, and meets our commercial requirements.

Bristol asked if there is a shared easement, is that a deed thing? Vann told him that the easement is only on a plat. We researched the issue, and tried to find a written easement, which we can't find, the title company can't find, and our company can't find. To his knowledge, it only shows up on the plat. Bristol asked if the access easement will move and Vann told him

that they are not moving that. Latta said that the applicant shows the easement on the site plan, and the current easement goes to about the midpoint of the old access. If they move it further to the north, the easement will stick out past the new access point. There is no need to relocate the easement, because it is outside their suggested access point. Thomas said then from the email received from Lefevre, it says the issue with the easement, is the entrance to the parking lot. Latta said that Lefevre is here tonight, so he'll get a chance to address the Planning Commission. The approach into their site is now shorter, which doesn't leave as much room for vehicles getting into JB Mini-Storage. Wullenwaber asked about the fire hydrant right on the corner? Vann said that they will relocate that. Latta said that right now, it's to the north; when they move the access point, they have to move the hydrant.

Wullenwaber and other commissioners started discussing how the big moving trucks could take up a lot of room on that easement; Kayner said that he sees quite a few stacked cars there in the day, and they will now be squished into a tighter area. Bristol asked where the key pad was, and Latta told him the keypad was just south of that.

Staff Report: Latta said that the site plan review criteria is in the zoning code, and it states that vehicle access to a site will not result in traffic related problems on the street. This is addressed briefly in the public testimony. The reason for the relocated access moving to the north, is the City's 16" sewer line. It would be quite difficult to relocate that. Staff had to look at that, and determine if the new access results in traffic related problems, and we had to look at the surrounding area. The purpose of the driveway at the storage facility is because of a locked gate. There is a keypad at the gate, which is 40' north of the curb cut, where the fire hydrant is now. The keypad is a little south of that, so if someone pulled up with a vehicle with a trailer, they could pull off the highway, enter the keypad, and go in. It needs to hold at least one vehicle, with a truck and trailer. There are times when there could be multiple people with a household, such as when someone is moving, when multiple vehicles could arrive at the same time. However, staff didn't feel that there would be many issues with this. If vehicles on street have a sight line to the driveway, they can see it. Although it's a state highway, it's not a super high traffic area; or rather, it's high for our City, but for ODOT, it's not. Staff felt it met the criteria. However, in the Conditions of Approval, it notes that they must get permission from ODOT. It also notes that ODOT is the expert in traffic analysis, and access management.

- Thomas asked if ODOT will take the easement into consideration.
- Latta told him yes, they will include that in their analysis. He is comfortable with relocating the access, and any accompanying traffic related problems. Second, the parking plan is sufficient. The applicant can provide 38 places, however, they would like to provide less parking. They provided a parking analysis, and compared it to other locations. They had a couple of years of data that shows that roughly ten to fifteen spaces is what is used on a daily basis. There is an alternative drawing in there, showing a reduction of parking spaces; the reduction would be on the south side, and the north end. Staff felt with their analysis, and other uses, that the reduced parking plan is acceptable. Staff felt that was appropriate because the reduced parking area, would allow different configurations for storm water and for landscaping. The 3rd criteria is the size, design, and operating characteristics, and being compatible with surrounding development. It's all zoned C-1 Commercial, so he felt it was met. The 4th criteria is

whether the utilities are adequate. The proposed use is compatible, and they will connect to all City services. For drainage, they show the storm water detention areas that will service the parking lot, and the drainage from the building, would allow drainage to accumulate. On page 4 of the staff report you'll also see Criteria 5, in which they need to provide a buffer. The required landscaping is 2% of the site area, which they will exceed. They don't about a residential zone, or a residential use of property, so they do not need to screen for that. They are providing more however, and are buffering the property on east side. The 6th criteria is onsite sediment control, and security, both of which were conditioned; they will show the control plan in their building permits. For the security measures, they will provide additional information. There are eight conditions of approval, and with development, they will need to pay SDC's, and provide us with a signage plan. As conditioned, the proposal could be approved, but again, with the alternative site plan, with reduced parking spaces. He would amend that motion, to consider staffs recommendation, that it should be approved as conditioned in the staff report.

Bristol asked why he went through criteria twice. Latta told him that in the criteria he used the additional development standards, which is included in section 100 of the zoning ordinance. That shows offsite landscaping, parking, and fences, etc. Bristol asked if there was any landscaping on the highway side. Like trees? Latta told him that there was a landscaping plan in their drawings, shown on B-25. There is landscaping, you can see three small trees near the intersection. Bristol said so they have it on the corners, but not in the middle where the highway curbs the sidewalk, and in their parking lot. Latta told him yes. Kayner was surprised that they put trees on the corner there. Latta told him it's a nice thing, it's opened up wider. As far as the site plan perspective, they do have the area to provide landscaping.

Chairperson Culver asked for testimony in favor, which there was none. He then asked for testimony in opposition to the application.

Opposition Testimony: Mike Lefevre, of 1138 Regency Dr., in Eugene, OR, 97401, said that he's very much in favor of the store being there; he looks forward to the synergy of businesses there. He hopes that people buy at lot there, and need a place to store it. It's nice to have that. His only concern is the access to the business. One thing is that the access is about 40' from the gate, and he thinks the key pad is about 15' to the south gate, close to the property line. He used an example of a 20' truck, with a 30' trailer. That alone would back up the access area, and affect the highway if you have a 2nd vehicle. That's quite common to see there. How it works, is that you put in a code, and you might wait 45 seconds for the gate to move. It's also common for someone who is not a customer to arrive, read the sign, then push the intercom, to call the manager. They might have to wait 3 to 4 minutes at that area. If the manager is showing a unit, and isn't in the office, they call a phone number instead, then she needs to walk back to the office to open a gate, or if she's not there, it could be several minutes. It's common to have two vehicles backed up, typically a truck and trailer, and another truck. They have a high percentage of stored vehicles that are there, that are larger, like trucks trailers, motorhomes, and RV's.

His concern is that there could be a few vehicles backed up, and their access would be blocked, and it could create a hazard on highway. He was comfortable with where it is now, where it's about 75'. If the access point could be moved 15' to 20' to the south, rather than where they have it now in their site plan, it would give that room to them. The downside to that access location would be with a delivery truck. It would be difficult with the truck, to pull out to the north. It looks like it would affect truck delivery, because they would have to pull into the parking spaces, and then back up into the loading dock. Where the access is planned now, the problem is passed to the Dollar General, because there is a problem with access, which potentially creates customer problems for both of them, and the highway access could be a problem. To him, it's manageable if they could move it 20', so when a delivery truck comes, it puts the problem into hands of professional driver; there would be no delay in pulling in. The only other thing he sees, when pulling back out, with the current location, they might have to go to the south for the main access, rather than the north. That is his take on it. Moving the access 15' to 20' would work fine. The current proposed access point leaves barely room for us, and to get a car into the Dollar General.

Thomas asked how far the key pad was from the gate; Lefevre thought it was about 15', but Latta thought it was probably about 25'. Bristol asked what would happen if you had to open the gate? Lefevre said that it's in the middle of a driveway. Bristol asked and once you are inside the gate? Lefevre said that there is probably about 30'. There is a keypad there too. Bristol wondered if they could move the gate to make it work. However, Lefevre said that the gate is already 20' in. They could move it in further, if needed. Thomas asked if the gate swings or if it's even; Lefevre said it's straight. Kayner said his business is across the street; he sees cars there all the time. Lefevre said that every vehicle must stop, and each one takes 3 to 5 minutes of wait time to get in. Kayner said then on weekends and Sundays, you could see a U-Haul truck and 4 to 5 rigs lined up there. Lefevre said that's right, there are families that shuttle materials. It's not like it happens all the time, but it is peak hours when it occurs. Bristol asked how many people use the south entrance from Territorial to go there. Lefevre said that he's not sure who would. Wullenwaber said that he does. Chairperson Culver thought that probably 60% to 70% of people do. However, the reality is that the south access wouldn't be the main access. Bristol agreed, with a building on that lot, they would probably go up to the other access off of the highway. He asked Latta if there is a turn lane there. Latta told him yes. Bristol said that helps, because people can use the turn lane to go around, without blocking traffic.

Kayner asked if there are limitations on how wide the access can be. Latta told him that you won't get two access points from ODOT; that's a certainty. Kayner said what if they make it one long access driveway? Chairperson Culver said that ODOT will determine it. Lefevre said that a moving truck would make it worse. Latta said that ODOT would understand traffic patterns. Kayner asked if the delivery truck would come from the north. Vann told him that's up to the drivers. They've done a truck turning analysis on the site to make sure it works. Kayner said that nobody thought about trucks when his business came in. They go onto his property, and there are accidents. Vann said that we do have some flexibility, otherwise, historically, we try to not to change the access point from what's been configured. Lefevre thought it looks like the same pattern would still apply, if the access moved just a little more south. Chairperson Culver, asked what they've laid out, is what you feel is necessary for trucks to egress and

ingress for deliveries? Vann told him that was correct. There might be some flexibility there. Kayner said that he doesn't want to back up trucks on Territorial, and wants what works best to get trucks in and out. Vann said that's what he's looking at. It provides a problem for a truck, if anyone is backing up.

