

June 9, 2022

TO: Manzanita Planning Commission

RE: Planned Unit Development at 698 Dorcas Lane – Vito Cerelli

FROM: Jim Miller, 363 Jackson Way (Classic Street Cottages)

Dear Planning Commission,

As you are aware,

The Manzanita Comprehensive Plan states:

The plan overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning, subdivision or other ordinances when there is a conflict."

The plan must have the support of the majority of the community.

The plan is not to be used for the benefit of a few property owners or special interests, but for the city as a whole.

Citizen involvement in Manzanita is consistent with the statewide citizen involvement goal, "to develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process".

The development of a hotel along Classic Street does not adhere to following goal, objectives, and policy of the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan.

Goal: Residual Land Uses is to maintain and create residential living areas which are safe and convenient, which make a positive contribution to the quality of life, and which are harmonious with the coastal environment.

Objective: Maintain livability by preserving within residential areas natural places and other environmental amenities.

Objective: Protect the character and quality of existing residential areas and neighborhoods from incompatible new development.

Policy: The City of Manzanita recognizes the need to conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources. Planning policies shall be designed to preserve the low intensity character of the community, to promote uses which preserve natural values, such as the presently abundant plant and animal habitat, and to preserve the scenic character of the town.



photo by Pete McDonnell



photo by Yvana Iovino

Site topography does not prevent visual impact to homes adjacent to east side of Classic Street as stated in the Staff Report. The homes will easily be able to view the hotel rooms, hear the noises and smell the smoke from the fire pits. Natural values, such as the presently abundant plant and animal habitat and the scenic character of the town (photos above) will not be preserved.

The report on traffic is insufficient. No traffic count was done at the time of the report and even if it had been done the count would not show what it will be like in the summer months when the vacation homeowners are here. I have read that about 75 percent of the homes in Manzanita are vacation homes or short term rentals which I am sure are used much more during the summer months. In addition as the homes in the Highlands (with more anticipated) are finished and occupied considerably more traffic on Classic Street and Dorcas Lane will be created. More traffic will also be created with the State Park expansion. The intersection of Classic Street and Dorcas Lane plus the entrance/exit from the proposed hotel will become an unsafe and inconvenient environment for all traveling by foot and car especially without any sidewalks.

A Department of State Lands Wetland Delineation Report was never provided covering the entire property. Approval must NOT be given to this hotel (STR?) proposal until a new Wetland Delineation is completed and reviewed by the Planning Commission and by the citizens of Manzanita. If approval is given without the report, the citizens of Manzanita will NEVER be given the opportunity to express their opinions on any changes required by the report since another meeting will NEVER be held. Which will mean the loss of citizen involvement as specified in the Comprehensive Plan.

The following is a response from the Department of State Lands concerning the wetland area where the hotel is being proposed.

=====

From: EVANS Daniel * DSL <Daniel.EVANS@dsl.oregon.gov>
Date: Mon, Jun 6, 2022 at 10:19 AM
Subject: RE: WD # 2017-0149-Wetlands-report July 18, 2017
To: Jim Miller <ducbucln@gmail.com>

Hi Jim,

There have been no other studies on the non-investigated portion of TL 2100. Additionally, WD2017-0149 expires on July 18, 2022. If you are also interested in that area, it can be renewed for another 5 years if a reissuance delineation is applied for. This requires significantly less report production and is free to submit to the Agency. Basically, confirming no changes in the previous delineation. The additional area of TL 2100 that you are acquiring about would require a full and complete wetland delineation in order to be evaluated, it can't be "added in" to a reissuance delineation.

Regards,

Daniel Evans, PWS

Jurisdictional Coordinator

Columbia, Clatsop, Marion, Polk, Tillamook, Yamhill,

[Oregon Department of State Lands](#)

=====

Jim Miller <ducbucln@gmail.com>

Attachments

Sun, Jun 5, 10:38 AM (1 day ago)

to daniel.evans

Subject: WD # 2017-0149-Wetlands-report July 18, 2017

Mr. Evans,

I have a question about Tax Lot 2100 mentioned in this attached report. In the report it says, "Please note that the study area includes only a portion of Tax Lot 2100 (see the attached map)". The Wetlands Inventory map on the DSL website shows a freshwater emergent wetland in the portion of Tax Lot 2100 not done in the study. Has any updated wetlands delineation report been done or requested for the entire Tax Lot 2100 including the freshwater emergent wetland shown on the website? I do not see any request for a wetland delineation in the "Check Wetland Delineation Status" Tillamook section of the DSL website. Would one have been done and shown elsewhere on the website?

=====

After I had received this email from Daniel Evans, the applicant has requested a Wetland Determination. A response from DSL may take awhile before a determination can be made. Please don't approve the PUD application without first knowing the determination results.

Please follow the Comprehensive Plan and don't let the zoning codes override what the plan states. Consider the livability and desires of the residents who live in this area of Manzanita.

Thank you,

Jim Miller

City Planning

From: Yvana Iovino <yvana.iovino@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 11:42 AM
To: City Planning
Subject: Corelli PUD application concerns

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Planning Commissioners,

First, let me say that last night you gave me reason to hope. After the development of the Highlands (and now Seaview, etc) and the development of 3rd street, I was afraid that the Planning Commission just rubber stamped any developers request. But last night, what I saw and heard, was a group of individuals who had done their research and had also really listened to the concerns of the growing number of Manzanita residents who are saying please stop this development madness that is destroying our town.

So this letter is just to review and put on record my concerns about the potential hotel development by the golf course.

(1) Traffic:

(a) I have major concerns about the area where traffic from the hotel will enter and leave Dorcas Street.

Many people from Classic Street Cottages, Dorcas Street, Ridge Road and now the hundreds of people who are populating the Highlands and the rest of Jim Pentz's development (Seaview, Hilltop, etc) use Dorcas to go to the Post Office and the beach. Dorcas is a small road, width wise, to have traffic entering and leaving the hotel onto a road that pedestrians and bikers and runners frequent. An accident waiting to happen.

(b) The visitors in these hotels will be from out of town and have been here infrequently or not at all. They will not be aware of how this road is utilized in our town. They will come upon the Stop sign immediately as they turn right onto Dorcas. This will be a danger for cars driving down Dorcas as well as cars coming down Classic who think the road is clear. Another accident waiting to happen.

(c) Increased traffic on Classic street. Classic has already become a site of increased traffic—from visitors going to the state park (RVs, large motor homes, trucks towing boats), citizens going to the recycling area, people going to their homes in the Highland development and Ridge road and the trucks. Trucks from any building site in Manzanita driving to dump fill, carry building equipment, wood, concrete mixers, etc all driving back and forth on Classic. The weight limit sign makes no difference. No one is enforcing it. And how else are the trucks going to go to the Highlands, etc or the dump site right on Classic. These trucks are huge, noisy and HEAVY.

Now enter another construction area right below Classic that has to access the same roads but also turning on and off Dorcas.

Where are the people who walk along Classic to get to Dorcas to get to the beach or post office or downtown supposed to walk? On the side of the road by the Classic Street Cottages? That area slopes up and one part forms a large "lake" when it has rained making walking on that side impossible. The city had at one time thought about creating a walking path since pedestrian accidents have already happened, but nothing has come about with that project.

(2) Our vision for our town:

As was so aptly put by one of the commissioners: just because it's legal doesn't make it OK and maybe the development shouldn't be approved.

Are we going to OK every land developer who wants to build on all the remaining green spaces in Manzanita? Most of us moved here for the natural beauty, the quietness, the forests and the ocean. Not THIS— unending huge second homes, the taking down of forest land and big old trees, the paving of wetlands.

Where is our heart? Are we becoming just a playground for visitors?

(3) The Environment

And what about the environmental impact? The light pollution, noise pollution, fire pits and smoke in a time when we are seeing more forest fires. The taking down of trees and vegetation in a time when we know through science that trees and vegetation trap carbon. A mature tree absorbs CO2 at a rate of 48 lbs per year. They are without doubt the best carbon technology in the world. Other concerned countries are planting trees in an effort to forestall climate change not cutting them down. It's frankly embarrassing to live in a community that has seeming little regard to what is happening to our world.

I was proud to live in Manzanita: a little known jewel on the Oregon coast known for the arts, its beautiful beach, its residents who care about the environment and its cute downtown.

Please, please let's not change who we are for the sake of greed.

Thank you for listening.

Respectfully,
Yvana Iovino

March 20, 2022

TO: Manzanita Planning Commission

RE: Planned Unit Development at 698 Dorcus Lane

FROM: Linda Olsen, Janet Carter, Mark Beach, Mary Ruef, Yvana Lovino

Please read aloud and answer the following questions during the hearing on Monday, March 21.

1. Wetlands. When can we see the required wetlands permit report?

Concern – City and County maps both show the development as wetland.

2. Traffic. What changes will you require at the corner of Dorcas and Classic when the road through the development creates a five-way intersection?

Concern - Ten years from now Highlands expects to have 100-200 houses, Manzanita infill could have 100 more, and the State Park has funding to approximately double its camping capacity. How will the intersection of Classic-Dorcas-Cerelli handle that traffic?

3. Trees. When can we see plans for tree removal and replacement required by the City?

4. Occupancy. Will there be 24/7 onsite hotel manager to monitor the number of occupants per unit and City noise regulations?

5. Restaurant. Will there be a restaurant? If there is a restaurant, where will customers park?

Concern - The documents mention a restaurant, but the renderings do not show one.

6. Pedestrians. Will the development have a path for customers to walk downtown and to the beach?

Thank you for volunteering your time and energy on behalf of our community.

Building

From: Russell Hanf <russell@rhlawoffice.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 10:22 AM
To: City Planning
Cc: Linda Kozlowski; Hans Tonjes; Steve Nuttall; Jerry Spegman; Leila Aman
Subject: Porposed Hotel off Classic Street and Dorcas:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

- I am writing to express my concern and dismay regarding currently proposed projects and ongoing development in the City of Manzanita.
- It seems the city is not following its own Comprehensive Plan or its zoning code.
- The proposed hotel is much too large for that area
- Its nature is that of a short-term rental property (which the City already has strict regulations for). There will be NO management on site and occupants will obtain a reservation and then a code totally online. Hence, the business would not be employing local folks to run the huge lodging accommodations.
- At the last Planning Commission meeting, public comment was not allowed even though the developer had provided 10 new documents. This is against the law.
- There were grave concerns voiced by even the Planning Commissioners themselves with regards to traffic, parking, noise, fire and smoke, etc. but the Chair said, “we are just going to have to swallow it” . If the City runs this through against it's own policies, they are asking for messy litigation for years to come.
- Surrounding neighbors of this project wrote letters included in the record that highlight the many ways the City is not following its own code for approving the project including livability issues which are specifically addressed in our Comprehensive Plan as important in the decision making of the town.
- In order to begin to address these issues a group has been created, the Concerned Citizens of Manzanita. We want the City to follow its own Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Codes. We want to engage in a full, robust public process with the Planning Commission and the City Council as new projects are brought to the table.
- We want to feel not only listened to but that those in leadership have the courage to act and make changes based on the input of the citizens of Manzanita.
- We are taking action because we love this town and we want to see the City begin to exhibit more care and concern as development becomes more faster paced.

My name is Russell Hanf and I live at 366 Jackson Way in The Classic Cottages.

May 30, 2022

Manzanita City Council, Planning Commission, and City Manager

To Whom it May Concern:

We are writing to express our concerns regarding currently proposed projects and ongoing development in the City of Manzanita. Development and building is happening at an extremely fast pace, citizen involvement is too limited, the City is not following its own Comprehensive Plan or zoning code. Permitting processes are being moved away from the Planning Commission where there is at least some opportunity for public engagement to staff approvals. Overall, citizens, like us, feel like our concerns are being largely ignored.

For example, the Planning Commission is currently considering a 34-unit hotel set next to the golf course in the middle of residential neighborhoods. It will be the largest hotel built in Manzanita in 40 years, and will basically function as short-term rentals, per comments made by the developer. The hearing was first held in March, continued at the April meeting and then discussed at the May meeting. As noted, concerned citizens were not allowed to provide comments at the May meeting.

The Chair of the Planning Commission said there were concerns about the project, but we are “just going to have to swallow it.” *The City is not following its own code for approving the project.*

What good is the City’s Comprehensive Plan and zoning codes if they’re not used to address concerns that citizens have about development projects? Why is there a limited-to-no public comment process? Why do we have to “swallow” projects that the Planning Commission knows are problematic? What is the City trying to hide?

There is a groundswell of frustration and deep concern about what is happening in our town. In order to begin to address these issues a number of us are creating a group, Concerned Citizens of Manzanita. We want the City to follow our Comprehensive Plan and our zoning codes.

We want to engage in a full, robust *public* process with the Planning Commission and City Council *every time* projects are brought to the table and go through an approval or denial process. We want to feel not only like we are heard, but that those in leadership have the courage to act and make changes based on our input.

We are taking action because we love this town and we want to see the City begin to exhibit more care and concern as development becomes faster paced. Business as usual is not working anymore, it is time for change, starting now.

Sincerely,

Janet Johnson and Margaret O’Toole

780 Dorcas Lane

503.807.8964

April 14, 2022

Denise Lofman
PO Box 206
Manzanita, OR 97130
dlofman@yahoo.com

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
VIA EMAIL: planning@ci.manzanita.or.us

RE: Planned Unit Development – Vito Cerelli

Dear City of Manzanita Planning Commission:

I am writing with several concerns about the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) at Dorcas Lane and Classic Street. As a neighbor whose family owns and lives full time in a home directly across the street from the proposed development, I am concerned that both the three page application from the developer and the Staff Report do not adequately address the requirements in City code for a PUD.

As you know, it is the Planning Commission's duty to make sure the PUD meets the standards in the code. The review must not be put off to technical review after the PUD has already been approved. There must be actual designs detailing the infrastructure plans, including water, sewer, roads/traffic, electricity, stormwater, and electricity for the Planning Commission to review and to base their decisions on. Instead, we have a three page application, and a Staff Report that consistently shifts the decision making to design review or technical review. Development standards must be reviewed by the Planning Commission now rather than kicking the can down the road when this development is already on its way to construction.

At the Planning Commission meeting on March 21, 2022, it was my understanding that the approved 2017 wetland delineation would be provided to the Planning Commission and public prior to the meeting on April 18, 2022. It does not appear that the delineation has been made available yet. Based on the National Wetlands Inventory (<https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>), the property has one of the larger freshwater emergent wetlands in the City. The wetland is one that is recognized by the City as it is shown on maps in the 2019 Buildable Lands Inventory. Department of State Lands approved wetland delineations are public documents, and the report and corresponding survey/map must be provided for review.

At the March 21 meeting, the City Planner stated that only the layout and concept is required at this time because of the PUD procedure and that the technical details would be reviewed later. I respectfully disagree with this premise, and the City code is quite clear that the Planning Commission shall review and discuss the PUD requirements now, not later in the process. This Planning Commission decision must be based on City code and the developer must provide

detailed plans that the Planning Commission can fully review before making its decision, given the code language includes the words shall and must.

*Section 4.136.2., establishes the following standards and requirements: (a) A planned development may include any uses and conditional uses permitted in any underlying zone. **Standards governing area, density, yards, off-street parking, or other requirements shall be guided by the standards that most nearly portray the character of the zone in which the greatest percentage of the planned development is proposed.***

The character of the zone has not been defined to my knowledge. That must occur before review of the other issues listed above.

Why does the Staff Report indicate that density standards do not apply when the buildings meet the definition of a dwelling?

Parking is already a big issue and has been a point of conflict in this neighborhood for several years. The Staff Report indicates that parking will be reviewed and approved at a later date. The parking plan must be reviewed and approved now, all parking for this development must occur onsite, there is no available street parking in the area.

*Section 4.136.3, addresses the Planned Unit Development Procedure. The following procedures shall be observed in applying for and acting on a planned development:
The Planning Commission shall consider the preliminary development plan at a meeting, at which time the comments of persons receiving the plan for study shall be reviewed. In considering the plan, the Planning Commission shall seek to determine that:*

(2) Resulting development will not be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan provisions or zoning objectives of the area, particularly with regard to dune stabilization, geologic hazards and storm drainage.

This area of town already has identified issues with stormwater management as runoff from Classic Street Cottages consistently runs down Dorcas. Stormwater from Dorcas was supposed to go onto the golf course, but that plan was discontinued. The City is now working to correct the issues in another way. Given stormwater management is already a concern in this neighborhood, Planning Commission must review how this proposed development plans to manage run off, especially given the freshwater emergent wetland that is either on the property or nearby as well as the impacts drainage can have on the golf course. As we saw in January, increasing storm events combined with non-permeable surfaces increases stormwater runoff and flooding. A detailed plan of how stormwater will be managed must be provided at this stage of review per the code above.

(3) The area around the development can be planned to be in substantial harmony with the proposed plan.

It is my opinion that a 34 unit hotel is not in substantial harmony with the residential neighborhood surrounding the proposed development.

(5) The streets are adequate to support the anticipated traffic and the development will not overload the streets outside the planned area.

My greatest concern, as I mentioned at the March 21 meeting is the traffic at the four way stop and on Dorcas Lane and Classic Street. I appreciate that the Planning Commission heard this concern from the community and is requiring a traffic study.

The City must address the fact that Classic Street is going to accumulate more and more traffic. Upgrading Classic Street to the design standards in the City of Manzanita Downtown Transportation Plan must be a priority, creating a safe path for pedestrians and bicycles, as well as ensuring the engineering and stormwater drainage is appropriate.

(6) Proposed utility and drainage facilities are adequate for the population densities and type of development proposed.

The plans for all the infrastructure that will be needed to fully develop this site must be provided in enough detail that the Planning Commission can fulfill its duty to review utility and drainage facilities. This shall include electricity, water, sewer, gas tanks, and stormwater. Review of these plans are REQUIRED at this review, based on language in Section 4.136.3. Engineering plans must be reviewed by the Planning Commission now, not later.

D. Development standards in the SR-R zone are found in Section 3.030(4). Each item is reviewed below:

1. (4)(a) - Overall density for the SR-R zone is 6.5 dwelling units per gross acre. Dwellings may be clustered on one portion of a site within the SRR zone and achieve a maximum density of 13 dwellings per acre where at least 40% of the total lot or parcel area is reserved or dedicated as permanent open space as a public or private park area or golf course. The open space shall be so indicated on the Plan and zoning map, and deed restrictions to that effect shall be filed with the City.

The findings for this section in the Staff Report states that density standards do not apply because it is a commercial project, even though the project is made up of dwellings. The cabins and lodges may not be long-term dwellings, but they appear to meet the definition of a dwelling in City ordinances (p. 3).

Dwelling Unit. Means one or more rooms occupied, designed or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters, and containing four (4) or more of the following: refrigeration; cooking facility (including cooking stove, hot plate, range hood, microwave, or similar facility) or wiring or venting to support same; dishwashing machine; sink intended for meal preparation (not including a wet bar); garbage disposal; toilet; shower or bathtub [Amended by Ord 03-08, passed October 15, 2003]

Due to the lack of specificity in the application and layout, I am unsure as to how many units will have a kitchen, but it seems that most of them will. If you look at the definition of a dwelling in the code, it means that every unit with a shower/tub, toilet, kitchen sink, and one other kitchen appliance qualifies as a dwelling. Why does just calling it a commercial project mean the density standards do not apply?

This proposed project will build 34 units in the middle of a residential area, the largest hotel development of its kind in 40 years in the City. The Planning Commission needs to look at this issue. If it follows the required density guidelines, the development shall only have 25 units (3.83 acres X 6.5 dwelling units/gross area). In an effort to reduce the impact of this development on our residential neighborhood, I request the Planning Commission apply the lower density standards to this project.

4. (4)(d) - The maximum lot coverage in the SR-R zone shall not exceed 40%. Less lot coverage may be required in steeply sloping areas or areas with drainage problems. In all cases the property owner must provide the City with a storm drainage plan which conducts storm runoff into adequately sized storm drains or approved natural drainage as approved by the Public Works Director.

5. (4)(e) - In areas without a high-water table, a dry well capable of absorbing the storm runoff shall be provided in accordance with City standards.

I am bringing these requirements to your attention in order to make it clear that stormwater must be addressed during this review. It is repeated in the ordinance multiple times. It cannot be addressed later in the development process.

(3)(f) - The maximum building or structure height shall be 28 feet, 6 inches. However, if more than one-half of the roof area has a roof pitch of less than 3 in 12, the building or structure height shall not exceed 24 feet. The height of a stepped or terraced building shall be the maximum height of any segment of the building or structure.

The height restrictions for this proposed development shall follow this code. The Planning Commission must not allow for an increase in height of the proposed structures.

The Staff Report Summary states that this approval is just for a basic layout and that the engineering and other details will be reviewed at later stages. I strongly disagree. The PUD code language is clear and directive, using shall in multiple instances, thereby requiring a deeper review, with greater specificity in plans for infrastructure and engineering, as well as grappling with the density requirements. The application and proposal need more work, as these issues must be reviewed and discussed by the Planning Commission now, as part of the decision-making process for the PUD, not in design and technical review in the future. Infrastructure and engineering plans need to provide enough specificity so the Planning Commission can do its duty and review this project in detail before making a decision. Approving this PUD as a simple

exercise of only approving the layout and then pushing the deeper review out to a later date is unfair to the neighbors who have real concerns about this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment and for your consideration of the issues I have raised.

Sincerely,
Denise Lofman

Building

From: steve rammer <maxwell2005@me.com>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 9:54 AM
To: Building
Subject: Dorcas/Classic 34 unit Air bnb

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

When I saw this “development” being consider I was once again left with a single question; how does this 34 unit keyless Air bnb benefit the city and its Full time residents? What are risks, with allowing this project to go forward. As it states they have NO on site management.

It is apparent that more and more the city of Manzanita is becoming a clone of Carmel CA. What was once a comfortable village with an affordable life style has gradually become a playground for the wealthy visitors, huge homes and many wealthy developers who’s primary concern, drumroll please; more wealth for themselves. Exactly the course of Carmel over the years.

It seems today the city, its staff and committees are benevolent to and enable the wealthy few in most cases. A recent example was the individual who was planning on “dune surfacing”. It seems apparent the city would have allowed this project to go forward if not for WE the full time resident's speaking up. Another is the scale of many recent homes...they simply dwarf their neighbors. Why is this allowed??

I have no problem with change, as long as the majority of time it benefits all off us who live here. We have lived here over 20 years and recall when there were no sidewalks, and only a single public restroom. These improvements...benefitted the majority and the visitors. A 34 unit development, with no oversight, parking issues, etc....who does that truly benefit?

The course the city is currently following is flawed, with over development being a primary one. I hope the city looks harder at this development and decides it is NOT in the best interest of the residents, regardless if it meets so called given parameters.

Sincerely
Steve Rammer
Full time resident
Home owner over 20+ years
Concerned citizen
Rammer8711@msn.com

Sent from my iPad

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I'm writing in regard to the Manzanita Lofts PUD proposed to be located between Dorcas and Classic Street. In the summer of 2012, my husband and I purchased one of the first houses built in Classic Street Cottages. We love this community for many reasons including its small-town atmosphere and how it's possible to really know your neighbors and to be involved in the community in many and varied ways including all the volunteer options. Because we bought our home when just four of the Classic Street Cottages houses were completed, we've lived with construction and all that comes with it (the noise, the pounding, the rattling and vibrations, the large trucks going back and forth, the construction debris blowing into our yard, the smoke from slash burning, etc.) ever since. We've been here through the building of CSC Phase 2 and Phase 3 and The Highlands, which as you know is a long-term project. It's been nine years of virtually non-stop construction in our area which affects the quality of life in our neighborhood. Now we're facing the possibility of being sandwiched in between The Highlands and the Manzanita Lofts construction projects. It's a lot for one small community to bear, especially for those working from home.

A couple recently chose to relocate from Portland to Classic Street Cottages. They reached out to the neighbors asking why their house was so often shaking and vibrating which they would feel even while on their porch. It was intense enough to upset their cat and since they both work from home, they can't escape it. When they found out the cause of the rattling was the construction above them, they were so disappointed. One of the main reasons they chose to move to quiet Manzanita from Portland was to escape all the construction noise they had dealt with in the city.

A major concern is that the proposal is for a hotel complex. I've been following the short-term rental discussions and debates and have felt so sorry for those who live in an area with a high concentration of STRs. Now I find out that we are potentially going to have what, with no on-site management, amounts to 34 short-term rental units just across the street from us. Heartbreaking.

Mr. Cerelli does not live in Manzanita nor in Tillamook county. His only stake in this development is financial gain. The question for the Planning Commission is does this development enhance Manzanita in any way other than the money the City will profit in taxes and fees? Does a 34-unit hotel complex in the middle of a quiet residential community improve our village? Even if the proposed development is in compliance with the zoning for the lots and the applicable ordinances, is it the right thing to do?

Thank you for your studied consideration of this proposal.

Linda Olson
281 Jackson Way

City of Manzanita Planning Commission

PO Box 129

Manzanita, OR 97130

TO: Manzanita Planning Commission

REF: Hotel/PUD/Commercial/Residential Project Classic and Dorcas Intersection

I reference the proposed project in this way because in your statements and documentation you have referred to the project in all these classifications. So what are you considering and what is it?

I am opposed to this project for 2 specific reasons.

1. Traffic. You have not addressed the issue of a 5-way intersection at Classic and Dorcas other than to say the property has 90 feet of access on to Dorcas. In this regard I do not see that staff has done an adequate job of evaluating the projects impact on the community and its livability as outlined in the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan.
2. Wetlands. The applicant is relying on a 2017 delineation that covers a very small portion of TL2100. It is the planning commissions responsibility to be sure that the Wetlands Issue is properly handled by the applicant to again protect the livability of our community as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

The other issue I have a problem with is the initial staff report of March 10, 2022. In almost every instance staff puts the burden of enforcement and decision making on the building department of Manzanita and does not require any detailed information from the applicant.

As an example:

Phase 1 of the project is 19 studio hotel rooms within a 2-story structure. So 9 buildings plus a one story building or 1 building with common walls. The renderings that were submitted seem to show 11 buildings. How can you approve a project with such limited specifics?

On page 3 of the staff report you state "The request does not involve dwellings so provision in item "(b)" does not apply. How is this not a dwelling? Persons will be in the individual units and will be using the space as a temporary dwelling.

William and May Gumpenberger

610 Division CT

Manzanita, OR 97130

503-970-8591

bgumpenberger@hotmail.com

Building

From: Mary Ruef <mary.ruef.home@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 10, 2022 12:17 PM
To: Building
Subject: Cerelli project on adjacent to golf course

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To All Planning commission members and the City Council:

After the first hearing on this project I have been contemplating the impact on the City of Manzanita (citizens of Manzanita). My concerns are not because I live close to this project but for our city as a whole.

1. **Traffic.** The intersection at Classic and Dorcus is already a problem with the four-way stop and pedestrian traffic. Hopefully the study that you asked Cerelli to have conducted will show this. A five way stop is too much. And it looks like the stop out of the hotel property would need to be on the east side of the current eastward stop on Dorcus.

2. **A hotel.** Is this what we want Manzanita to become? If you allow another hotel will more follow? Cerelli says he wants to follow the idea of Coast Cabins. A nice idea, however, the location along the golf course does not allow for the seclusion that Coast Cabins has.

3. **Comprehensive plan.** It seems like Manzanita really needs to very soon look at what is happening here and come up with a plan to preserve quality of life here. The quaintness of Manzanita that people come here for will soon be lost.

Mary Ruef
Full time resident
355 Jackson Way

Building

From: Sandy Wood <columbiagrove@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2022 9:17 AM
To: City Planning
Subject: FW: Classic\Dorcas project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the Planning Commission for meeting on April 18th; I forwarded this letter to you last month, but I had used the wrong address.

From: [Sandy Wood](#)
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 2:13 PM
To: mscott@ci.manzanita.or.us; kozlowski@ci.manzanita.or.us; htonjes@ci.manzanita.or.us; snuttall@ci.manzanita.or.us; jspgman@ci.manzanita.or.us; [Leila Aman](#); [cityhall](#)
Subject: Dune decision and Classic\Dorcas project

Good morning

The planning commission last evening focused on the hotel complex proposed for the Classic and Dorcas area. 19 units in hotel, 9 cabins, and 6 micro-cabins present 34 more short term rental units to the community. How many occupants in each unit? And, who will control that number? More people could occupy each unit, of course. Who will control the number of vehicles? Four occupants per unit could mean four vehicles. The parking areas allow for how many vehicles?

The traffic study will need to anticipate the complex being fully occupied, and the accident potential, as well as potential disaster evacuation. I do not think that any of the owners in the area bought with the idea of being across the road from a large party area, with lots of traffic.

The person presenting the project spoke of a keyless entry system, and no responsible person living in the project. There will therefore be no person controlling activities, such as the fire pits, parties, noise, etc. The neighborhood will be forced to tolerate the behavior, or resort to calling the police.

Will there be regulations against fireworks, loud music, etc? And, how enforced?
Again, many people will be responsible guests; many won't be.
Who will be cleaning the "kitchen" area, the common areas, etc?
Will there be daily cleaning, yet more traffic?
What promise is there, or can be made, for the livability factor for the neighbors?

People want to party when on vacation; people who live here rely on quiet and privacy and respect their neighbors. Livability is an important consideration for all of us. We all are faced with STR units throughout our neighborhoods; many of those guests are responsible, especially with homes surrounding them. Many more take advantage of the fact they are on vacation. They are paying for staying here, and think they have no responsibility and take advantage of the opportunity. Trash everywhere increases with the increase in visitors.

A hotel, cabins, and micro-cabins, without someone in charge of the complex, do not have any protection for the neighbors across the road.

What dog policy is anticipated?

I, too, am concerned about the loss of wetlands. Too much development has already destroyed wetlands. Endless tree cutting has prevailed; I was glad to hear that the trees are being saved. Cutting trees and re-planting baby trees simply isn't the same.

Thank you to the planning commission for delaying permits until wetland, party areas, and traffic are studied. Thank you, also, for requiring your input and public hearing with each phase, if you do approve this project.

Thank you for allowing public input.

Sandy Wood
120 Beeswax Lane
Manzanita

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

City Planning

From: AJ Arriola <arriola.aj@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 9, 2022 12:21 PM
To: City Planning
Subject: Manzanita Infrastructure

As you are aware, Manzanita and the North Oregon Coast, are predicted to have more severe storm events in the future, delivering high levels of precipitation in shorter periods of time. Given the lack of proper stormwater management planning from Classic Street Cottages and down Dorcas and ongoing stormwater issues in the neighborhoods surrounding this proposed development, it is reasonable to expect that the developer must provide the Planning Commission with detailed drawings of how stormwater will be managed onsite prior to project approval. The requirement of providing this detailed information is mentioned in the code multiple times. Because the development will be creating hardened surfaces on a large portion of the property, which is well below the surrounding streets and infrastructure, how will stormwater be addressed? This question needs to be answered NOW, not sometime in the future with approval only by City staff.

- Infrastructure — Does Manzanita have the infrastructure to support a development of this size? How will the infrastructure for the project be configured? Where are the detailed plans that must be provided before the PUD is approved according to the Manzanita City Zoning Code giving the requirement for the approval of a PUD? The language in those ordinances regarding the requirement to provide infrastructure details prior to approval is quite directive, using both shall and must, to give direction to the Planning Commission.**

- Onsite Hotel Management – As discussed at the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the hotel management is planning**

for this hotel to be what Forbes has called a “staff-less boutique hotel.” This means there will be up to 96 guests on-site, without any management or staff to help with safety issues or criminal activity. This does not meet the standard of a hotel. Neighbors have valid concerns that the lack of management will cause conflict and issues between neighbors and hotel guests — this in a City already saturated with STRs and those common problems. Without on-site management, these units should be treated as STRs on which the City Council has currently passed a freeze in the SRR zone. This does not meet the standard of a hotel.

- **Parking** – While the applicant has met the requirements in City code for number of parking spaces, there is concern that when larger events, like weddings, or large family reunions, are held in the shared community building, that there will not be adequate parking on-site. The applicant is on the record in the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting stating that weddings and gathering are part of the planned use for the community building.

What size of gatherings will be allowed in the community building in addition to the guests onsite? Are outside guests allowed? If so, how many? Where will they park if all lodging is filled with guests and the parking spaces are all used?

- There is extremely limited street parking surrounding the proposed development. If larger gatherings with outside guests are to be part of this development and will be allowed, extra parking spaces beyond what has already been proposed should be required as a condition of approval, as well as a plan for parking if large gatherings bring more cars than parking spaces to the development.

- **Livability** - The livability in our neighborhoods is at risk, and we ask the Planning Commission to look at the PUD code. There are places where it is not being followed for this project and the code is clear that a higher level of detail is required before project approval.

The Contract City Planner is on record that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be used to address livability concerns raised by citizens and Commissioners. We strongly disagree with this opinion. The plan itself states that the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan “has the force of law” and “overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning.” It also states that “Citizens’ feelings and concerns are the foundation of decision making.” The fact is that robust public engagement is a foundation of Oregon Land Use and is required by Manzanita’s Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission itself, according to the State of Oregon’s records, serves as the Committee for Citizen’s Involvement (CCI) following the adopted Citizen Involvement Program (CIP). Thus, limiting comment and not addressing valid concerns is violating citizens’ rights, which is against the law. The developer needs to understand that if there is a major change in the City’s administration following the November election in 2022, these violations will be met with rigor.

We believe the applicant needs to create more considered plans and strategies that address many of the concerns and questions that have been raised about this project both by citizens and by Planning Commission members, and not just come up with answers on the fly when hard questions are asked during the Planning Commission hearing. At the May meeting, the applicant stated multiple times that he felt he had met code. And yet, there are multiple places outlined above where neighbors and citizens strongly disagree with him and with the Staff Report. The applicant has the opportunity to get started on the right foot in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.

Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure

that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it “meets code.” There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

A J Arriola

369 Jackson Way

Manzanita

City Planning

From: Paul Milne <Paul@floralservices.net>
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2022 5:03 PM
To: City Planning
Cc: Laura Milne
Subject: "Just because something is legally okay, doesn't mean it's the right thing to do for the community"

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing about Vito Cerelli's proposal for a 34 unit development along Classic Street.

My wife and I live on Classic Street. Our address is 303 Jackson Way, which fronts on the East side of Classic Street.

As you can well imagine we are alarmed at the prospect of this large development going in across the street. When we bought in Classic Street, we were assured that the city had come to terms with the golf course owners and that that property would be preserved as is in perpetuity. We "knew" that there would never be development across the street from our house. While the area of the proposed development is not technically on the golf course, we believe this development is at odds with the spirit of that agreement, as we understand it.

Part of the beauty of the Classic Street Cottages HOA is the prohibition on STR's. I know this is a hot button issue in Manzanita. Imagine our dismay at the prospect of 34 STR's directly across the street!

Simply put, this proposal will blow up our quiet corner of town.

We are opposed to this development at many levels, including noise, crowding, environmental degradation, traffic and safety, all of which have been articulated elsewhere. We are already negatively impacted by the ever-increasing traffic on Classic St; this will certainly make it much worse.

We strongly believe these negatives far outweigh any potential benefits to our town.

Please vote against this proposal.

Best regards,

Paul & Laura Milne
303 Jackson Way | Manzanita, OR 97130 | C: 503-754-0140

661 Dorcas Lane
P. O. Box 338
Manzanita, OR 97130

Ms. Leila Amana, City Manager
P.O. Box 129
Manzanita, OR 97130

Looking across from our Dorcas Lane home, I see greenery with songbirds and wildlife. This serenity is to be replaced by a proposed 34-unit *Manzanita Lofts* hotel? If so, our *little corner of Manzanita* where many walk, some with children and dogs, and many others jog and bike, will become a 5-intersection street with constant traffic and noise. *Please say it isn't so...*

Manzanita's Comprehensive Plan has a number of policies that contradict building *the hotel, the largest in Manzanita in 40 years*:

- * "establishing land uses which are harmonious" A 34-unit hotel is *not harmonious* in the middle of our residential communities along Dorcas Lane, Classic Street and Ridge Drive.
- * "must have the support of the majority of the community" Does the majority of Manzanita want a new 34-unit hotel?
- * "destroy living quality and natural amenities" Envision the impact a 34-unit hotel will have on surrounding residents and the Manzanita lifestyle we currently enjoy.
- * "overload streets and other public facilities" Estimates of an additional 300+ vehicles a day on Dorcas Lane would destroy one of the most popular promenades in Manzanita.

"Manzanita's role shall remain centered around its second home and residential character.



Paul A. Hughes

Cc: City Council
Planning Commission
Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Building

From: Sandy Wood <columbiagrove@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2022 7:22 PM
To: City Planning; Leila Aman; Mike Scott; Linda Kozlowski; Hans Tonjes; Steve Nuttall; Jerry Spegman
Subject: Concerned Citizen of Manzanita

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you all for reading this.

Our country is in crisis due to people in the government not being willing or able to listen to the thoughts, needs, desires of the public they were elected to serve.

Rather, they are consumed with power and the effort of maintaining it.

Our community is a microcosm of that system, with claims that the public can express their opinions and suggestions and protests, and the reality of shutting down that very ability with each of the public meetings of the city council and the planning commission and the budget committee.

The mayor, for some reason, has been given the responsibility of nominating those members, thus guaranteeing the majority opinion.

The mayor has consistently closed the public comments, leaving many with their hands up, as he goes on to the next items on the city council planning sessions and meetings.

He has overruled the plan to "pause" the STR permits, even with the city manager having worked for hours with the city attorney to ensure legality.

The Comprehensive Plan is being ignored or overruled:

For example, establishing land uses that are harmonious: the destruction of the 3rd Street property and the permission given by the city council to exempt the buildings from the STR pause are not harmonious with the public wishes.

I met the driver of a construction supply company truck; he stopped me and asked why? He was horrified, offended, and almost wordless with his distress about the demolition and buildings on 3rd Street, and wondered why they were permitted. And this from a person whose job is dependent upon builders\remodelers.

The owners of those buildings do not care about Manzanita; the two who called in to the city council meeting were clear about their sole concern: MAKING MONEY on rentals.

The Comprehensive Plan is not to be used for the benefit of a few property owners or special interests, but for the city as a whole.

The decisions must have the support of the majority of the community: who decided we want this insane burst of growth?

What about fixing infrastructure first? Many streets need repair\paving, but have not heard that being suggested.

Destroying the quality of living here and not protecting the environment. . .

Overloading the streets and other public facilities. . .who hasn't had construction, the trucks, the noise as a part of "normal" daily life?

Quality of life??

Our Comprehensive Plan is in need of update, as are apparently many of the coastal communities. Why don't we lead the way?

Remember the dune grading permit, and the protest, and the denial of that permit by the state?
You were going to work with the attorney on that subject; what is the status?

The proposed Manzanita Lofts project has not been submitted with all the infrastructure details required, yet the project seems to be forced forward.

The traffic study should have shown the massive increase in traffic, both from the proposed hotel and the massive development nearby, causing more damage to Dorcas.

It, too, is being proposed by a developer who doesn't care about Manzanita's livability.

"We are just going to have to swallow it" WHY??

The neighborhood would be negatively impacted by a 34 unit STR "hotel", with the concerns by the public being ignored.

The traffic, parking, noise, parties, fire pits, open kitchen: all uncontrolled: just call the police is the suggested solution. The police force is wonderful, but this is not their job.

Manzanita is not a big city; it is a charming small town. There needs to be a stop with competing with Cannon Beach, or whatever image the decisions are trying to outdo.

I purchased a home in Manzanita because I loved the community.

A Concerned Citizen of Manzanita
Sandy Wood
120 Beeswax Lane

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

April 12, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
167 South 5th Street
Manzanita, Oregon 97130

RECEIVED

APR 13 2022

CITY OF MANZANITA

Dear Planning Commissioners:


I am a resident of Classic Street Cottages and am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Manzanita Lofts development along Classic Street.

My principal reason for opposing this development is the potential negative impact the increased car traffic will have on pedestrian usage of this side of Manzanita. In recent years the the full length of Classic Street from Necarney City road up to Manzanita Avenue has seen a sharp increase in motor vehicle traffic. Classic Street is narrow, without sidewalks, and a popular bypass for drivers coming off Hwy 101 into central Manzanita, trying to avoid the Lenada bottleneck. Dorcas Lane is increasingly being used to funnel traffic in and out of town. My neighbors and I walk daily to local stores, the post office, and up and over Ridge road to the beach. In conversations with other walkers I frequently hear something like this: "Classic Street and Dorcas Lane are so narrow, there are no sidewalks, and cars ignore the posted speed limit. They're really becoming dangerous to walk."

The livability of our corner of Manzanita is being upended, first by the Highlands Development and now by this commercial motel possibility. This is not the vision many of us share or desire for our town. The attraction of our community is its serenity, it's quiet, friendly peaceful beach town lifestyle. Ironically this is both Manzanita's appeal and it's downfall as the pressure to grow and accommodate visitor increases.

I think we are at a critical junction in Manzanita. Are we going to succumb, like so many Oregon coastal communities before us, to the imperative of commerce? Or can we have the courage to prioritize the livability our residents desire? I strongly urge you to deny this inappropriate development for the sake of all of us who love our community. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Patrick J. Barrett
758 Dorcas Lane
Manzanita, Oregon

Building

From: jo@josdomain.com
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 6:34 PM
To: k.r.yurka@gmail.com
Cc: City Planning
Subject: FW: planned development

Karen, I see this wasn't in the record as an attachment. What did I do wrong?

From: jo@josdomain.com <jo@josdomain.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2022 1:06 PM
To: Leila Aman <laaman@ci.manzanita.or.us>; 'k.r.yurka@gmail.com' <k.r.yurka@gmail.com>
Cc: 'Mike Scott' <miscott@ci.manzanita.or.us>; 'Linda Kozlowski' <lkozlowski@ci.manzanita.or.us>; 'Steve Nuttall' <snuttall@ci.manzanita.or.us>; 'jspegman@ci.manzanita.or.us' <jspegman@ci.manzanita.or.us>; 'htonjes@ci.manzanita.or.us' <htonjes@ci.manzanita.or.us>
Subject: planned development

To: Leila Aman and Karen Reddick-Yurka
Cc: Manzanita City Council
From: Jo Newhouse
Date March 23, 2022

I recently attended the Planning Commission meeting regarding the potential development to be built at the corner of Dorcas and Classic. I have some concerns about the actual use of the property.

I do not object to the development itself. **But if not staffed full-time**, I contend that this 'hotel' will be a collection of 34 short-term rentals, especially as half of them will be in self-contained cabins. This is in a zone (SR-R) that contains no other hotels and limits the STRs to the 17 ½% cap. It is a dangerous precedent at a time when the City is considering a moratorium on additional STRs.

As presented, this property will have: 19 studio hotel rooms in semi-attached and detached two-story structures. This phase also includes an event gathering space. Phase 2 will contain 9 hotel cabins. These will be unattached. Phase 3 will contain 6 small cottages.

When asked if the hotel will be staffed, the applicant, Mr. Cirelli said that it would be a "hybrid model" and would have people available to respond. This is no different than a company like Sunset Rentals. They have people available to respond. A key difference is that Ordinance 10-3, governing STRs, ensures that the response will be quick and effective.

"If the problem cannot be resolved or an immediate resolution is not achieved by phone, the Owner or Local Agent shall make an in-person visit to the Short-Term Rental to rectify the situation within 20-minutes."

There is no similar regulation for hotels in City ordinances. There is also no requirement that I was able to find that a hotel must have an on-site staff 24/7. A commitment, in writing, that the property will include an office and full-time staff person would alleviate many of the issues regarding noise, loose dogs, etc., that people have associated with STRs, and would make this truly the “hotel” people expect.

Jo Newhouse

 Virus-free. www.avg.com

May 13, 2022

TO: Manzanita Planning Commission

RE: Planned Unit Development at 698 Dorcas Lane - Vito Cerelli

FROM: Jim Miller, 363 Jackson Way (Classic Street Cottages)

It is my opinion that the development of a hotel along Classic Street does not adhere to following goal, objectives, and policy of the **MANZANITA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

Goal of Residual Land Uses is to maintain and create residential living areas which are safe and convenient, which make a positive contribution to the quality of life, and which are harmonious with the coastal environment.

Objective 1 Maintain livability by preserving within residential areas natural places and other environmental amenities.

Objective 3 Protect the character and quality of existing residential areas and neighborhoods from incompatible new development.

