

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

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER: Chair Karen Reddick-Yurka called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. ROLL: Members present were: Karen Reddick-Yurka, Phil Mannan, John Nanson, Steve Bloom, and Lee Hiltenbrand. Staff present: City Planning Consultant Walt Wendolowski, Building Official Scott Gebhart, and Permit Technician Chris Bird.

III. AUDIENCE: There was 1 person in the audience.

QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES: Chair Reddick-Yurka introduced the application being considered, described the public hearing process, and opened the hearing at 4:03 p.m.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R) – MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE, R-2 ; LOCATION: HIGHLANDS PHASE 5; APPLICANT: PINEGROVE PROPERTIES, INC. (JIM PENTZ AND RICK HINKES)

A. OBJECTION TO THE NOTICE SENT ANNOUNCING THE HEARING – None

B. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None

C. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Each of the Commissioners declared that they had visited the site or were familiar with it.

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

E. APPLICANTS' PRESENTATION – The applicants, presented some background information and the reasons for their application, and described their proposed projects.

F. STAFF REPORT –Planning Consultant Walt Wendolowski presented the staff report and described the application. He then presented staff's findings of facts, conclusions, recommended conditions of approval, and a recommendation to approve the application subject to inclusion of conditions noted in the staff report.

G. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – It was asked of the applicant what the status of the gutters and when completion might be done. The conversation then transitioned

to “Tract M” and the turnaround road. The applicant then explained that lots wouldn’t be sold until the plat was recorded.

H. TESTIMONY PRO- None

I. TESTIMONY CON - None

J. CORRESPONDENCE – None

K. REBUTTAL – The applicant stated that he wouldn’t mind foot traffic on the un-improved roads just not motor vehicle traffic.

L. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING – Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 4:22 p.m.

M. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS – None

N. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION -

A motion was made by Hiltenbrand, seconded by Bloom to approve the application adopting the findings and conditions contained in the staff report. Motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: LAND USE; ZONE: SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL /RECREATION (SR-R) – MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE, R-2; LOCATION: MANZANITA TRANSFER STATION; APPLICANT: TILLAMOOK COUNTY

A. OBJECTION TO THE NOTICE SENT ANNOUNCING THE HEARING – None

B. CHALLENGE TO PLANNING COMMISSION JURISDICTION – None

C. CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACTS INCLUDING SITE VISITS – Each of the Commissioners declared that they had visited the site or were familiar with it. Hiltenbrand stated he had a short conversation with the applicant about improvements. Reddick-Yurka stated she was a personal friend of the applicant and used to run the Transfer Station for the prior management.

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

E. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION – The applicant, presented some background information and the reasons for their application, and described their proposed project.

F. STAFF REPORT –Planning Consultant Walt Wendolowski presented the staff report and described the application. He then presented staff’s findings of facts, conclusions, recommended conditions of approval, and a recommendation to approve the application subject to inclusion of conditions noted in the staff report.

G. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – Comments started off with relief and happiness that the tree buffer on the south side of the property survived the heat wave of

several years ago. The applicant was then asked about where and how many parking spaces for staff parking. Questioning then turned to the outer ring road and what plans were meant for it. It was then asked what type of paving would be done on the Dump Road and the Outer Ring Road. There was uncertainty about Section 7 - C1 of the staff report regarding installing a backflow device after the water meter. The conversation then turned to what was causing run-off water on the site. Following up, it was asked of the applicant, after all improvements for run-off are finished, which parts of the property would be directed to a suitable point of discharge. A question about adding a septic system as a condition in the staff report was then asked. Discussion then turned to whether the site has been in continuous use since 1981 and if use was discontinued in 2019. It was asked if there should be a proper plot plan in the record to delineate any property setbacks. Staff was then asked about “sand revegetation” and what that might reference. Conversation then turned to adding as a condition for approval a site plan drawn to scale identifying the setbacks. The applicant was then asked if he had a timeline for when the project would be completed and if it were to be done in phases. A follow-up question was asked about the z-walls for waste and yard debris. The applicant was then asked to clarify where the Dump Road was in relation to the property and when it would be completed. It was then asked about the status of storm water and operator’s permits issued from DEQ. The applicant was asked about the construction and materials of the z-walls on site.

- H. TESTIMONY PRO** – A member of the audience asked if the transfer station would rent out storage areas for recycled items.
- I. TESTIMONY CON** - None
- J. CORRESPONDENCE** – None
- K. REBUTTAL** – None
- L. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 5:27 p.m.
- M. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** – It was asked if there was any objection to adding a line to item B conditions of approval, to include a site plan drawn to scale showing setback delineations would be part of the record. The conversation then turned on the “berm” in the southwest corner and the collection of run-off water and particulates. The commission then discussed the amended recommendations of approval and if they had any objections. No objections were noted by the commission.
- N. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION** -

A motion was made by Nanson, seconded by Bloom to approve the application adopting the findings and amended recommendations of conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 17, 2022

Related to.

A motion was made by Nanson seconded by Mannan, to approve the minutes of the October 17, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as stated. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. GENERAL UPDATES: Gebhart informed the Commissioners that there were no applications at the current time and there would be training in the coming months for new members of council and planning commission. It was also stated that there would be no December meeting. Thanks and gratitude were given to retiring members Went and Bloom for their service to the commission.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Reddick-Yurka to adjourn the meeting.

Chair Reddick-Yurka adjourned the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 21ST
DAY OF NOVEMBER 2022**

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

ATTEST:

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder