

**CITY OF MANZANITA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
MAY 16, 2022**

- I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Due to technical issues, Chair Karen Reddick-Yurka called the meeting to order at 4:27 p.m.
- II. ROLL:** Members present were: Karen Reddick-Yurka, Burt Went, Phil Mannan, John Nanson (late to join meeting due to technical issues), Steve Bloom, Lee Hiltenbrand and Jenna Edginton. Staff present: City Manager Leila Aman, City Planning Consultant Walt Wendolowski, Public Works Director Dan Weitzel, Building Official Scott Gebhart and License & Ordinance Specialist Judy Wilson.
- III. AUDIENCE:** There were 35 persons in the audience.
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** March 21 and April 18, 2022 (deferred to end of meeting)

QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES: Chair Reddick-Yurka described the process for these public hearings.

- V. PUBLIC HEARING: FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT PHASE 4 FOR THE HIGHLANDS WITHIN THE SR-R, R2 & C1 ZONES; LOCATION: CLASSIC STREET AND NECARNEY CITY ROAD; APPLICANT: PINE GROVE PROPERTIES, INC. (JIM PENTZ AND RICK HINKES)**
- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None**
 - b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS –** Mannan, Hiltenbrand, Bloom, Edginton, Went stated that they had no conflict of interest, bias or ex parte contact and had visited the site. Reddick-Yurka stated no conflict of interest, ex parte contact, or bias but had driven to the site a few times to track progress.
 - c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**
 - d. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION –** Jim Pentz gave an overview and update on the development.
 - e. STAFF REPORT –**Planning Consultant Walt Wendolowski presented the staff report and stated that the final plat complies with the conditions of approval and recommended that the Planning Commission approve the final plat.
 - f. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – None**
 - g. CORRESPONDENCE – None noted**

- h. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 4:39 p.m.
- i. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** – None
- j. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

A motion was made by Hiltenbrand, seconded by Mannan, to approve the application for the Final Subdivision Plat for Highlands Phase 4 as submitted and to adopt the findings, conditions and conclusions contained in the staff report. Motion passed unanimously.

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

- a. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION** – None
- b. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS** – Went, Edginton, Hiltenbrand, Mannan, Nanson and Reddick-Yurka noted that they had no conflict of interest, bias, or ex parte contact, and had visited or been by the site. Bloom stated no conflict of interest, bias, or ex parte contact and had not visited the site.
- c. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS, OR EX PARTE CONTACT** – None
- d. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION** – The owner, Vito Cerelli, stated the application is for a hotel complex comprising of studio rooms, cabins, and small micro cabins. There is a combination of 1-bedroom studios at the north end of the site, a community gathering building in the middle, nine 1000 square foot cabins, and 6 small cabins all sharing one property and overall development. The design is integrated into the hillside, parking is woven between the site. The site plan explains that parking and access would come in from the north side at the intersection of Classic and Dorcas.

As a follow up to a previous meeting, the three items that were requested as continuation with no change to the design were (a) Traffic analysis study (b) Wetlands Delineation report – A third party consultant report on the site showed that the existing report stating no wetlands on the parcel is correct. (c) To show a more developed site plan that has cabins, roadways, and common areas. Cerelli stated he had attached a site plan that shows the common areas would be used for the property itself. At the base of the hill, there would be 5000 square feet of gathering space. In front of each cabin, there would be another 5000 square feet followed by 4000 square feet of outdoor gathering space. There were questions last time on providing outdoor amenities for the common area of the development itself. Those would be integrated into the landscape, city portion of the golf course, and existing trees.

- e. STAFF REPORT** - City Planning Consultant Walt Wendolowski presented the proposed planned unit development, the process, and the staff report, findings, and recommendations. He noted the additional information that had been submitted by the applicant and the related

comments by the City Engineer. He also noted that the number of units stated in the staff report was in error as 36 and should be 34. He continued that it appears the application meets the requirements, and that the applicant submitted the additional material needed. Wendolowski stated staff's recommendation that this application be approved subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

f. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS –

The Commissioners, staff, and the applicant discussed whether the Planning Commission will be able to review a final plat and additional details such as garbage area locations and ADA spaces as phases are developed. Concern was expressed about ingress and egress safety, if there would be adequate access for emergency vehicles and garbage haulers, and if there would be adequate parking for staff vehicles and deliveries. Concern was also expressed about the use of the common building and if additional parking spaces should be required to accommodate non-guests attending events at it. Additional concern was expressed that the proposed parking spaces may not be enough for the larger units.

Discussion followed of stormwater and wetlands concerns. Wendolowski explained related conditions in the staff report and stated that the applicant must provide the City with proof from the Oregon Department of State Lands that this report substantially conforms with state law and that there are no wetlands on the property before any construction can begin.

Concern was expressed about livability issues related to the proposed keyless entry system and lack of fulltime onsite management. Cerelli responded that he was open to having a unit for a staff member to be on the premises. Commissioners also expressed concern that what they approve be compatible with the neighbors and the integrity of Manzanita and stated that the Planning Commission carries the community's interest on the project as it is the forum for the public to voice their concerns to the applicant. The concerns expressed by the owner of the adjacent golf course in his letter were noted with the applicant stating he would try to mitigate as much as possible.

It was noted that at the top of page 2 of the staff report "2002" should read "2022", on page 2 in the second sentence under Item C the word "this" should only be written once, and in the application summary on page 2 A-1, it states 19 studio hotel rooms containing approximately 350 square feet each, yet sheet A-101 for The Manzanita Hotel shows 20 rooms between 200 and 220 square feet each. Cerelli clarified that it should read 19 rooms at 350 square feet each and explained that this was caused by an issue with the software he used for that sheet. Concerns related to density were also noted.

Wendolowski summarized the main issues expressed during this discussion as the use of the community building and parking, and the management of the property. He suggested that it may be appropriate to have the applicant return and address the concerns expressed and that the Planning Commission apply some onerous conditions. Concern about additional traffic on Dorcas Lane and Laneda Avenue was also expressed.

g. CORRESPONDENCE – Reddick-Yurka noted the related letters that were received for the record.

h. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING – Public comment was closed at the March 21, 2022, meeting.

i. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS –

After discussion by Commissioners related to the need for more detailed drawings, traffic, parking, livability, absence of onsite management, the size of the development, it's impact on the community, and the conflict with the comprehensive plan, it was determined that the Commission was not prepared to make a decision at this meeting.

j. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION -

After discussion, Cerelli asked for a list of what is still needed. Wendolowski explained. It was suggested that the applicant review Manzanita's Comprehensive Plan in order to address the concerns that have been expressed.

A motion was made by Hiltenbrand, seconded by Edginton, to continue this hearing until the June Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant time to process and comment on the concerns expressed at this meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. GENERAL UPDATES: Gebhart informed the Commissioners that they may have one additional item for the June meeting. It was noted that there would be a quorum for that meeting.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 21 and April 18, 2022

A motion was made by Went, seconded by Nanson, to approve the minutes of the March 21 and April 18, 2022, Planning Commission meetings as submitted. Motion passed unanimously.

IX. ADJOURNMENT:

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

Chair Reddick-Yurka adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 20TH
DAY OF JUNE 2022**

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

ATTEST:

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder