

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
AUGUST 16, 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 (arrived at 4:50 p.m.) and Jenna Edginton. There was a quorum. Staff present: City Manager Leila Aman, 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 33 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** May 17, 2021

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Edginton to approve the minutes of the May 17, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Kim Rosenberg commented on the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan as it relates to tree removal near her property and in other developments in Manzanita.

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Chair Reddick-Yurka described the process for tonight's public hearings.

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

Chair Reddick-Yurka introduced the proposed project and opened the public hearing at 4:11 p.m.

- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
- b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS –** Bloom, Went, Nanson, Mannan, Edginton, 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 –** Jessy Cereghino gave an overview of the project

and some minor adjustments that have been made since its preliminary approval.

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planner Wendoloski presented the staff report and how the conditions of approval from the preliminary approval were met. He explained that the project has not yet been bonded and that the maintenance agreement has yet to be presented and should be recorded with the plat. Wendoloski stated his recommendation that the final plat be accepted subject to the remaining requirements being met. The Commissioners, City Planner and applicant discussed the maintenance agreement, the sewer plan, and the required bond.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** - None
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** - None noted
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** - None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** - Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 4:25 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** - The Commissioners, City Planner and applicant discussed that any groundwater issues would be addressed during the building permit process.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

**A motion was made by Bloom seconded by Mannan to accept the final plat for the Whispering Pines Subdivision adopting the modified findings and recommendations with the additional conditions that the bonding is made prior to construction and that a maintenance agreement is submitted and referenced on the recorded plat. Motion passed unanimously.**

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING: DESIGN REVIEW OF ADDITION TO RETAIL GROCERY STORE, VARIANCE REQUEST & SUBDIVISION REQUEST; 193 LANEDA AVENUE; IN THE COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-1) AND HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL/LIMITED COMMERCIAL ZONE (R4); APPLICANT: CHUNG & JUDY LEE (MANZANITA GROCERY & DELI)**

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** - Edginton, Nanson, Mannan, Went, Bloom, 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** – The applicants' architect Jim Fanjoy gave an overview of the proposed project, the request for a variance to expand a nonconforming use, and the subdivision request to consolidate three lots.
- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planner Wendoloski described the three parts of the application, presented the findings in the staff report, and stated his recommendation of approval subject to the listed conditions. Mannan noted a missing word on page 3. The word “affect” will be added to the second from the last paragraph so that it reads “The two lots located in the C-1 zone comply with the minimum 5,000 square foot minimum lot size. Combining the lots into a single larger property does not reduce or otherwise affect the area devoted to the C-1 zone.” Mannan also noted a missing word on page 5. The word “be” will be added to the second paragraph so that it reads “FINDINGS: This is a minor (85 square foot) expansion of a nonconforming use into the R-4 zone. This small amount will barely be discernable to the general public while allowing necessary improvements to the structure's exterior and interior.”

Commissioner Hiltenbrand joined the meeting at 4:50 p.m. and declared for the record that he had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had visited the site.

Commissioner Mannan asked about handicap parking and cart returns. Hiltenbrand questioned the calculation for parking spaces and stated that there should be fourteen (14) parking spaces required, not twelve (12) as stated in the staff report. Following discussion of the storage buildings and landscaping requirements, the City Planner stated that there were two options for meeting the correct parking requirement of fourteen (14) spaces which were either sharing spaces with other nearby businesses or requesting a variance. He then asked the Chair to consider continuing this hearing to next month's meeting date to allow time to address the need for two additional parking spaces. It was also noted that the number of required square feet of landscaping to be maintained along Laneda Avenue stated in the finding in the 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraph on page 9 of the staff report needs to be changed to state 200 square feet instead of 250. Discussion followed of the exterior materials, lighting, and exterior colors.

**f. CONTINUATION OF HEARING –**

**Went made a motion, seconded by Nanson, to continue this hearing until the September 20, 2021 regular Planning Commission meeting to allow staff and the applicant to address the issue of parking. Motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Reddick-Yurka announced a five-minute break at 5:28 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 5:33 p.m.

**VIII. PUBLIC HEARING: DESIGN REVIEW OF MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED FOR NORTH SIDE OF LANEDA AVENUE AND NORTH 5<sup>TH</sup> STREET; TAX LOT 3N-10W-29AC-14800 (LOT 13); IN THE COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-1); APPLICANTS: SEAN & MELISSA PIERCE**

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** – Mannan, Nanson, Edginton, Bloom, Went, 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** – The applicants' architect Donnie Schmidt presented an overview of the proposed project.
- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planner Wendoloski presented the findings and explained that, although there was an error in the floor area ratio in the staff report, the related criteria was still met. Discussion followed of the shared driveway and easement, parking, doors, venting, roofing and eaves, watering of vegetation, elevations and grade, rain-water runoff, gutters and downspouts, height variations and topography, waste containment, fencing and screening, landscaping and planters, and lighting.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** – A neighboring property owner, Michael Duncan, expressed concern about vehicle headlights shining into his home if the proposed privacy screening and retaining wall at the rear of this development are not tall enough. He also asked about the possibility of providing for privacy screening along the existing driveway. Following discussion of possible options to address the expressed concerns, it was agreed that the applicant would move the privacy screen on the north property boundary to the top of the proposed retaining wall.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – None noted
- h. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 6:35 p.m.
- i. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** – The Commissioners and City Planner discussed the wording of the additional conditions and the changes to be made to the findings to reflect these conditions.

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

**A motion was made by Hiltenbrand, seconded by Went to approve the application as submitted with the additional conditions that the shared driveway agreement with the property owner to the west be recorded before building starts and that the fence screening on the north property line be relocated from the property line to the top of the retaining wall. Motion passed unanimously.**

**IX. GENERAL UPDATES**

It was noted that there were currently no new up-coming projects for the September Planning Commission meeting.

**A motion was made by Bloom, seconded by Nanson to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Chair Reddick-Yurka adjourned the meeting at 6:43 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 20<sup>TH</sup> DAY  
OF SEPTEMBER 2021**

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

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder