

## Building

---

**From:** Sharon Parker <sharonparker1111@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 7, 2025 4:55 AM  
**To:** City Planning  
**Cc:** Sharon Parker; david parker  
**Subject:** Fwd: Proposed PUD-comments for criteria of ordinance 95-4 section 4.136 & SR/RZ zone standards in ordinance 95-4 section 3.030

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

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sharon Parker** <[sharonparker1111@gmail.com](mailto:sharonparker1111@gmail.com)>

Date: Fri, Feb 7, 2025 at 7:52 AM

Subject: Re: Proposed PUD-comments for criteria of ordinance 95-4 section 4.136 & SR/RZ zone standards in ordinance 95-4 section 3.030

To: Sharon Parker <[sharonparker1111@gmail.com](mailto:sharonparker1111@gmail.com)>

On Thu, Feb 6, 2025 at 10:28 PM Sharon Parker <[sharonparker1111@gmail.com](mailto:sharonparker1111@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello,

As property owners adjacent to the proposed development, here our concerns/questions. We are hoping the topics can be taken into consideration.

1. One of the goals is to protect the character and quality of existing residential areas and neighborhoods from incompatible development. We appreciate there is a shortage of housing for coastal residents, but the sheer size and design does not reflect the stated goal of coastal housing of this area. The monolithic design and sheer size of the 3 story buildings do not reflect the neighborhood and coastal character. The stated goal is safe, convenient, positive contribution to quality of life and harmonious with the coastal environment. The proposed extra 3 feet in height only adds to what appears to be an out of scale evaluation of the neighborhood character and coastal environment.

2. According to the plan provided, the loop road stops abruptly at the north end of the property, rather than connecting to any other roads. By connecting the loop road to the existing road of the new residential development to the west, some of the congestion at 101 could be minimized. As a low income housing development, where not every tenant or family has a vehicle, by connecting this loop, residents would be able to access services in downtown Manzanita without going out to 101. This would improve safety. This would also improve livability by providing transportation and connection options to all residents in the area.

3. Developer states this is a phased project without explanation of phases and timelines.

4. In order to get the density, the developer has proposed a 40% open space at the north end of the property and states this undisturbed area will buffer the existing neighbors from the new development. However, there are no existing neighbors on the north side, only the east side of the planned development. The proposal to put the 40% open space all at the north end to buffer residents does not accomplish the stated goal since there are no neighbors to the north. The proposed plan does not provide a buffer to the east of the project. An increased setback and/or consideration of adding a walking/biking path would improve the buffer on the east and ensure generations to come, a safe and fun access to downtown Manzanita. The added buffer on the east could come by considering reducing the property setback on the west. This would also build trust between the community, the city and the developers. Can the open space be shared amongst the project rather it being all at one end?

Also, by designing all the open space at the north end does not allow project construction to flow with the contours of the upsloping land at the north end. This gives the image of a flat building site with gridded roads, rather than a thoughtful design that includes the natural contours. This appears to be contradiction from the developer stating they want to utilize the contours but they are not actually utilizing the contours either in the overall character of the design or the gridded roads that will surround the project.

5. Will the new landscaping at the east side setback supplement the existing landscape or will the existing landscape be cleared out and re-landscaped with new plants.

6. The City of Manzanita website includes a NB TSP statement adopted in August 2023 that says their goal is to create a transportation system utilizing multimodal needs and create safer connections between the NB communities for people walking, biking, or using other non-auto modes and identity strategies to reduce crashes on 101. Also, to identify key non motorized accessibility between NB communities and prioritize pedestrian and bicycle facilities on these routes. Their map shows the area of the proposed project to include connecting Laneda avenue with the state park. The goals of the City are not met according to the proposed plan because accessibility issues are not addressed (including handicap access to pathways to facilities and services at the park and on Laneda).

Thank you,

Sharon and Dave Parker

