

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

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

**ATTEST:**

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

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

---

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

---

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**

- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
- b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
- c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
- d. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**



**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

---

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

---

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

---

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

---

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

---

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

---

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**



- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

---

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

---

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

---

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

**ATTEST:**

---

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

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

**ATTEST:**

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



**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**

- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
- b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
- c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
- d. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

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

**ATTEST:**

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

**CITY OF MANZANITA  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 21, 2022**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Vice Chair Lee Hiltenbrand called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

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

**III. AUDIENCE:** There were 21 persons in the audience.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 22, 2022

**A motion was made by Mannan, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.**

**QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS**

**V. PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE FOR NONCONFORMING STRUCTURE; ZONE: COMMERCIAL (C-1); LOCATION: 220 LANEDA AVENUE; APPLICANT: STEEPLEJACK - MANZANITA**

The applicant withdrew his application prior to the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:** Vice Chair Hiltenbrand described the process for the public hearing and introduced the application.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R); LOCATION: 698 DORCAS LANE; APPLICANT: VITO CERELLI**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
  - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Mannan, Bloom, Nanson, Went, Hiltenbrand and Edginton each noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site.**
  - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
  - d. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The owner, Vito Cerelli, provided a slide presentation of his proposed project which would be developed in phases.**

- e. **STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations.
- f. **GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** –  
The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed the proposed roadway, useable open space, and if the development would benefit community livability as related to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed the submitted wetland delineation, if the plans presented adequately show the details of this development, traffic concerns and the need for a professional traffic impact analysis.  
  
Members of the audience expressed concerns related to traffic, livability, and the location and size of the proposed development; and asked questions related to its design and operation.
- g. **CORRESPONDENCE** – Hiltenbrand noted three related letters that were received for the record.
- h. **APPLICANT REBUTTAL** – None
- i. **CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Hiltenbrand closed the public testimony at 5:41 p.m.
- j. **DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** –  
The Commissioners discussed the need for an updated wetlands report, that the applicant should be required to delineate the common areas and open use areas and label them along with their sizes on the map, that the traffic impact analysis should be added as a condition of approval, and the need for the Planning Commission to see a modified set of plans from the applicant before making their decision. City Planning Consultant Walt Wendoloski recommended continuing this hearing to the next Planning Commission meeting to consider a modified layout from the applicant, a modified staff report including the additional conditions of approval discussed, a traffic impact analysis, and an updated wetland map and statement from the State. City staff asked the applicant to have his engineer draft a scope of initial intent for review by the City to see if it addresses the traffic concerns expressed at this hearing with the full traffic impact analysis to be addressed at a later phase.
- k. **DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

Wendoloski suggested the following motion: To continue this hearing until April 18, 2022, at 4:00 p.m. requesting the applicant return with a modified layout or additional information regarding the site’s recreational amenities, revising the staff report to include clarification of the restaurant and conditions with regard to the wetland and the traffic impact analysis. He clarified that the condition would be that the traffic impact analysis would be required by the first phase.

**A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Went, to continue the hearing until April 18<sup>th</sup> in order to get more information on the wetlands issue, to get the modified recreational map, and to get clarification on the traffic impact to the degree it is available at that point. Motion passed**

**unanimously.**

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

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

**Vice Chair Hiltenbrand adjourned the meeting at 6:02 p.m.**

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 16<sup>TH</sup>  
DAY OF MAY 2022**

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

**ATTEST:**

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