

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 19, 2021**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Chair Karen Reddick-Yurka called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

**II. ROLL:** Members present were: Karen Reddick-Yurka, Burt Went, Phil Mannan, John Nanson, Steve Bloom, Lee Hiltenbrand and Jenna Edginton. There was a quorum. Staff present: Assistant City Manager Kristin Grassetth, City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski, Public Works Director Dan Weitzel, Building Official Scott Gebhart, and License and Ordinance Specialist Judy Wilson.

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 10 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 16, 2021 and March 4, 2021

Chair Reddick-Yurka moved the approval of these minutes to the end of the meeting.

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE APPLICATION; ZONE: MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL R-2; LOCATION: 3N10-29BA-13100; APPLICANT: JUDITH ALLEN**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Chair Reddick-Yurka introduced the proposed project and described the process for public hearings. Reddick-Yurka opened the public hearing.

**A. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**

**B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS –** Mannan, Edginton, Bloom, Went and Hiltenbrand stated that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had visited the site. Nanson and Reddick-Yurka stated that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact but had not visited the site.

**C. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**

**D. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION –** Judith Allen, her husband, and their architect Vito Cerelli explained their variance request and that the variance would make it possible to anchor the foundation of the planned structure to the most stable part of the lot which is located within the side-yard setback.

**E. STAFF REPORT -** City Planner Wendoloski stated that the information

concerning stability was not included in the materials he received to create the staff report and recommended that the Planning Commission continue this public hearing to their next meeting. He explained that this information may allow approval of the variance requested due to the hardship presented at this meeting.

**F. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – None**

**G. CORRESPONDENCE – None**

**H. APPLICANT REBUTTAL – None**

**I. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS –** The Commissioners asked for clarification on the proposed hardship and asked Public Works Director Weitzel whether the related roads are to City standards and the condition of the roads. The materials that were provided to the Commissioners by staff were discussed.

**J. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING –** Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 4:30 p.m.

**K. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION –** The Commissioners and the City Planner discussed the need for more information related to grade, elevations and slope. Wendoloski noted the information that he would need to receive to properly determine if a qualified hardship exists on the property that may warrant approval of the variance requested.

**A motion was made by Went, seconded by Hiltenbrand to continue this public hearing until the next Planning Commission meeting at which time the owners will have submitted additional information to support their application. Motion passed unanimously.**

## **VI. PUBLIC HEARING: DESIGN REVIEW OF PROPOSED AWNING ON FRONT OF THE WINERY AT MANZANITA IN THE COMMERICAL ZONE (C-1)**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Chair Reddick-Yurka introduced the proposed project and opened the public hearing.

**A. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**

**B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS –** Hiltenbrand, Mannan, Nanson, Bloom, and Reddick-Yurka stated that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had visited the site. Edginton stated that she had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had visited the site, but not recently. Went stated that he had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had walked by the site.

**C. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**

**D. CONTINUATION OF HEARING –** Because the applicant lost internet connection, Reddick-Yurka continued the remainder of this public hearing until later in the meeting to give him time to rejoin the meeting.

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING: WHISPERING PINES SUBDIVISION PLAT; ZONE: HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL/ LIMITED COMMERCIAL R-4; LOCATION: MERTON LANE AND 3<sup>RD</sup> STREET SOUTH; APPLICANT: JESSE CEREGHINO**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Chair Reddick-Yurka introduced the proposed project and opened the public hearing.

**A. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**

**B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS –** Went stated that he had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had walked by the site. Bloom, Edginton, Nanson, Mannan, Hiltenbrand, and Reddick-Yurka stated that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had visited the site.

**C. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**

**D. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION –** Owner Jesse Cereghino gave an overview of the proposed development.

**E. STAFF REPORT -** City Planner Wendoloski presented the findings in the staff report stating it was a simple straight-forward subdivision. He noted that lot 4 will need to be reconfigured to meet the minimum width requirement, but there is enough room on lot 5 to make the adjustment. Wendoloski then stated staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission approve this application subject to Conditions A through G as presented in the staff report.

**F. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS –** Commissioner Nanson stated that lot 1 also does not meet the minimum lot width requirement. Wendoloski concurred and stated that Finding I (1) on page 6 and Condition D in the staff report will be modified to apply to both lots 1 and 4. Discussion followed of the retaining wall near lot 4, the water table on the property, the south portion of the proposed hammerhead, improvement of Merton Lane, stormwater collection, parking concerns, if there would be a homeowners' maintenance agreement for the Merton Lane extension if it remains private property, emergency vehicle access, and existing drainage issues on the property. Discussion continued of whether there should be a walkway

extension or easement included from Merton Lane to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street South for connectivity and as an emergency escape route or if there should be a prohibition on building fencing on certain lots which could block escape during an emergency. Next topics discussed were whether the proposed hammerhead at the end of Merton Lane would ever be extended to connect to Hallie Lane, appreciation that the property is to be developed with single family homes, if the proposed hammerhead should be made a dedicated City street, that Merton Lane will extend about 30 feet into the property, and that duplexes could be built on the lots as well as single family dwellings due to the proposed lot sizes.

**G. CORRESPONDENCE – None**

**H. APPLICANT REBUTTAL – None**

**I. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING –** Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 5:33 p.m.

**J. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS –** Chair Reddick-Yurka and the Commissioners reviewed the concerns and questions that had been raised during discussion. Weitzel explained the process for the City to accept the proposed hammerhead as City maintained property. The width of the proposed hammerhead was noted. The Commissioners concurred that there should be a maintenance agreement required and a limitation on parking in the hammerhead area. Wendoloski will bring back the related language for Planning Commission review and make the necessary changes throughout the findings report. There was not concurrence by the Commissioners to require an easement for a public walkway for connectivity. There was concurrence that a Geotech report be required related to drainage on lots 3 and 6.

**K. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION -**

Wendoloski proposed the following motion: **To approve the Merton Lane Subdivision application with the conditions noted in the staff report but subject to the following changes: that the minimum 40 foot width requirement applies to both lots 1 and 4; that there would be a condition regarding a maintenance agreement between lots 1, 2 and 3 over the private access to those lots extending from Merton Lane and that also in that agreement there be language regarding parking limitations; and finally there is a condition that a geotechnical report will be required for lots 3 and 6.**

**A motion was made by Went, seconded by Nanson to approve the Merton Lane Subdivision application as proposed and stated by Wendoloski. Motion passed unanimously.**

Wendolowski will prepare a revised staff report to circulate to the Commissioners via

email for review and reply with changes, approval, or disapproval. Once approved by the Commissioners, there will be a final order.

Reddick-Yurka closed the public hearing at 5:57 p.m.

### **VIII. PUBLIC HEARING: DESIGN REVIEW OF PROPOSED AWNING ON FRONT OF THE WINERY AT MANZANITA IN THE COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-1)**

Chair Reddick-Yurka reopened the public hearing at 5:58 p.m.

- E. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION** – Owner Mark Proden gave an overview of his proposed awning project.
- F. STAFF REPORT** - City Planner Wendoloski presented the staff report, explained how the criteria have been met, and stated his recommendation to approve the design review application with the listed conditions.
- G. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** – The Commissioners and the applicant discussed public safety concerns including wind speed ratings, failure point, and settings on the awning; the impact on the public right-of-way during rain; operation of the electric awning during power outages; that the awning can be retracted remotely in case it was accidentally left extended; that the Commissioners did not receive elevation drawings prior to the meeting (these were shared on-screen during the meeting); how the awning will be supported; that awnings are not currently being proposed for the upper deck; and if the extension size meets the City code maximum of 10-feet and where on the property this measurement is to be taken from. Weitzel expressed concern about water run-off from the awning onto public land. Discussion followed of possible solutions to the water run-off issue. Additional comments included whether the awning could be on a timer to retract at a certain time or only allowed during certain hours and the impact on the visibility of the Pine Grove Community House or in keeping with the ambiance on Laneda Avenue.
- H. CORRESPONDENCE** – None
- I. APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- J. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 6:31 p.m.
- K. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** – Hiltenbrand expressed that the Planning Commission needs the answers to their questions before they make their decision. Discussion followed of if the awning could be operated only seasonally, if there could be just one awning, if a perforated awning could be considered to lessen the impact of the wind and not be used during the rain, if there is anything printed clarifying the awning dimensions and thickness, and

that it may be helpful if the awning company representative could attend the next Zoom meeting if this public hearing is continued.

**L. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION -**

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Mannan to continue this public hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting. Motion passed unanimously.**

**IX. GENERAL UPDATES**

Assistant City Manager Grassetth updated the Commission on projects that will be coming before them at their next meeting.

**X. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 16, 2021 and March 4, 2021**

**A motion was made by Hiltenbrand, seconded by Mannan to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

Concerning the minutes of May 4, 2021, Commissioner Mannan noted that in the second paragraph of page 4, the word “stands” should read “standards”.

**A motion was made by Bloom, seconded by Went to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2021 Planning Commission workshop as revised. Motion passed unanimously.**

Reddick-Yurka noted for the record that she will not be able to attend the July 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

**A motion was made by Bloom to adjourn the meeting.**

**Chair Reddick-Yurka adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 17<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2021**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Kunkel, Interim City Manager/Recorder