Policy 1 The City of Manzanita recognizes the need to conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources. Planning policies shall be designed to preserve the low intensity character of the community, to promote uses which preserve natural values, such as the presently abundant plant and animal habitat, and to preserve the scenic character of the town.

COMMITTS ON THE STAFF REPORT

IV. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS

Item C (c) (3) The area around the development can be planned to be in substantial harmony with the proposed plan.

FINDING:

Site topography places most of the structures below residential uses to the east thereby limiting visual impacts.

Further, as a hotel with a limited number of units, the use is generally residential in nature which also promotes compatibility with the area.

COMMIT:

I disagree with this assumption.

The homes directly adjacent to Classic Street in the Classic Street Cottages will easily be able to view the hotel rooms, hear the noises and smell the smoke from the firepits.

Guests will be coming and going from the hotel a lot more than residents come and go from their homes.

Item C (c) (5) The streets are adequate to support the anticipated traffic and the development will not overload the streets outside the planned area.

FINDING:

Traffic study report

COMMIT:

I find the report on traffic to be insufficient. No traffic count was done at the time of the report and even if it had been done the count would not show what it will be like in the summer months when the vacation homeowners are here.

I have read that about 75 percent of the homes in Manzanita are vacation homes or short term rentals which I am sure are used much more during the summer months. In addition as the homes in the Highlands (with more anticipated) are finished and occupied considerably more traffic on Classic and down Dorcas will be created.

Item D. Development standards in the SR-R zone are found in Section 3.030(4). Each item is reviewed below:

FINDING:

Wetlands

COMMIT

I agree that the Department of State Lands must be involved but an entirely new Wetlands Delineation Report be provided by them that covers the entire property where the PUD is planned not just a small section.

Thank you for your consideration and time to read this.

Jim Miller

June 9, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
PO Box 129
Manzanita, OR 97130

Dear Manzanita Planning Commission:

The citizens signed below have the following concerns regarding the Manzanita Lofts Project. We ask that they be addressed before this project is approved.

- **Traffic safety — The project will create an extremely awkward five-way stop at Dorcas and Classic, an already busy intersection on narrow streets, which, according to the developer's traffic study, will add an additional 309 traffic trips a day during the busy summer months. Traffic safety is one of the top concerns of citizens who live in the neighborhood surrounding the proposed project. Classic is a very narrow street without five foot easements on both sides. While the project has been reviewed for safety, it does not answer the questions of how the City will deal with heavier traffic at this intersection and pedestrian or bicycle safety on two busy and narrow City streets. The City should address these issues, and this plan should also include an update on the structure of Classic and Dorcas which are both sub-standard. In addition, Classic Street (according to Manzanita's Downtown Transportation Plan) should include a pedestrian/bike path adjacent to the street, similar in design to the pedestrian/bike path on Carmel.**
- **Fire access – the proposed hotel has only one entrance and egress. How will visitors be evacuated in case of a fire when fire trucks and other equipment need access to the buildings?**
 - The lack of additional entrances and egress may expose the City to liability if visitors cannot get out of the area in the case of an emergency.
 - A further complication are that firepits are featured as an exterior amenity of the hotel to be used by visitors in the evenings when there will be no staff on site.
- **Wetlands – The developer of the property provided a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) of wetlands and other waters for Tax Lot #2100 stating that there is no wetland on the property. However, the lot has a freshwater emergent wetland shown on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI), State Wetland Inventory**

(SWI), and in City of Manzanita's 2019 Buildable Lands Inventory. This means it requires more than a PJD to determine whether a wetland exists on the property. We understand that the applicant has submitted a wetlands and waters determination request to the Department of State Lands (DSL). DSL will provide a response to the City of Manzanita within 30 days of the submission, and part of the response will be a recommendation if a delineation is needed or not.

A Wetland Land Use Notice (WLUN) from the City of Manzanita to DSL is required by ORS 196.676 for this property/development. The notice should have been sent to DSL within five days after the application was deemed complete. According to the DSL Aquatic Resource Planner, "At this point the determination can informally stand-in for the WLUN, since the 'wet det' request has been submitted, but obviously this is not the best or standard operating procedures." It is concerning that proper procedures have not been followed by the contract City Planner to ensure wetlands are properly reviewed and work in wetlands properly permitted.

How does the Planning Commission want to handle the fact that DSL will most likely require a wetland delineation for all of Tax Lot #2100 where the majority of the development will be located? If there is a wetland on the site, the site plan may need to be revised to accommodate the wetland and a joint permit from DSL and US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be secured prior to any work in the wetland area. It does not make sense to move forward with approval while these large, outstanding issues exist. **We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission ask the applicant to agree to a voluntary extension of the 120 day limit while coordinating with DSL to address the wetland issues. If the applicant will not agree to a voluntary extension while addressing wetlands and other concerns, we request the Planning Commission deny the application.**

- **Stormwater & Infrastructure – The code is very clear that these issues are to be addressed before the PUD is approved, not after. In fact, the code that provides instructions about how the PUD is to be evaluated is clear that infrastructure must be addressed with detailed plans before approval. Approval of the project requires detailed information, as the Planning Commission uses discretionary judgement to make their decision. Instead, the Staff Report is doing the community a deep disservice and gaming the system by moving most of the approvals for infrastructure and project details away from the Planning Commission to City staff sometime in the future, taking away the discretionary judgement and opportunities for public comment that rest with the Planning Commission.**

Manzanita, and the North Oregon Coast, are predicted to have more severe storm events in the future, delivering high levels of precipitation in shorter periods of time. Given the lack of proper stormwater management planning from Classic Street Cottages and down Dorcas and ongoing stormwater issues in the neighborhoods surrounding this proposed development, it is reasonable to expect that the developer must provide the Planning Commission with detailed drawings of how stormwater will be managed onsite prior to project approval. The requirement of providing this detailed information is mentioned in the code multiple times. Because the development will be creating hardened surfaces on a large portion of the property, which is well below the surrounding streets and infrastructure, how will stormwater be addressed? This question needs to be answered NOW, not sometime in the future with approval only by City staff.

- **Infrastructure** — Does Manzanita have the infrastructure to support a development of this size? How will the infrastructure for the project be configured? Where are the detailed plans that must be provided before the PUD is approved according to the Manzanita City Zoning Code giving the requirement for the approval of a PUD? The language in those ordinances regarding the requirement to provide infrastructure details prior to approval is quite directive, using both shall and must, to give direction to the Planning Commission.
- **Onsite Hotel Management** — As discussed at the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the hotel management is planning for this hotel to be what Forbes has called a “staff-less boutique hotel.” This means there will be up to 96 guests on-site, without any management or staff to help with safety issues or criminal activity. This does not meet the standard of a hotel. Neighbors have valid concerns that the lack of management will cause conflict and issues between neighbors and hotel guests — this in a City already saturated with STRs and those common problems. Without on-site management, these units should be treated as STRs on which the City Council has currently passed a freeze in the SRR zone. This does not meet the standard of a hotel.
- **Parking** — While the applicant has met the requirements in City code for number of parking spaces, there is concern that when larger events, like weddings, or large family reunions, are held in the shared community building, that **there will not be adequate parking on-site**. The applicant is on the record in the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting stating that weddings and gathering are part of the planned use for the community building.

- o What size of gatherings will be allowed in the community building in addition to the guests onsite? Are outside guests allowed? If so, how many? Where will they park if all lodging is filled with guests and the parking spaces are all used?
 - o There is extremely limited street parking surrounding the proposed development. If larger gatherings with outside guests are to be part of this development and will be allowed, extra parking spaces beyond what has already been proposed should be required as a condition of approval, as well as a plan for parking if large gatherings bring more cars than parking spaces to the development.
- Livability - The livability in our neighborhoods is at risk, and we ask the Planning Commission to look at the PUD code. There are places where it is not being followed for this project and the code is clear that a higher level of detail is required before project approval.

The Contract City Planner is on record that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be used to address livability concerns raised by citizens and Commissioners. We strongly disagree with this opinion. The plan itself states that the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan "has the force of law" and "overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning." It also states that "Citizens' feelings and concerns are the foundation of decision making."

The fact is that robust public engagement is a foundation of Oregon Land Use and is required by Manzanita's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission itself, according to the State of Oregon's records, serves as the Committee for Citizen's Involvement (CCI) following the adopted Citizen Involvement Program (CIP). Thus, limiting comment and not addressing valid concerns is violating citizens' rights which is against the law. The developer needs to understand that if there is a major change in the City's administration following the November election in 2022, these violations will be met with rigor.

We believe the applicant needs to create more considered plans and strategies that address many of the concerns and questions that have been raised about this project both by citizens and by Planning Commission members, and not just come up with answers on the fly when hard questions are asked during the Planning Commission hearing. At the May meeting, the applicant stated multiple times that he felt he had met code. And yet, there are multiple places outlined above where neighbors and citizens strongly disagree with him and with the Staff Report. The applicant has the opportunity to get started on the right foot



in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.


Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it "meets code." There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Signed by Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

- Signed begin on next page

- 
- 

- 
- Margaret O'Toole

March 20, 2022

TO: Manzanita Planning Commission

RE: Planned Unit Development at 698 Dorcus Lane

FROM: Linda Olsen, Janet Carter, Mark Beach, Mary Ruef, Yvana Lovino

Please read aloud and answer the following questions during the hearing on Monday, March 21.

1. Wetlands. When can we see the required wetlands permit report?

Concern – City and County maps both show the development as wetland.

2. Traffic. What changes will you require at the corner of Dorcas and Classic when the road through the development creates a five-way intersection?

Concern - Ten years from now Highlands expects to have 100-200 houses, Manzanita infill could have 100 more, and the State Park has funding to approximately double its camping capacity. How will the intersection of Classic-Dorcas-Cerelli handle that traffic?

3. Trees. When can we see plans for tree removal and replacement required by the City?

4. Occupancy. Will there be 24/7 onsite hotel manager to monitor the number of occupants per unit and City noise regulations?

5. Restaurant. Will there be a restaurant? If there is a restaurant, where will customers park?

Concern - The documents mention a restaurant, but the renderings do not show one.

6. Pedestrians. Will the development have a path for customers to walk downtown and to the beach?

Thank you for volunteering your time and energy on behalf of our community.

April 12, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
167 South 5th Street
Manzanita, OR 97130

RECEIVED

APR 15 2022

CITY OF MANZANITA

Dear Planning Commission members:

I am writing regarding the planned unit development Manzanita Lofts. I was unable to attend the public hearing on March 21, 2022 but watched the video. I appreciated the discussion that took place that evening and now the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

As a resident of Classic Street Cottages, I have daily exposure throughout all the seasons, with the area of the proposed development. I experience it as a neighbor, driver and walker. It is because of this background that I urge the Commission to vote against the development. My reasons fall into three broad categories:

Infrastructure issues

- A. The current four way intersection of Classic and Dorcas Streets is one of the most awkward I've ever seen. It is poorly planned to handle the ever increasing traffic from old and new housing developments to the south and the heavily used state park. To add another development that would need an entrance and exit onto Dorcas, adding a minimum of 34 more cars, will just make a bad situation worse.
- B. Neither Classic Street or Dorcas are built to handle existing traffic let alone more. Both streets are a minimum width with no striping to designate vehicle lanes, inadequate speed limit signs, no shoulders for safe walking, and no designated bike lanes. Both streets have limited ability to be widened due to steep drop offs bordering the golf course. Additionally part of Classic Street to the south of the intersection is already showing signs of slumping on the roadway closest to the steep cliff on the east side of the proposed new development.

Density Issues


- A. The developer repeatedly referenced Coast Cabins (6 units) and the San Dune Inn (14 units) as inspiration or in support of his development. At a total of 34 units, The Manzanita Lofts has more units than both of those two businesses combined, in a much more problematic location and on much more challenging property.

Community Issues

- A. There continues to be friction in Manzanita and other cities between tourism/commerce and community/livability. Right now Manzanita is suffering from rapid development infilling formerly open lots and sprawling into outlying areas once forested wildlife corridors. Increased pressure from tourism is upending the small town quality of life. Once narrow but walkable streets such as Dorcas and Classic are becoming dangerous for walkers, bikers and drivers alike. Drivers used to city driving speed on Classic and Dorcas and walkers accustomed to sidewalks walk on both sides of the street making it hard for a single car to pass let alone opposing vehicles.
- B. Fire pits. What can I say? Tourists love them, neighbors hate them. On days when the wind is from the north, we can smell the fire at Coast Cabin. Fire pits in the Loft Development would get us on the other days when the wind is from the west.

Thank you for your service and commitment to this community process.

Sincerely,
Patti Walker, 758 Dorcas Lane, Manzanita OR





Dear Manzanita Planning Commission,

I am writing about the proposed SR-R Planned Development – Dorcas Lane + Classic St. (Manzanita Lofts LLC). As you know this piece of property (Tax Lot: 3N 10W TAX LOT 2600 + 2100) is directly adjacent to hole #5 of Manzanita Links golf course. Hole #5 is our “signature hole”. It is the most photographed and for many their favorite hole on the golf course. It is a short par 4 of 280 yards, where most folks use a driver, with out of bounds on the right-hand side (property line). Many balls are sliced to the right and out of bounds along that property line.

As of now, no representative from the proposed development design team has approached myself or my staff about the proposed development and what it may mean for the operation of the golf course. While the plans and design sketches are beautifully rendered, we do have some concerns on how this development could affect the golf course operation and on how the development itself seems dependent on golf course views as a selling point.

Important Concerns:

- Aesthetics and playability of the golf course
- General safety, including from errant golf shots
- Local public accessibility to the course or walking paths
- Drainage/hazardous materials during construction and beyond

It appears by the sketches and plans in the application that several units are right on the property line and several trees and shrubs that are on golf course property are removed or limbed up to offer golf course views. It appears that a lot of the marketing and appeal of the property of the development will be because of golf course views as it is in a low area with no attractive views to east.

As owner of the golf course, we do reserve the right to keep the vegetation on the property as is, or plant new trees and vegetation for safety, playability, aesthetic, or other purposes that may block some or all views of the proposed design. We also reserve the right to build signs or fencing to prevent unwanted trespassing or help with safety or aesthetics, which also could eliminate viewing corridors.

Again, as of today, no one from the proposed development team has met with myself or any of my staff about the scope, marketing, or design plans and how they may affect the golf course operation and playability. This letter is in no way a condemnation of the plan or a comment of their right to do such a development in the SR-R zone, of which it appears to be a legal use, but to make note of our concerns to the city and the developer.

As many of you know, we have worked hard over the last 4+ years to keep the golf course open and have spent tens of thousands of dollars to upgrade outdated systems and facilities for the benefit of the course and the community. We also very much enjoy allowing the community to use the golf course on Monday's during the off season for walking paths and a park. Our plan is to continue to make Manzanita Links a jewel for the city to enjoy long into the future. Thank you for your consideration.

All the best,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt J. Brown" followed by a long horizontal line.

Matt J. Brown
Owner, Manzanita Links, LLC
Cell: 503-757-3644
Email: mjbrown@pga.com

Comments relating to the traffic report about Manzanita Lofts dated April 7 submitted by the applicant following the March meeting of the Planning Commission.

- The traffic report was based on estimates on guidelines published by a professional association, not on a site visit.
- Estimates come from guidelines for Motel Land Use. But the distribution and variety of sizes of buildings for Manzanita Lofts make it more like a neighborhood than a motel. A neighborhood has far more traffic for housekeeping, landscaping, maintenance, and package delivery than a motel.
- The report does not consider reconstruction of the roadway and intersection of Dorcas and Classic scheduled by Manzanita public works for next fall.
- The report says traffic volumes are typically low on Classic and Dorcas but does not say whether volume is a count of vehicles or a measure of weights. The matter of weights is especially important because of the tonnage of construction and RV traffic using Classic.
- Whether volume means count or weights, the report does not consider traffic increases from expansion of the Highlands, growth of the transfer station, and doubling capacity of the state park – all foreseeable in the near future. Those factors seem fundamental to planning by a Planning Commission.

Please ask the applicant for a more precise and thoughtful traffic study.

Mark Beach

207 Jackson Way


March 21, 2022

TO: Manzanita Planning Commission

RE: Planned Unit Development at 698 Dorcas Lane

FROM: James Miller, 363 Jackson Way

Just an observation but the study area of wetlands in the maps of the Wetlands Delineation Report do not coincide with where the actual wetlands are as shown in the City of Manzanita Buildable Lands Inventory 2019 and the Tillamook County wetlands website. The study area only considers a very small area of Tax Lot #2100 and does not include the actual wetlands as shown on the Tillamook County wetlands website. So the actual wetlands are not included in the Wetlands Delineation Report. The report may have incorrectly shown the area that was studied or the website location of the wetlands is wrong. Or the Delineation Report needs to be redone.



June 9, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
PO Box 129
Manzanita, OR 97130

Dear Manzanita Planning Commission:

The citizens signed below have the following concerns regarding the Manzanita Lofts Project. We ask that they be addressed before this project is approved.

- Traffic safety — **The project will create an extremely awkward five-way stop at Dorcas and Classic**, an already busy intersection on narrow streets, which, according to the developer's traffic study, will add an additional 309 traffic trips a day during the busy summer months. Traffic safety is one of the top concerns of citizens who live in the neighborhood surrounding the proposed project. Classic is a very narrow street without five foot easements on both sides. While the project has been reviewed for safety, it does not answer the questions of how the City will deal with heavier traffic at this intersection and pedestrian or bicycle safety on two busy and narrow City streets. The City should address these issues, and this plan should also include an update on the structure of Classic and Dorcas which are both sub-standard. In addition, Classic Street (according to Manzanita's Downtown Transportation Plan) should include a pedestrian/bike path adjacent to the street, similar in design to the pedestrian/bike path on Carmel.
- Fire access — **the proposed hotel has only one entrance and egress**. How will visitors be evacuated in case of a fire when fire trucks and other equipment need access to the buildings?
 - o The lack of additional entrances and egress may expose the City to liability if visitors cannot get out of the area in the case of an emergency.
 - o A further complication are that firepits are featured as an exterior amenity of the hotel to be used by visitors in the evenings when there will be no staff on site.
- Wetlands — The developer of the property provided a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) of wetlands and other waters for Tax Lot #2100 stating that there is no wetland on the property. However, the lot has a freshwater emergent wetland shown on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI), State Wetland Inventory

(SWI), and in City of Manzanita's 2019 Buildable Lands Inventory. This means it requires more than a PJD to determine whether a wetland exists on the property. We understand that the applicant has submitted a wetlands and waters determination request to the Department of State Lands (DSL). DSL will provide a response to the City of Manzanita within 30 days of the submission, and part of the response will be a recommendation if a delineation is needed or not.

A Wetland Land Use Notice (WLUN) from the City of Manzanita to DSL is required by ORS 196.676 for this property/development. The notice should have been sent to DSL within five days after the application was deemed complete. According to the DSL Aquatic Resource Planner, "At this point the determination can informally stand-in for the WLUN, since the 'wet det' request has been submitted, but obviously this is not the best or standard operating procedures." It is concerning that proper procedures have not been followed by the contract City Planner to ensure wetlands are properly reviewed and work in wetlands properly permitted.

How does the Planning Commission want to handle the fact that DSL will most likely require a wetland delineation for all of Tax Lot #2100 where the majority of the development will be located? If there is a wetland on the site, the site plan may need to be revised to accommodate the wetland and a joint permit from DSL and US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be secured prior to any work in the wetland area. It does not make sense to move forward with approval while these large, outstanding issues exist. **We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission ask the applicant to agree to a voluntary extension of the 120 day limit while coordinating with DSL to address the wetland issues. If the applicant will not agree to a voluntary extension while addressing wetlands and other concerns, we request the Planning Commission deny the application.**

- Stormwater & Infrastructure – **The code is very clear that these issues are to be addressed before the PUD is approved, not after.** In fact, the code that provides instructions about how the PUD is to be evaluated is clear that infrastructure must be addressed with detailed plans before approval. Approval of the project requires detailed information, as the Planning Commission uses discretionary judgement to make their decision. Instead, the Staff Report is doing the community a deep disservice and gaming the system by moving most of the approvals for infrastructure and project details away from the Planning Commission to City staff sometime in the future, taking away the discretionary judgement and opportunities for public comment that rest with the Planning Commission.

Manzanita, and the North Oregon Coast, are predicted to have more severe storm events in the future, delivering high levels of precipitation in shorter periods of time. Given the lack of proper stormwater management planning from Classic Street Cottages and down Dorcas and ongoing stormwater issues in the neighborhoods surrounding this proposed development, it is reasonable to expect that **the developer must provide the Planning Commission with detailed drawings of how stormwater will be managed onsite prior to project approval. The requirement of providing this detailed information is mentioned in the code multiple times.** Because the development will be creating hardened surfaces on a large portion of the property, which is well below the surrounding streets and infrastructure, how will stormwater be addressed? This question needs to be answered NOW, not sometime in the future with approval only by City staff.

- Infrastructure — Does Manzanita have the infrastructure to support a development of this size? How will the infrastructure for the project be configured? Where are the detailed plans that must be provided before the PUD is approved according to the Manzanita City Zoning Code giving the requirement for the approval of a PUD? The language in those ordinances regarding the requirement to provide infrastructure details prior to approval is quite directive, using both shall and must, to give direction to the Planning Commission.
- Onsite Hotel Management – As discussed at the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the hotel management is planning for this hotel to be what Forbes has called a “staff-less boutique hotel.” This means there will be up to 96 guests on-site, without any management or staff to help with safety issues or criminal activity. This does not meet the standard of a hotel. Neighbors have valid concerns that the lack of management will cause conflict and issues between neighbors and hotel guests — this in a City already saturated with STRs and those common problems. Without on-site management, these units should be treated as STRs on which the City Council has currently passed a freeze in the SRR zone. This does not meet the standard of a hotel.
- Parking – While the applicant has met the requirements in City code for number of parking spaces, there is concern that when larger events, like weddings, or large family reunions, are held in the shared community building, that **there will not be adequate parking on-site.** The applicant is on the record in the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting stating that weddings and gathering are part of the planned use for the community building.

- o What size of gatherings will be allowed in the community building in addition to the guests onsite? Are outside guests allowed? If so, how many? Where will they park if all lodging is filled with guests and the parking spaces are all used?
- o There is extremely limited street parking surrounding the proposed development. **If larger gatherings with outside guests are to be part of this development and will be allowed, extra parking spaces beyond what has already been proposed should be required as a condition of approval, as well as a plan for parking if large gatherings bring more cars than parking spaces to the development.**
- Livability - The livability in our neighborhoods is at risk, and we ask the Planning Commission to look at the PUD code. **There are places where it is not being followed for this project and the code is clear that a higher level of detail is required before project approval.**

The Contract City Planner is on record that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be used to address livability concerns raised by citizens and Commissioners. We strongly disagree with this opinion. The plan itself states that the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan “has the force of law” and “overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning.” It also states that “Citizens’ feelings and concerns are the foundation of decision making.”

The fact is that robust public engagement is a foundation of Oregon Land Use and is required by Manzanita’s Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission itself, according to the State of Oregon’s records, serves as the Committee for Citizen’s Involvement (CCI) following the adopted Citizen Involvement Program (CIP). Thus, limiting comment and not addressing valid concerns is violating citizens’ rights which is against the law. The developer needs to understand that if there is a major change in the City’s administration following the November election in 2022, these violations will be met with rigor.

We believe the applicant needs to create more considered plans and strategies that address many of the concerns and questions that have been raised about this project both by citizens and by Planning Commission members, and not just come up with answers on the fly when hard questions are asked during the Planning Commission hearing. At the May meeting, the applicant stated multiple times that he felt he had met code. And yet, there are multiple places outlined above where neighbors and citizens strongly disagree with him and with the Staff Report. The applicant has the opportunity to get started on the right foot

in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.

Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it "meets code." There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Signed by Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

- Signatures begin on next page

Linda Olson 281 Jackson Way Manzanita

M. J. Olson 281 Jackson Way "

Building

From: cityhall
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 1:57 PM
To: Building
Subject: FW: Planning Commission comment

From: Mark Beach <mbeach125@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 1:51 PM
To: cityhall <cityhall@ci.manzanita.or.us>
Subject: Planning Commission comment

Please post this message for the Planning Commission meeting on June 20.

Manzanita's comprehensive plan, which carries the force of law, says that in the SRR zone "overall residential densities shall not exceed 6.5 dwelling units per acre." The Manzanita Lofts property lies inside the SSR zone and is therefore limited to 24 units. The application far exceeds that limit. Obeying the law requires denying the application.

Mark Beach
207 Jackson Way

Building

From: cityhall
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 1:57 PM
To: Building
Subject: FW: Planning Commission comment

From: Mark Beach <mbeach125@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2022 1:51 PM
To: cityhall <cityhall@ci.manzanita.or.us>
Subject: Planning Commission comment

Please post this message for the Planning Commission meeting on June 20.

Manzanita's comprehensive plan, which carries the force of law, says that in the SRR zone "overall residential densities shall not exceed 6.5 dwelling units per acre." The Manzanita Lofts property lies inside the SSR zone and is therefore limited to 24 units. The application far exceeds that limit. Obeying the law requires denying the application.

Mark Beach
207 Jackson Way

June 9, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
PO Box 129
Manzanita, OR 97130

Dear Manzanita Planning Commission:

The citizens signed below have the following concerns regarding the Manzanita Lofts Project. We ask that they be addressed before this project is approved.

- Traffic safety — **The project will create an extremely awkward five-way stop at Dorcas and Classic**, an already busy intersection on narrow streets, which, according to the developer's traffic study, will add an additional 309 traffic trips a day during the busy summer months. Traffic safety is one of the top concerns of citizens who live in the neighborhood surrounding the proposed project. Classic is a very narrow street without five foot easements on both sides. While the project has been reviewed for safety, it does not answer the questions of how the City will deal with heavier traffic at this intersection and pedestrian or bicycle safety on two busy and narrow City streets. The City should address these issues, and this plan should also include an update on the structure of Classic and Dorcas which are both sub-standard. In addition, Classic Street (according to Manzanita's Downtown Transportation Plan) should include a pedestrian/bike path adjacent to the street, similar in design to the pedestrian/bike path on Carmel.
- Fire access — **the proposed hotel has only one entrance and egress**. How will visitors be evacuated in case of a fire when fire trucks and other equipment need access to the buildings?
 - o The lack of additional entrances and egress may expose the City to liability if visitors cannot get out of the area in the case of an emergency.
 - o A further complication are that firepits are featured as an exterior amenity of the hotel to be used by visitors in the evenings when there will be no staff on site.
- Wetlands — The developer of the property provided a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) of wetlands and other waters for Tax Lot #2100 stating that there is no wetland on the property. However, the lot has a freshwater emergent wetland shown on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI), State Wetland Inventory

(SWI), and in City of Manzanita's 2019 Buildable Lands Inventory. This means it requires more than a PJD to determine whether a wetland exists on the property. We understand that the applicant has submitted a wetlands and waters determination request to the Department of State Lands (DSL). DSL will provide a response to the City of Manzanita within 30 days of the submission, and part of the response will be a recommendation if a delineation is needed or not.

A Wetland Land Use Notice (WLUN) from the City of Manzanita to DSL is required by ORS 196.676 for this property/development. The notice should have been sent to DSL within five days after the application was deemed complete. According to the DSL Aquatic Resource Planner, "At this point the determination can informally stand-in for the WLUN, since the 'wet det' request has been submitted, but obviously this is not the best or standard operating procedures." It is concerning that proper procedures have not been followed by the contract City Planner to ensure wetlands are properly reviewed and work in wetlands properly permitted.

How does the Planning Commission want to handle the fact that DSL will most likely require a wetland delineation for all of Tax Lot #2100 where the majority of the development will be located? If there is a wetland on the site, the site plan may need to be revised to accommodate the wetland and a joint permit from DSL and US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be secured prior to any work in the wetland area. It does not make sense to move forward with approval while these large, outstanding issues exist. **We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission ask the applicant to agree to a voluntary extension of the 120 day limit while coordinating with DSL to address the wetland issues. If the applicant will not agree to a voluntary extension while addressing wetlands and other concerns, we request the Planning Commission deny the application.**

- Stormwater & Infrastructure – **The code is very clear that these issues are to be addressed before the PUD is approved, not after.** In fact, the code that provides instructions about how the PUD is to be evaluated is clear that infrastructure must be addressed with detailed plans before approval. Approval of the project requires detailed information, as the Planning Commission uses discretionary judgement to make their decision. Instead, the Staff Report is doing the community a deep disservice and gaming the system by moving most of the approvals for infrastructure and project details away from the Planning Commission to City staff sometime in the future, taking away the discretionary judgement and opportunities for public comment that rest with the Planning Commission.

Manzanita, and the North Oregon Coast, are predicted to have more severe storm events in the future, delivering high levels of precipitation in shorter periods of time. Given the lack of proper stormwater management planning from Classic Street Cottages and down Dorcas and ongoing stormwater issues in the neighborhoods surrounding this proposed development, it is reasonable to expect that **the developer must provide the Planning Commission with detailed drawings of how stormwater will be managed onsite prior to project approval. The requirement of providing this detailed information is mentioned in the code multiple times.** Because the development will be creating hardened surfaces on a large portion of the property, which is well below the surrounding streets and infrastructure, how will stormwater be addressed? This question needs to be answered NOW, not sometime in the future with approval only by City staff.