The Planning Commission continued to talk about the location of the access easement, taking into account what kind of merchandise is being moved. Vann said that deliveries are determined by the store. Most deliveries are 3 times a week, although initially, it will be 3 times a day. Kayner asked what if ODOT doesn't approve it. Latta stated that you mean if they look at application, and decide whether or not they can accommodate it. Lefevre would like to know how far south can you get it....what they said, is that they could talk to their engineer's to determine how far south could you move it, and still accommodate both of you. The Planning Commission then discussed the location off where Dollar General would like the access, compared to the current access point. Latta showed them on the map where it was. It's probably 95' feet down. Thomas asked if there was any way for a happy medium. One company could move that? Bristol thought the gate could be moved. Thomas didn't think the gate needed to move, just the keypad. The Planning Commission discussed the issue a little more; however, Chairperson Culver noted that they could talk about it all night, but ODOT will ultimately determine the answer. Wullenwaber said then we have to find out what ODOT will grant. Kayner asked what the least amount of moving the access point was acceptable to Lefevre. Lefevre said that he could meet them halfway. If they moved it 20', that would still give some additional room. He said that the current access point has worked for 16 years from the highway. We don't need to fix something that's not broken. He thinks that there is a little room to give, and it wouldn't just be our access, it's for the Dollar General customers too.

The Chairperson then asked if there was any other opposition; which there wasn't. There was also no neutral testimony; therefore, the public hearing was closed at 7:55pm.

Wullenwaber said that we really can't say yes or no, based on ODOT's decision? Chairperson Culver told him that we can, but they have to know so they can move forward. The access decision will be based on ODOT's decision. Latta said that ODOT's preferred approach, is that they would like the City to be on board, and to approve, and accept the site plan with the approved access. ODOT are the ones to make the call, they are the experts, and have traffic engineer expertise. The only way to weigh on it, is whether the proposed access is appropriate, or not. Kayner said that he knows we need to weigh on that. He owns trucks. Leaving the access where it is, is like what EZ Stop is like. You would park in a parking space there the first time, but don't want to do it again. Moving the access would cause you guys problems, but seems to him that moving it is an appropriate step. Maybe they can compromise with each other. Thomas asked if we can approve it, but encourage the applicant to re-engineer the access point. Kayner agreed, and it would give them a chance to be a good neighbor, but leave them the leeway, but still accommodate the other business.

Bristol said that they will have more hourly traffic by far than the storage facility. They will lose more business from a plugged driveway than the storage facility. They would have the motivation to be a good neighbor. Thomas asked Vann if their engineer would consider that. Did they consider that? Vann told her yes, they did a traffic study. Our traffic study that was

done determined our approximate needed parking spaces, and why we feel that would work. Thomas asked if the engineers weren't worried about a blocked entrance. Vann would say that the traffic study supported it. We could go both ways... He's happy to look into it, if you would like us to minimize the impact on Mr. Lefevre's property. Thomas said that's what she thinks. They did a traffic study, and paid people to do this; they don't want their customers to be blocked. ODOT will study it; we probably wouldn't find any better information. Kayner said then we can approve the plans, and the two of you can work out the details. It's probably the best alternative. Thomas said that it's all about the access; they could go into a legal fight later, but that's not our problem. Kayner agreed, and thought we should do that. Latta reminded them that you can continue to deliberate after the motion.

- Thomas then **moved to approve the application, as conditioned in the staff report for Dollar General, LU 352. This is based on findings contained in the February 9, 2016 staff reports, and on findings made during deliberations on the request.** Kayner **seconded the motion**, but he did have a question; should they include any language to encourage cooperation between the two?
- Latta said that you can't condition to them to hold hands and sing Kumbaya. We have to satisfy the criteria. If you feel it's not met, then you can change it. For example, on the access, Condition of Approval No. 2 is that the applicant must provide us with an approved road approach permit, meaning that they will go to ODOT, and will work out what works best. ODOT will be impartial, and will try to satisfy Lefevre's concerns, and the applicants. You probably will get what you are looking for with that condition.
- Thomas asked then when they apply to ODOT, will they take Lefevre's account in place?
- Latta wasn't sure how they notify neighbors for an approach permit. He would say, that Mike should approach ODOT, and let them know that he was at the Planning Commission meeting, and that he's a neighbor, and how can he get to be informed of the process.
- **The Planning Commission then voted, and unanimously approved the application, which allows the Dollar General site plan application to be allowed as conditioned in the staff report.**
- The Chairperson thanked Robert Vann, and Mike Lefevre for being there; we appreciate that they will try to work things out in a compromise.

Others:

- Latta had brought it up before, but they were trying to update the zoning code, and were trying to figure out best way to change the development code. There seems to be redundancies in some areas, where criteria is listed twice, but we also have a lot of missing pieces. The state has a model code, for small cities, which he thinks is a good foundation; it's comprehensive, and cohesive, with drawings. He is doing research into what other cities have adopted, and would like to maybe look at that, a few chapters at a time. Do we want to pursue that, and modify it to our local needs, and try to get a more complete code? It would probably mean a series of work session meetings. We can complete what we have, but he thinks it's a bigger challenge, than to go to a finished code, and determine it.

- The Planning Commission gave a consensus that they were in favor of that, although Kayner said that if it's not broke, don't fix it. However, he is tired of kicking the can down the road.
- Latta said that Lori Ross and he are looking at the model code for a basis, for wireless communication towers, nonconforming uses, and minimum lot sizes. We've already started that, and will bring it to you later.

Nominations for Chairperson and Vice-chair for the 2016 year:

- Kayner **motioned to appoint Todd Culver to be the Chairperson, which was seconded** by Thomas. **The Planning Commission voted unanimously, with the exception of Culver, to appoint Todd Culver to be the chairperson for 2016.**
- Kayner then **motioned to nominate Charlotte Thomas to be the Vice-Chair, which was seconded** by Bristol. **The Planning Commission then voted unanimously with the exception of Thomas, to appoint Charlotte Thomas to be the vice-chair for 2016.**
- Eldridge reminded the Commissioners that their OGEC (Oregon Government Ethics Commission) reports would be due soon, and that they would receive emails from the OGEC. They had probably already received them. All reporting would now be on-line.

At the hour of 8:15pm, the Planning Commission adjourned for the evening with no further business to discuss.

Chairperson

Secretary

From: Mike Lefevre <miclefevre@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2016 9:57 AM
To: Brian Latta
Subject: Re: Dollar General

Dear Brian,

Thank you for the files you sent, and for taking time to meet with me last week.

I've been considering all that we discussed, and spent some more time looking at the drawings. I had mentioned that I would be okay with moving the access approximately 15-20 feet north (roughly half the current access width), and I think that could accomplish what we need for access, allowing a truck/trailer and a second truck to fully exit the highway. I think this would not only be beneficial for us, but also beneficial for Dollar General customers. I could imagine up to 1/2 of their retail traffic will use the Hwy 99 access, and it would be to their benefit to not have our traffic blocking their access. The only negative impact I see for Dollar General (not having their proposed access) would be a slightly longer (approx 30 feet) backing up of the truck. The turning toward the unloading dock would be the same, and the entry back on to Highway 99 going south would be the same.

Here is a list of facts, questions, concerns I've considered.

1. How often does the Dollar General delivery truck come? Once a week, twice a week? What time of day does the delivery truck typically arrive? This could be helpful and relevant to know, and to compare with all the other traffic using the access.
2. Is approximately 1/2 of Dollar General retail traffic (or more?) going to use the highway 99 access? How many vehicle trips per day will be generated by Dollar General from Highway 99? Will the Highway 99 access see a 2, 3 or 4-fold increase in vehicle trips?
3. For JB Mini Storage, peak traffic is up to 20 vehicles per hour. This is entering the facility only. It would be 40 if you count exiting.
4. For JB Mini Storage, every vehicle has to stop at the keypad. The vehicle can be there for up to several minutes, and thus it is common to have two vehicles in a line, and occasionally three.
5. A large proportion of the storage vehicles are Trucks, trailers, motorhomes and RVs.
6. Due to the fact that every vehicle has to stop at the keypad, and that the vehicles are often large, we feel it is safe to have 75' of access from the keypad (located at the property line) to the curb cut access. This would allow a 25' truck pulling a 30' trailer, and one more 25' vehicle to fully exit highway 99. It would avoid backing up traffic on the highway: the back-up would not only affect the Storage traffic, but it could affect the delivery truck, and all the General Dollar customer traffic.
7. JB Mini Storage has used the current access for 16 years successfully, with no known traffic hazards on Hwy 99. Changing this access is like "fixing" what isn't broken: it perhaps solves one problem, but is creating bigger problems!

All things considered, our opinion is that moving the access north, as proposed by Dollar General, with almost certainly obstruct traffic, and create a traffic hazard on Highway 99. This would not only impact our business, but that of Dollar General as well. We would agree to the access moving approx 15-20 feet north, which would alleviate these concerns, and at least partially help the maneuvering of the delivery truck.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Mike Lefevre
JB Mini Storage (Alan Kay Properties, LLC)

On Wed, Feb 10, 2016 at 12:14 PM, Brian Latta <blatta@ci.harrisburg.or.us> wrote:

Addendum No. 1

Mike,

Thank you for coming in and visiting with me this morning. Attached is the written testimony from ODOT as well as the proposed site plans for the Dollar General store.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind Regards,

Brian Latta

City Administrator

City of Harrisburg

120 Smith Street, 97446

541-995-6655

PUBLIC RECORDS LAW DISCLOSURE:

This e-mail is a public record of the City of Harrisburg and is subject to public disclosure unless exempt from disclosure under Oregon Public Records Law. This email is subject to the State Retention Schedule.

City of Harrisburg
PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE OF DECISION

REQUEST: The applicant requests approval of Site Plan Review land use application to construct a 9,100 sq. ft. retail building, 30 off-street parking spaces, and landscaping.

LOCATION: Tax Lot 600 of Linn County Assessor's Map 15S04W09DD

HEARING DATE: February 16, 2016

ZONING: C-1 (Commercial)

APPLICANT
Cross Development, LLC
5317 Inverrary Drive
Plano TX, 75093

OWNER
Steve Bowers
31514 Bowers Drive
Harrisburg, OR 97446

APPEAL DEADLINE: February 29, 2016, at 5:00 p.m.

DECISION: The Harrisburg Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on February 16, 2016, and voted to approve the request, subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. The Planning Commission adopted the findings contained in the Staff Report of the February 16, 2016, Planning Commission meeting, and portions of the minutes from the meeting that demonstrate support for the Planning Commission's actions.

APPEALS: This decision may be appealed by filing a Notice of Appeal with the City Recorder at 120 Smith Street. The Notice of Appeal should be filed by the Appeal Deadline date listed above. Specific information on the requirements for an appeal or a copy of the complete file of this land use action may be obtained at Harrisburg City Hall. There is a fee of \$425 plus actual expenses for appealing a Planning Commission to the City Council.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 29, 2016, unless an appeal has been filed with the City Recorder.

EFFECTIVE PERIOD:

Site Plan Review approvals shall be effective for one year from the date of approval. If the applicant has not begun the work associated with the approval within one year, all approvals shall expire. Where the Planning Commission finds that conditions have not changed, at its discretion and without a public hearing, the Commission may extend the period one time for a period not to exceed one additional year.

Unless appealed, this Site Plan Review approval will expire on February 29, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Todd Culver", written over a horizontal line.

Todd Culver
Planning Commission Chair

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. **Consistency with Plans** – Development shall comply with the plans and narrative in the applicant's proposal.
2. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide the city with an approved road approach permit from the Oregon Department of Transportation for the relocated access on Highway 99E.
3. With submission of building permits, the applicant shall provide revised landscaping, irrigation, lighting and other plans consistent with the 'reduced parking' site plan.
4. Prior to the installation of utilities, the applicant shall obtain the approvals from the city for connections to the city's water, sewer, and storm drainage systems.
5. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide a 16 foot utility easement over and across the 16 inch sewer main line running from the east to west property line of the subject site. The easement shall be recorded with the Linn County Recorder's office.
6. With the submission of building permits, the applicant shall provide necessary erosion and sediment control plans. The plans shall indicate how the proposed development will restrict the movement of earth and debris from leaving the property and entering onto other properties or into the City's drainage system.
7. With the submission of building permits, the applicant shall submit a construction safety plan. The plan shall demonstrate how the applicant proposes to keep the general public safe and out of the construction zone during construction activity.
8. All required landscaping shall be installed within the first year of building occupancy.

DEVELOPMENT RELATED CONCERNS

- a. **System Development Charges** – The proposed development will require the payment of applicable system development charges. The system development charges are to be paid prior to the issuance of a any building permits.
- b. **Signage** – Although not subject to permitting, all signage needs to comply with Harrisburg Municipal Code Chapter 18.70.