- Infrastructure — Does Manzanita have the infrastructure to support a development of this size? How will the infrastructure for the project be configured? Where are the detailed plans that must be provided before the PUD is approved according to the Manzanita City Zoning Code giving the requirement for the approval of a PUD? The language in those ordinances regarding the requirement to provide infrastructure details prior to approval is quite directive, using both shall and must, to give direction to the Planning Commission.
- Onsite Hotel Management – As discussed at the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the hotel management is planning for this hotel to be what Forbes has called a “staff-less boutique hotel.” This means there will be up to 96 guests on-site, without any management or staff to help with safety issues or criminal activity. This does not meet the standard of a hotel. Neighbors have valid concerns that the lack of management will cause conflict and issues between neighbors and hotel guests — this in a City already saturated with STRs and those common problems. Without on-site management, these units should be treated as STRs on which the City Council has currently passed a freeze in the SRR zone. This does not meet the standard of a hotel.
- Parking – While the applicant has met the requirements in City code for number of parking spaces, there is concern that when larger events, like weddings, or large family reunions, are held in the shared community building, that **there will not be adequate parking on-site.** The applicant is on the record in the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting stating that weddings and gathering are part of the planned use for the community building.

- o What size of gatherings will be allowed in the community building in addition to the guests onsite? Are outside guests allowed? If so, how many? Where will they park if all lodging is filled with guests and the parking spaces are all used?
- o There is extremely limited street parking surrounding the proposed development. **If larger gatherings with outside guests are to be part of this development and will be allowed, extra parking spaces beyond what has already been proposed should be required as a condition of approval, as well as a plan for parking if large gatherings bring more cars than parking spaces to the development.**
- Livability - The livability in our neighborhoods is at risk, and we ask the Planning Commission to look at the PUD code. **There are places where it is not being followed for this project and the code is clear that a higher level of detail is required before project approval.**

The Contract City Planner is on record that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be used to address livability concerns raised by citizens and Commissioners. We strongly disagree with this opinion. The plan itself states that the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan “has the force of law” and “overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning.” It also states that “Citizens’ feelings and concerns are the foundation of decision making.”

The fact is that robust public engagement is a foundation of Oregon Land Use and is required by Manzanita’s Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission itself, according to the State of Oregon’s records, serves as the Committee for Citizen’s Involvement (CCI) following the adopted Citizen Involvement Program (CIP). Thus, limiting comment and not addressing valid concerns is violating citizens’ rights which is against the law. The developer needs to understand that if there is a major change in the City’s administration following the November election in 2022, these violations will be met with rigor.

We believe the applicant needs to create more considered plans and strategies that address many of the concerns and questions that have been raised about this project both by citizens and by Planning Commission members, and not just come up with answers on the fly when hard questions are asked during the Planning Commission hearing. At the May meeting, the applicant stated multiple times that he felt he had met code. And yet, there are multiple places outlined above where neighbors and citizens strongly disagree with him and with the Staff Report. The applicant has the opportunity to get started on the right foot

in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.

Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it "meets code." There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Signed by Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

- Signatures begin on next page

Linda Olson 281 Jackson Way Manzanita

M. J. Olson 281 Jackson Way "

Building

From: cityhall
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2022 6:28 AM
To: Building
Subject: FW: Contact Us message from City Of Manzanita Website

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: City Of Manzanita contact form <cityofmanzanitaoregon@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2022 4:08 AM
To: cityhall <cityhall@ci.manzanita.or.us>
Subject: Contact Us message from City Of Manzanita Website

Name: Lydia Felley
Email: lfelley@nehalem.tel.net

Choose Department: Planning Department

Message: Please do not approve the Manzanita Lofts proposal. The density of this proposal is way too much for the area. Manzanita was a small town community and is now a bursting at the seams tourist attraction. As a north county resident, I find it unpleasant to come to Manzanita Memorial Day to Labor Day due to the crowds.

Loss of community is one reason to vote no on this proposal. Another reason is loss of "green" in the city. In a time of climate change keeping green spaces is very important. Due to the ever growing size of homes and now this green spaces in Manzanita are shrinking.

It also appears that the proposal has not met all of the required ordinance issues and should do so before being approved. These ordinances are there to protect our community and land. Please follow the land use laws and procedures that are required before accepting ANY proposal.

Please say no to the Loft proposal and yes to sustaining a liveable city.

Thank you!

Lydia Felley

Date: June 19, 2022

Time: 3:07 am

Page URL: <https://ci.manzanita.or.us/contact/>

User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Macintosh; Intel Mac OS X 10.15; rv:91.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/91.6

Remote IP: 212.102.33.139

Powered by: Elementor

June 15, 2022

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair
Members, Planning Commission
Manzanita Planning Commission
City of Manzanita
Manzanita, OR 97130

Dear Karen and Commission Members:

I just wanted to provide you with a short note opposing the proposed development of a “hotel” west of Classic Street and the Classic Street community.

I know that many of my neighbors have already expressed their strong opinions about this proposed development and their opposition to it. I suspect that all the code and legal arguments have already been presented.

My concern—which would affect the entire surrounding community—is the placement of a commercial enterprise right in the middle of an exclusively residential community. As a longtime resident of Portland, and a frequent visitor to Seaside, Oregon, I can attest to the fact that developers often pay little attention to the residential properties they impact when they decide they want to build their project. This is not to say their project has no merit, but, in the case here in Manzanita, it’s imperative we, as a community, preserve the uncluttered, peaceful, relaxing, and charming setting that defines our town and our neighborhood.

If this project has merit that would significantly benefit our town, I respectfully ask the Commission to urge the developer seek an alternative site for this project.

Thank you for considering all our community concerns.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "William H. Kern", on a light-colored rectangular background.

William H. Kern
375 Jackson Way,
Manzanita, OR 97130

City Planning

From: Leslie Bagon <lesliebagon.lcsw@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2022 8:58 PM
To: City Planning
Subject: Dorcas Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

As a homeowner in Manzanita for ten years the unabated growth of development is unprecedented. And it would appear having minimal rules or regulations in order to put a pause in development, that would adversely affect the charm and character of Manzanita. We bought a house here, as so many of us, to have a slower and more manageable pace of life. We are not antidevelopment but the needs of the homeowners seems to be over shadowed for those that are here to make money with no consideration for the character of this community or the well being of those of us that have considered this home. Please reconsider this recent development on Dorcas as a bellwether that will be a message to those who can blatantly determine anything and everything can be built and encouraged in Manzanita.

Thank You,

Leslie & Frank Bagon


in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.

Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it "meets code." There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Signed by Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

- Signatures begin on next page


Jeff Robinson
Jencamarillo Robinson

Building

From: cityhall
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2022 6:27 AM
To: Building
Subject: FW: Contact Us message from City Of Manzanita Website

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: City Of Manzanita <cityofmanzanitaoregon@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2022 10:11 PM
To: cityhall <cityhall@ci.manzanita.or.us>
Subject: Contact Us message from City Of Manzanita Website

Name: Patti Walker

Email: pbarrettwalker@gmail.com

Message: Unfortunately I recently broke my leg and find myself unable to write another letter or attend the next meeting, to urge the Planning Commission to deny the PUD at the corner of Dorcas and Classic. The issues I highlighted in my first letter have not been addressed by the applicant even after a direct phone conversation. The developer is unwilling to make any changes to address community concerns. Further he portrays himself as a local person with Manzanitas best interests at heart. However he is not interested in community concerns raised and got quite angry when I suggested decreasing the density of his project and questioned the size of his proposed cabins. I really urge the Commission to deny his application until community concerns are acknowledged and addressed.

Thank you.

Patti Walker and Patrick Barrett
758 Dorcas Lane

Date: June 18, 2022

Time: 9:11 pm

Page URL: <https://ci.manzanita.or.us/contact/>

User Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (iPhone; CPU iPhone OS 15_5 like Mac OS X) AppleWebKit/605.1.15 (KHTML, like Gecko)

Version/15.5 Mobile/15E148 Safari/604.1

Remote IP: 173.224.179.187

Powered by: Elementor



Dear Manzanita Planning Commission,

I am writing about the proposed SR-R Planned Development – Dorcas Lane + Classic St. (Manzanita Lofts LLC). As you know this piece of property (Tax Lot: 3N 10W TAX LOT 2600 + 2100) is directly adjacent to hole #5 of Manzanita Links golf course. Hole #5 is our “signature hole”. It is the most photographed and for many their favorite hole on the golf course. It is a short par 4 of 280 yards, where most folks use a driver, with out of bounds on the right-hand side (property line). Many balls are sliced to the right and out of bounds along that property line.

As of now, no representative from the proposed development design team has approached myself or my staff about the proposed development and what it may mean for the operation of the golf course. While the plans and design sketches are beautifully rendered, we do have some concerns on how this development could affect the golf course operation and on how the development itself seems dependent on golf course views as a selling point.

Important Concerns:

- Aesthetics and playability of the golf course
- General safety, including from errant golf shots
- Local public accessibility to the course or walking paths
- Drainage/hazardous materials during construction and beyond

It appears by the sketches and plans in the application that several units are right on the property line and several trees and shrubs that are on golf course property are removed or limbed up to offer golf course views. It appears that a lot of the marketing and appeal of the property of the development will be because of golf course views as it is in a low area with no attractive views to east.

As owner of the golf course, we do reserve the right to keep the vegetation on the property as is, or plant new trees and vegetation for safety, playability, aesthetic, or other purposes that may block some or all views of the proposed design. We also reserve the right to build signs or fencing to prevent unwanted trespassing or help with safety or aesthetics, which also could eliminate viewing corridors.

Again, as of today, no one from the proposed development team has met with myself or any of my staff about the scope, marketing, or design plans and how they may affect the golf course operation and playability. This letter is in no way a condemnation of the plan or a comment of their right to do such a development in the SR-R zone, of which it appears to be a legal use, but to make note of our concerns to the city and the developer.

As many of you know, we have worked hard over the last 4+ years to keep the golf course open and have spent tens of thousands of dollars to upgrade outdated systems and facilities for the benefit of the course and the community. We also very much enjoy allowing the community to use the golf course on Monday's during the off season for walking paths and a park. Our plan is to continue to make Manzanita Links a jewel for the city to enjoy long into the future. Thank you for your consideration.

All the best,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt J. Brown" followed by a long horizontal line.

Matt J. Brown
Owner, Manzanita Links, LLC
Cell: 503-757-3644
Email: mjbrown@pga.com

To: City of Manzanita Planning Commission
Contracted City Planner Walt Wendowski
City Manager Leila Aman

June 16, 2022

Dear All,

When I discovered Manzanita's Comprehensive Plan two years ago I thought I found what looked to me like a vision of a residential community in a beautiful place with a guide aimed at maintaining it.

I've been told by land use lawyers and planners that the plan is aspirational but has the force of law in instances where mandatory language is used. In disputes about land use the Plan is supposed to beat zoning, ordinances--all of it.

Supposedly, the Comprehensive Plan works for the majority of citizens and not for a handful of property owners or special interests. Except, that's not what it looks like from where I sit.

You see, I'd been trying to figure out how a prohibited clear-cut of 100+ year-old trees in the center of town could be done with no permit and no tree replacement plan on designated Open Space Land with recognized marshy wetland.

That was the beginning of my education. But this letter isn't about that.

I read with interest the public comment letters on the Planning Commission's webpage about the Manzanita Lofts Planned Unit Development in the SRR zone on Classic and Dorcas and it seems I'm not alone in my confusion about the convoluted interpretation of code in the Staff Report.

Does "require" not mean to specify as compulsory? Aren't "shall" and "must" the mandatory language of law?

When the words we read in these land use documents can be interpreted to mean something we know isn't right, we lose our faith in the processes and systems of government. When the reality we see and experience around us is denied by the people who hold positions of authority it erodes trust and further divides the community. That's what's happening. It makes a girl feel gaslit.

It's not whining to want the rules to work for everyone equally. It's not whining to ask questions or to have opinions. Pretending like the problems our community faces don't exist won't make them go away. We can see the disconnect between what the rules say and what actually happens.

According to code the plans for infrastructure and engineering require detail now so the Commission can fully review them before accepting or denying the application even though the Staff Report says it does not. So which is accurate and why?

SR-R code 4.136.2 and 3 reads, "2) Standards governing area, density, yards, off-street parking, or other requirements shall be guided by the standards that most nearly portray the character of the zone in which the greatest percentage of the planned development is proposed.

3) The area around the development can be planned to be in substantial harmony with the proposed plan."

How is a 34 unit keyless hotel with no on-site management in harmony with a residential neighborhood on land adjoining a golf course?

Why has no wetland delineation report for the whole property been completed?

What's the plan to deal with stormwater? Parking? Traffic?

How are 34 units where people will live albeit temporarily, not dwellings?

The more I read, the less I understand the rush to approve this project. The Manzanita Lofts application needs far more work before it should be considered.

Playing with language to allow what the code and the Plan prohibits benefits developers every time. I'm not against development but I'd like thoughtful well-planned development that serves the needs of our community. I'd like to see the Planning Commission empowered to hold developers to stricter standards.

The Planning Commission is the community's first line of defense and must act with determination, if we are to save what's good and beautiful about the place we call home and leave it in good shape for those who come after.

We want thoughtful managed growth and this project is not that.
Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Kim and Ben Rosenberg
280 Edmund Lane
Manzanita OR 97130



June 16, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission

VIA EMAIL: planning@ci.manzanita.or.us

Re: Manzanita Lofts PUD

Dear City of Manzanita Planning Commission,

Oregon Coast Alliance is an Oregon nonprofit corporation whose mission is to protect coastal natural resources and work with residents to enhance livability in coastal communities. We write today with some very serious concerns about the Manzanita Lofts PUD proposed at the intersection of Dorcas Lane and Classic Street. The property is zoned Special Residential/Recreation.

ORCA's initial comment is that the City of Manzanita should never have accepted an application so vague, fragmentary and skeletal as a *complete* application. That was a serious dereliction of duty on the part of the city and city staff. For a complex PUD that proposes 19 studio hotel rooms, nine hotel cabins and six cottages, it is beyond absurdity for the applicant to submit a vague, three-page narrative with no technical studies, and have the city accept the application as "complete." By way of example of the continuing slipshod nature of this application, the Planning Commission required a traffic analysis after testimony indicating that Classic and Dorcas already have serious congestion difficulties. The resulting "study" is two pages long, and concludes there will be no problems. The city's review of this report, at three pages long, is not only longer, but also quite a bit more detailed.

The city's staff report takes an aggressive stance that only basic approval of the overall PUD plan needs to occur now, and "details" can be dealt with later, during design review – everything from stormwater management and water infrastructure to building size and density. This directly contradicts what Manzanita ordinances require. Section 4.136.2 requires a PUD to use the standards of area, density, yards, off street parking or other requirements be guided by the standards that portray the character of the zone – in this case, the SR-R zone. This essential first step has not been done.

City ordinances lay out the PUD development procedure in detail in Section 4.136.3, requiring a showing that the development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and/or

zoning provisions, including but not limited to geologic hazards and storm drainage. The applicant has not provided, nor has the city required, studies or plans on either of these two issues.

But the most glaring issue, and perhaps the most egregious, is that the staff report consistently describes the project as a “hotel.” However, as the Manzanita ordinances contain no definition of a “hotel,” that provides the applicant with an enormous loophole: by describing the project as a hotel, which is an undefined category, the city is giving the applicant the opportunity to pretty much design the project as desired, without any sideboards. The city has made no attempt to explain what definition of “hotel” it will use in lieu of having one in its own ordinances.

The city also consistently refuses to apply the standards for “dwellings,” which are defined in Manzanita code. These standards definitely apply to this project, which consists primarily of dwellings. The reason for this glaring omission appears to be to allow the applicant to duck the required density standards of 6.5 units per acre that applies to this SR-R zone.

The city is following a lax philosophy of trying to minimize the applicant’s burden of proof, which is stringent and required under state law as well as Manzanita ordinances. It is strictly inappropriate for the city to require the Planning Commission only to approve basic layout, and shove all the many issues and approval criteria under the rug as “technical” issues that can be dealt with by later design review. This is turning the land use laws on their head, and does not follow legal requirements. *See* page 6 of the May 2022 staff report for an example of this tactic concerning utility and drainage facilities.

The Planning Commission has a legal obligation to consider the project based on the requirements and criteria of city ordinances, and to place the burden of proof on the applicant to meet those standards. Perhaps the city and the developer hope that by knocking critical issues down to the technical level, there will be no appeals possible.

ORCA urges the Planning Commission to return the application to the applicant with instructions to provide more detailed studies and information on a myriad of matters which have not, or have barely, been mentioned. The Planning Commission is explicitly granted this authority by city ordinances, Sec. 4.136.3 (d), which says the Planning Commission **shall** notify the applicant whether all the foregoing provisions have been satisfied, and whether they can be satisfied with further revisions. In other words, the Commission *must* make a determination on all the issues listed in this ordinance, as well as others, at this level – not a later technical review.

These include, but are not limited to: stormwater, utility facilities, geohazard issues, wetlands (this property contains a designated wetland under the National Wetland

Inventory), Comprehensive Plan compliance, water provision, standards for dwellings, density standards, and requirements for hotels, as well as a definition the city proposes to use for this type of building.

Please place this testimony into the record for this matter.

Sincerely,

/s/ Cameron la Follette

Cameron La Follette

June 9, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
PO Box 129
Manzanita, OR 97130

Dear Manzanita Planning Commission:

The citizens signed below have the following concerns regarding the Manzanita Lofts Project. We ask that they be addressed before this project is approved.

- Traffic safety — **The project will create an extremely awkward five-way stop at Dorcas and Classic**, an already busy intersection on narrow streets, which, according to the developer's traffic study, will add an additional 309 traffic trips a day during the busy summer months. Traffic safety is one of the top concerns of citizens who live in the neighborhood surrounding the proposed project. Classic is a very narrow street without five foot easements on both sides. While the project has been reviewed for safety, it does not answer the questions of how the City will deal with heavier traffic at this intersection and pedestrian or bicycle safety on two busy and narrow City streets. The City should address these issues, and this plan should also include an update on the structure of Classic and Dorcas which are both sub-standard. In addition, Classic Street (according to Manzanita's Downtown Transportation Plan) should include a pedestrian/bike path adjacent to the street, similar in design to the pedestrian/bike path on Carmel.
- Fire access – **the proposed hotel has only one entrance and egress**. How will visitors be evacuated in case of a fire when fire trucks and other equipment need access to the buildings?
 - The lack of additional entrances and egress may expose the City to liability if visitors cannot get out of the area in the case of an emergency.
 - A further complication are that firepits are featured as an exterior amenity of the hotel to be used by visitors in the evenings when there will be no staff on site.
- Wetlands – The developer of the property provided a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) of wetlands and other waters for Tax Lot #2100 stating that there is no wetland on the property. However, the lot has a freshwater emergent wetland shown on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI), State Wetland Inventory

(SWI), and in City of Manzanita's 2019 Buildable Lands Inventory. This means it requires more than a PJD to determine whether a wetland exists on the property. We understand that the applicant has submitted a wetlands and waters determination request to the Department of State Lands (DSL). DSL will provide a response to the City of Manzanita within 30 days of the submission, and part of the response will be a recommendation if a delineation is needed or not.

A Wetland Land Use Notice (WLUN) from the City of Manzanita to DSL is required by ORS 196.676 for this property/development. The notice should have been sent to DSL within five days after the application was deemed complete. According to the DSL Aquatic Resource Planner, "At this point the determination can informally stand-in for the WLUN, since the 'wet det' request has been submitted, but obviously this is not the best or standard operating procedures." It is concerning that proper procedures have not been followed by the contract City Planner to ensure wetlands are properly reviewed and work in wetlands properly permitted.

How does the Planning Commission want to handle the fact that DSL will most likely require a wetland delineation for all of Tax Lot #2100 where the majority of the development will be located? If there is a wetland on the site, the site plan may need to be revised to accommodate the wetland and a joint permit from DSL and US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be secured prior to any work in the wetland area. It does not make sense to move forward with approval while these large, outstanding issues exist. **We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission ask the applicant to agree to a voluntary extension of the 120 day limit while coordinating with DSL to address the wetland issues. If the applicant will not agree to a voluntary extension while addressing wetlands and other concerns, we request the Planning Commission deny the application.**

- Stormwater & Infrastructure – **The code is very clear that these issues are to be addressed before the PUD is approved, not after.** In fact, the code that provides instructions about how the PUD is to be evaluated is clear that infrastructure must be addressed with detailed plans before approval. Approval of the project requires detailed information, as the Planning Commission uses discretionary judgement to make their decision. Instead, the Staff Report is doing the community a deep disservice and gaming the system by moving most of the approvals for infrastructure and project details away from the Planning Commission to City staff sometime in the future, taking away the discretionary judgement and opportunities for public comment that rest with the Planning Commission.

Manzanita, and the North Oregon Coast, are predicted to have more severe storm events in the future, delivering high levels of precipitation in shorter periods of time. Given the lack of proper stormwater management planning from Classic Street Cottages and down Dorcas and ongoing stormwater issues in the neighborhoods surrounding this proposed development, it is reasonable to expect that **the developer must provide the Planning Commission with detailed drawings of how stormwater will be managed onsite prior to project approval. The requirement of providing this detailed information is mentioned in the code multiple times.** Because the development will be creating hardened surfaces on a large portion of the property, which is well below the surrounding streets and infrastructure, how will stormwater be addressed? This question needs to be answered NOW, not sometime in the future with approval only by City staff.

- Infrastructure — Does Manzanita have the infrastructure to support a development of this size? How will the infrastructure for the project be configured? Where are the detailed plans that must be provided before the PUD is approved according to the Manzanita City Zoning Code giving the requirement for the approval of a PUD? The language in those ordinances regarding the requirement to provide infrastructure details prior to approval is quite directive, using both shall and must, to give direction to the Planning Commission.
- Onsite Hotel Management – As discussed at the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the hotel management is planning for this hotel to be what Forbes has called a “staff-less boutique hotel.” This means there will be up to 96 guests on-site, without any management or staff to help with safety issues or criminal activity. This does not meet the standard of a hotel. Neighbors have valid concerns that the lack of management will cause conflict and issues between neighbors and hotel guests — this in a City already saturated with STRs and those common problems. Without on-site management, these units should be treated as STRs on which the City Council has currently passed a freeze in the SRR zone. This does not meet the standard of a hotel.
- Parking – While the applicant has met the requirements in City code for number of parking spaces, there is concern that when larger events, like weddings, or large family reunions, are held in the shared community building, that **there will not be adequate parking on-site.** The applicant is on the record in the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting stating that weddings and gathering are part of the planned use for the community building.

- o What size of gatherings will be allowed in the community building in addition to the guests onsite? Are outside guests allowed? If so, how many? Where will they park if all lodging is filled with guests and the parking spaces are all used?
 - o There is extremely limited street parking surrounding the proposed development. **If larger gatherings with outside guests are to be part of this development and will be allowed, extra parking spaces beyond what has already been proposed should be required as a condition of approval, as well as a plan for parking if large gatherings bring more cars than parking spaces to the development.**
- Livability - The livability in our neighborhoods is at risk, and we ask the Planning Commission to look at the PUD code. **There are places where it is not being followed for this project and the code is clear that a higher level of detail is required before project approval.**

The Contract City Planner is on record that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be used to address livability concerns raised by citizens and Commissioners. We strongly disagree with this opinion. The plan itself states that the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan “has the force of law” and “overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning.” It also states that “Citizens’ feelings and concerns are the foundation of decision making.”

The fact is that robust public engagement is a foundation of Oregon Land Use and is required by Manzanita’s Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission itself, according to the State of Oregon’s records, serves as the Committee for Citizen’s Involvement (CCI) following the adopted Citizen Involvement Program (CIP). Thus, limiting comment and not addressing valid concerns is violating citizens’ rights which is against the law. The developer needs to understand that if there is a major change in the City’s administration following the November election in 2022, these violations will be met with rigor.

We believe the applicant needs to create more considered plans and strategies that address many of the concerns and questions that have been raised about this project both by citizens and by Planning Commission members, and not just come up with answers on the fly when hard questions are asked during the Planning Commission hearing. At the May meeting, the applicant stated multiple times that he felt he had met code. And yet, there are multiple places outlined above where neighbors and citizens strongly disagree with him and with the Staff Report. The applicant has the opportunity to get started on the right foot

in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.

Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it "meets code." There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Signed by Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

- Signed begin on next page

DocuSigned by:

FD1706DE52474C3... 6/15/2022

DocuSigned by:

E7B1DBC029C54B7... 6/15/2022

DocuSigned by:

2614C0B43A0946E... 6/15/2022

June 9, 2022

City of Manzanita Planning Commission
PO Box 129
Manzanita, OR 97130

Dear Manzanita Planning Commission:

The citizens signed below have the following concerns regarding the Manzanita Lofts Project. We ask that they be addressed before this project is approved.

- **Traffic safety — The project will create an extremely awkward five-way stop at Dorcas and Classic**, an already busy intersection on narrow streets, which, according to the developer's traffic study, will add an additional 309 traffic trips a day during the busy summer months. Traffic safety is one of the top concerns of citizens who live in the neighborhood surrounding the proposed project. Classic is a very narrow street without five foot easements on both sides. While the project has been reviewed for safety, it does not answer the questions of how the City will deal with heavier traffic at this intersection and pedestrian or bicycle safety on two busy and narrow City streets. The City should address these issues, and this plan should also include an update on the structure of Classic and Dorcas which are both sub-standard. In addition, Classic Street (according to Manzanita's Downtown Transportation Plan) should include a pedestrian/bike path adjacent to the street, similar in design to the pedestrian/bike path on Carmel.
- **Fire access – the proposed hotel has only one entrance and egress.** How will visitors be evacuated in case of a fire when fire trucks and other equipment need access to the buildings?
 - The lack of additional entrances and egress may expose the City to liability if visitors cannot get out of the area in the case of an emergency.
 - A further complication are that firepits are featured as an exterior amenity of the hotel to be used by visitors in the evenings when there will be no staff on site.
- **Wetlands –** The developer of the property provided a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) of wetlands and other waters for Tax Lot #2100 stating that there is no wetland on the property. However, the lot has a freshwater emergent wetland shown on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI), State Wetland Inventory

(SWI), and in City of Manzanita's 2019 Buildable Lands Inventory. This means it requires more than a PJD to determine whether a wetland exists on the property. We understand that the applicant has submitted a wetlands and waters determination request to the Department of State Lands (DSL). DSL will provide a response to the City of Manzanita within 30 days of the submission, and part of the response will be a recommendation if a delineation is needed or not.

A Wetland Land Use Notice (WLUN) from the City of Manzanita to DSL is required by ORS 196.676 for this property/development. The notice should have been sent to DSL within five days after the application was deemed complete. According to the DSL Aquatic Resource Planner, "At this point the determination can informally stand-in for the WLUN, since the 'wet det' request has been submitted, but obviously this is not the best or standard operating procedures." It is concerning that proper procedures have not been followed by the contract City Planner to ensure wetlands are properly reviewed and work in wetlands properly permitted.

How does the Planning Commission want to handle the fact that DSL will most likely require a wetland delineation for all of Tax Lot #2100 where the majority of the development will be located? If there is a wetland on the site, the site plan may need to be revised to accommodate the wetland and a joint permit from DSL and US Army Corps of Engineers will need to be secured prior to any work in the wetland area. It does not make sense to move forward with approval while these large, outstanding issues exist. **We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission ask the applicant to agree to a voluntary extension of the 120 day limit while coordinating with DSL to address the wetland issues. If the applicant will not agree to a voluntary extension while addressing wetlands and other concerns, we request the Planning Commission deny the application.**

- **Stormwater & Infrastructure – The code is very clear that these issues are to be addressed before the PUD is approved, not after.** In fact, the code that provides instructions about how the PUD is to be evaluated is clear that infrastructure must be addressed with detailed plans before approval. Approval of the project requires detailed information, as the Planning Commission uses discretionary judgement to make their decision. Instead, the Staff Report is doing the community a deep disservice and gaming the system by moving most of the approvals for infrastructure and project details away from the Planning Commission to City staff sometime in the future, taking away the discretionary judgement and opportunities for public comment that rest with the Planning Commission.

Manzanita, and the North Oregon Coast, are predicted to have more severe storm events in the future, delivering high levels of precipitation in shorter periods of time. Given the lack of proper stormwater management planning from Classic Street Cottages and down Dorcas and ongoing stormwater issues in the neighborhoods surrounding this proposed development, it is reasonable to expect that **the developer must provide the Planning Commission with detailed drawings of how stormwater will be managed onsite prior to project approval. The requirement of providing this detailed information is mentioned in the code multiple times.** Because the development will be creating hardened surfaces on a large portion of the property, which is well below the surrounding streets and infrastructure, how will stormwater be addressed? This question needs to be answered NOW, not sometime in the future with approval only by City staff.

- Infrastructure — Does Manzanita have the infrastructure to support a development of this size? How will the infrastructure for the project be configured? Where are the detailed plans that must be provided before the PUD is approved according to the Manzanita City Zoning Code giving the requirement for the approval of a PUD? The language in those ordinances regarding the requirement to provide infrastructure details prior to approval is quite directive, using both shall and must, to give direction to the Planning Commission.
- Onsite Hotel Management — As discussed at the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the hotel management is planning for this hotel to be what Forbes has called a “staff-less boutique hotel.” This means there will be up to 96 guests on-site, without any management or staff to help with safety issues or criminal activity. This does not meet the standard of a hotel. Neighbors have valid concerns that the lack of management will cause conflict and issues between neighbors and hotel guests — this in a City already saturated with STRs and those common problems. Without on-site management, these units should be treated as STRs on which the City Council has currently passed a freeze in the SRR zone.
- Parking — While the applicant has met the requirements in City code for number of parking spaces, there is concern that when larger events, like weddings, or large family reunions, are held in the shared community building, that **there will not be adequate parking on-site.** The applicant is on the record in the May 2022 Planning Commission meeting stating that weddings and gathering are part of the planned use for the community building.

- o What size of gatherings will be allowed in the community building in addition to the guests onsite? Are outside guests allowed? If so, how many? Where will they park if all lodging is filled with guests and the parking spaces are all used?
- o There is extremely limited street parking surrounding the proposed development. **If larger gatherings with outside guests are to be part of this development and will be allowed, extra parking spaces beyond what has already been proposed should be required as a condition of approval, as well as a plan for parking if large gatherings bring more cars than parking spaces to the development.**
- Livability - The livability in our neighborhoods is at risk, and we ask the Planning Commission to look at the PUD code. **There are places where it is not being followed for this project and the code is clear that a higher level of detail is required before project approval.**

The Contract City Planner is on record that the Comprehensive Plan cannot be used to address livability concerns raised by citizens and Commissioners. We strongly disagree with this opinion. The plan itself states that the Manzanita Comprehensive Plan "has the force of law" and "overrides other city ordinances, such as zoning." It also states that "Citizens' feelings and concerns are the foundation of decision making."

The fact is that robust public engagement is a foundation of Oregon Land Use and is required by Manzanita's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission itself, according to the State of Oregon's records, serves as the Committee for Citizen's Involvement (CCI) following the adopted Citizen Involvement Program (CIP). Thus, limiting comment and not addressing valid concerns is violating citizens' rights which is against the law. The developer needs to understand that if there is a major change in the City's administration following the November election in 2022, these violations will be met with rigor.

We believe the applicant needs to create more considered plans and strategies that address many of the concerns and questions that have been raised about this project both by citizens and by Planning Commission members, and not just come up with answers on the fly when hard questions are asked during the Planning Commission hearing. At the May meeting, the applicant stated multiple times that he felt he had met code. And yet, there are multiple places outlined above where neighbors and citizens strongly disagree with him and with the Staff Report. The applicant has the opportunity to get started on the right foot

in our neighborhood and City, truly hearing and addressing the concerns that have been raised by the neighbors that will surround his project.

Given the many outstanding issues listed above, we request the Planning Commission either ask the applicant to voluntarily stop the 120 day clock while the wetland issues are addressed, and use the time to develop the detailed information about infrastructure that the code requires. If the applicant is unwilling to halt the clock, the Planning Commission should deny the project and allow the applicant to return with a more thoughtful and complete application.

We ask the Planning Commission not to yield to pressure to approve this application because the City is getting close to its 120 day deadline for a decision or because of some assurance that it "meets code." There can be disagreements about what meeting code means, and the Planning Commission has every right to exercise their discretionary judgement of this project.

Signed by Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

- Signatures begin on next page

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

	<u>Name - Printed</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Address in Manzanita</u>
1	GARY BURROUGHS	G S Burghs	451 DORCAS LN
2	CORRINE BURROUGHS	Corrine Burghs	451 DORCAS LN
3	Sharon Isahel	Sharon Isahel	446 Dorcas Ln.
4	LINDSEY BURROUGHS	Lindsay Burghs	DORCAS LN.
5	SANDY WOOD	Sandy Wood	120 BEERWATER LANE
6	Leslie Bagon	Leslie Bagon	138 Edmund Lane
7	Loetta Kim Rosenberg	Loetta Kim Rosenberg	280 Edmund Lane
8	Kaleen Wineinger	Kaleen Wineinger	37 Portland Ave
9	Lyla Hendrickson	Lyla Hendrickson	465 Dorcas Lane
10	MARY RUE F	Mary Rue	355 JACKSON WAY
11	JEANINE RUMBLE	Jeanine Rumble	360 JACKSON WAY
12	Kenneth Ryan	Kenneth Ryan	384 Jackson way
13	Yvana Iovino	Yvana Iovino	352 Jackson way
14	JON GUSTAFSON	Jon H. Gustafson	566 DORCAS LANE
15	Barbara GUSTAFSON	Barbara Gustafson	566 DORCAS LN. MAN
16	William G. Mendenhall	William G. Mendenhall	610 Division St.
17	DAW & Bonnie SAVICKAS	Bonnie Savickas	4005 4th St.
18	PAUL A HUGHES	Paul A Hughes	661 DORCAS LANE
19	Barbara A. Lee	Barbara A. Lee	661 Dorcas Lane
20	Suzanne R. Cameron	Suzanne R. Cameron	249 University Ave














Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page










	<u>Name - Printed</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Address in Manzanita</u>
21	JAMES MILLER	James R. Miller	353 Jackson Way
22	Denise Lofman	D. Lofman	663 Dorcas Lane
23	Michael Churchill	Michael Churchill	598 Dorcas Lane
24	Debra Simmons	Debra Simmons	256 Treasure Cove Lane
25	Corinna Beuchet	C. Beuchet	454 Dorcas Lane
26	Roger Seun	Roger Seun	Hemlock ST.
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			

DEREEN DE SCHARY VER	<u>D de Scharyver</u>	<u>412 UNIVERSITY AVE</u>	<u>97130</u>	<u>dereend007@gmail.com</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Jennifer Stewart	<u>Jennifer Stewart</u>	<u>368 S. 4th Place</u>	<u>97130</u>	<u>4 Jenny pec@gmail.com</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code	
MATHEW GOODRICH	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>368 S. 4TH PLACE</u>	<u>97130</u>	<u>MATHEW GOODRICH @ G MAIL</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Gregory Wiewert	<u>Gregory Wiewert</u>	<u>369 S 4TH PLACE</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
ELIZABETH AYERAK	<u>E. Ayerak</u>	<u>853 Lakeview Dr</u>	<u>97130</u>	<u>126thmyzsk-1@gmail.com</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code	
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>Paul Miller</u>	<u>577 Portland Ave</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Liza Jones	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>57 Portland Ave</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Jan Layne	<u>Jan Layne</u>	<u>460 Treasure Cone</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
John Tuttle	<u>John Tuttle</u>	<u>528 Ridge Drive</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
JEFF FOLEN	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>438 Dorcas Lane</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Jennifer Rammer	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>address Jennifer Rammer 946112</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Jennifer Rammer	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>400 Ocean Ave Manzanita</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Jennifer Rammer	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>34640 Neptune Dr</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	
Charlotte von Ahlfeld	<u>Charlotte von Ahlfeld</u>	<u>890 Greenridge</u>	<u>97130</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code	

Isabella Beaton	Isabella Beaton	P.O. Box 431 Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Karen Small	Karen Small	P.O. Box 507 Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
P. Davis-Hansen	P. Davis-Hansen	P.O. Box 45 Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
June L. Baumbler	June L. Baumbler	P.O. Box 187, Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Ralph J. Dobieiko	Ralph J. Dobieiko	P.O. Box 187, Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
CHRISTINA UTTER	Christina Utter	P.O. Box 732, Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
CLIFF UTTER	Cliff Utter	P.O. Box 732 Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
THOMAS SENBROOK	Thomas Senbrook	7276 SW 86TH AVE BOX	97223
print name	signature	address	zip code
Carol Kennesy	Carol C. Kennesy	578 Dorcas Lane Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Marisue McGrath	Marisue McGrath	P.O. Box 1193 Manzanita	97135
print name	signature	address	zip code
Elizabeth Connor	Elizabeth Connor	P.O. Box 515 Manzanita, OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
print name	signature	address	zip code
print name	signature	address	zip code

RONALD DIETRICH		8905 PUFFIN LANE	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Amy Engelberger		228 Beeswax Ln	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Juli Strzhan		228 Beeswax LN	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
COLIN EIDERS		1124 Caribee Ave	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
NANCY MOSS		8905 Puffin Lane	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
DANAS TONKS		170 BEESWAX LN	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Ellen Drumheller		159 Beeswax LN	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
ROGERD. CAMPANA		159 BEESWAX LN	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Robert LeChevallier		470 Treasure Cove, dr	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Debbie Jonathan		421 Treasure Cove OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Jon Willie		480 Treasure Cove OR	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Nancy Grande		448 Dorcas Lane	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
St Vaguel de Wiermer		369 S	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code

Don von Ahlefeld	<u>Don von Ahlefeld</u>	<u>890 Greenridge</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Donnie I. Kost	<u>Donnie I. Kost</u>	<u>8866 Ocean Crest Ln</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Janeline M. Pascoe	<u>Janeline M. Pascoe</u>	<u>9960 Pine Ridge</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Tom Mock	<u>Tom Mock</u>	<u>9354 Nelson Rd</u>	<u>97131</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
KATE JOHNSTONE	<u>Kate Johnstone</u>	<u>POB 493 Marz</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Jessica Schaffner	<u>Jessica Schaffner</u>	<u>Po Box 1082 Manzanita</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Constance A Burton	<u>Constance A Burton</u>	<u>PO Box 1387 Manzanita</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
SUSAN BAKER	<u>Susan S. Baker</u>	<u>38475 Boulder Reed Rd.</u>	<u>97131</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Steve Ranover	<u>Steve Ranover</u>	<u>400 Ocean Ave</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Will Clafin	<u>Will Clafin</u>	<u>8255 Neahkahave Rd</u>	<u>97131</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
Guy Whitehead	<u>Guy Whitehead</u>	<u>whitecars.msn.</u>	
print name	signature	address	zip code
Julie Carson	<u>Julie Carson</u>	<u>292 Treasure Cove Manzanita</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
DANIEL L. SAVICKAS, JR.	<u>Daniel L. Savickas, Jr.</u>	<u>292 Treasure Cove M</u>	<u>97130</u>
print name	signature	address	zip code
		<u>400 S Fourth St</u>	<u>97130</u>
		address	zip code

print name	KELI HANSEN	signature		address	215 JACKSON WAY	zip code	97130
print name	Janet Carter	signature		address	372 JACKSON WAY	zip code	97130
print name	MOLLY DeLORE	signature		address	294 JACKSON WAY	zip code	97130
print name	Peter McDonnell	signature		address	381 Jackson Way	zip code	97130
print name	Brian Postle	signature		address	381 Jackson Way	zip code	97130
print name	Ziad Abdalhan	signature		address	378 Jackson Way	zip code	97130
print name	ERIK HANSEN	signature		address	215 JACKSON WAY	zip code	97130
print name	JELLY GLOWAY	signature		address	300 JACKSON WAY	zip code	97130
print name	Mark Beach	signature		address	207 Jackson Way	zip code	97130
print name		signature		address		zip code	
print name		signature		address		zip code	
print name		signature		address		zip code	
print name		signature		address		zip code	

JOHN R. DUBÉ	J. R. Dubé	2873 RD MANZANITA	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
BORG H L EMMAN	Borg H L EMMAN	613 Dorcas Lane Manzanita	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Alia Hedges	Alia S Hedges	585 Dorcas Lane Manzanita	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
JASON HEOGES	[Signature]	585 Dorcas Lane MANZANITA	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Gary Seelig	Gary Seelig	9300 Puffin Lane, Manzanita	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Melinda Seelig	Melinda Seelig	9300 Puffin Lane, Manzanita	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Greg Kranholtz	Greg Kranholtz	9320 Puffin Lane Manzanita	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
SUSAN KEO M HOLTZ	Susan Kromholz	9320 Puffin Lane Manzanita	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Stephen E. Spainhour	Stephen E. Spainhour	135 Classic St. MANZANITA	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Deborah Reed	[Signature]	176 Division Street	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
ANNA CAMPBELL	AN	172 DIVISION ST	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code
Dianne M Kennedy-Getty	Dianne M Kennedy-Getty	9380 SANDPIPER LN	97131
print name	signature	address	zip code
Sandra J Hearman	Sandra J Hearman	965 FAIRWAY COURT	97130
print name	signature	address	zip code

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

to Planning Commission

-- June 9, 2022

Steven Allen Dowell
print name

Terry M. Folen
print name

Steven Allen Dowell
signature

Terry M. Folen
signature

36445th Kearney Rd
address

498 Dorcas Lane
address

97131
zip code

97130
zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

— June 9, 2022

97130
zip code

9713 zip code

97130
zip code

zip code

zip code

zip code

zip code

zip code

zip code

zip code

zip_code

zip code

zip code

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

	<u>Name - Printed</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Address in Manzanita</u>	<u>eMail</u>
1	Gregg Allison	Gregg Allison	1103 Classic, Manzanita	greggda11ison@gmail.com
2	Kathleen M. Allison	Kathleen Allison	1103 Classic, Manzanita	allison57@comcast.net
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

	<u>Name - Printed</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Address in Manzanita</u>	<u>eMail</u>
1	Kristin Dinkheller	Kristin M Dinkheller	163 Classic St. (co-owner)	KMDINK@GMAIL.COM
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

	<u>Name - Printed</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Address in Manzanita</u>	<u>eMail</u>
1	David Adams	<i>David Adams</i>	163 Classic St. Manzanita (CO-OWNER)	dadams.gomez@gmail.com
2	Nadene Adams	<i>Nadene Adams</i>	163 Classic St. Manz. (CO-OWNER)	dnadams3@gmail.com
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

Name - Printed

Signature

Address in Manzanita

eMail

1

Jennifer Mayerle



760 Cherry Street
Manzanita, OR 97130

jennifer@mayerlecompany.com

2

3

BRAD MAYERLE



786 Cherry Street
MANZANITA, OR 97130

BRAD@mayerlecompany.com

4

JODY LEWIS



480 Laurel Ave
Manzanita, OR 97130

5

GARY LEWIS



480 Laurel Ave
Manzanita, OR 97130

gary.lewis@asmn.com

6

7

8

9

10

11













12

13

14



Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

Name - Printed	Signature	Address in Manzanita	eMail
1 Ben Rosenberg		280 Edmund Lane, 97130	ben.killen.rosenberg@gmail.com
2 Martha Schedel		258 Edmund Lane, 97130	schedel.m.a.comcast.net
3 William T. Jordan		William T. Jordan 258 Edmund Lane, 97130	Jordan.bill@comcast.net
4 Darryl Saunders		157 Edmund Lane 97130	dws97130@gmail.com
5 Randy Mannen		157 Edmund Lane 97130	rgmannen@paydix.com
6 Lisa Sutton		316 3rd St. S.	lisa7pdx@gmail.com
7 Jeff Sutton		316 3rd St. S.	jeffysutton@gmail.com
8 Christina Willis		227 Edmund Lane	willis@bentl.org
9 Peter Boyle		161 Edmund Lane	Pete.Lynne@newtel.net
10 Lynne Boyle		161 Edmund Ln 97130	LYBOYLE23@gmail.com
11 Jcatt REDD		295 EDMUND LN	sreddog@bendbroadband.com
12 Lisa Manson		273 Edmund Ln.	mphorses1@gmail.com
13			
14			

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

Signature Page

	<u>Name - Printed</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Address in Manzanita</u>	<u>eMail</u>
1	Bryan Churchill		598 Dorcas Lane	bryanchurchill@comcast.net
2	Michele Churchill		598 Dorcas Lane	michelechurchill@comcast.net
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				

Concerned Citizens of Manzanita

to Planning Commission — June 9, 2022

Eric Stammer

print name

Jay Stammer

print name

signature

signature

address

address

zip code

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code

print name

signature

address

zip code