

City Planning

From: Constance Burton <bun.burton@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 11:03 AM
To: City Planning
Subject: Housing and Zoning changes

To the Planning Commissioner,

After assisting with gathering input from neighbors and friends regarding a vision for Manzanita for the next 20 years, I did not hear the desire for smaller lots, 3-story apartment buildings, or relaxation in parking regulations. Developers may want those things, but our neighbors do not. Also reflected in the comments of our community members was that everyone wants trees and green spaces maintained. Smaller setbacks means less vegetation.

When parking is not adequate, there is a visual impact, but there is also a social impact.. Neighbors are irritated by neighbors and/or visitors. The territorial instinct flares up, and it affects how folks feel about their personal space.

Please provide at least one off-the-street ON-SITE parking space per dwelling. Two spaces, as is the current rule, would be even better.

Thank you for serving our community.

Respectfully,
Connie Burton

Chris Bird

From: Toni Plato <toni.plato@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 3:38 PM
To: City Planning
Cc: Leila Aman; Andrew Plato
Subject: Housing Ordinance Concerns & Questions

To Members of the Planning Commission,

My husband and I have a home in Manzanita. I have been watching the meetings about the changes to the housing ordinances and have a few concerns and questions to consider before your June 2 meeting.

Concerns for Consideration:

1. The explanation of form and the changes to the envelope of the property is conceptually challenging to comprehend, but the diagrams used in the planning meeting discussions are essential to understanding the form-based approach. These are not included in the documents to review although they are part of the presentation in the videos.
2. The proposed square footage limitation for the first dwelling was increased to 3,000 square feet. This has not been updated in the draft materials for review. It still says 2,500 in the code amendment summary, and the only other place in the draft materials where it states the 3,000 sq ft cap is in a small footnote to the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum in attachment C.
3. This square footage cap includes garage space, which is not clearly stated in the draft materials and was not specified at the City Council 5/14 work session.

I include the first three points because the implications that these limitations would place on first dwellings may not be fully clear to those who have not watched the Planning Commission meetings or who are not familiar with how FAR works.

4. I would also like to address the proposal to set both a maximum FAR for a first dwelling on a property AND a maximum square footage. It seems that one or the other would suffice, and the FAR maximum seems fair as it is proportional to the lot size as opposed to a square footage limit set to all properties, no matter what shape or size. Limitations to both square footage and FAR seem overly constraining.
5. It was stated in one of the planning sessions that additional FAR and/or square footage would be granted to incentivize building additional dwellings. But it was not clearly stated how this would work.

Questions:

- Why not choose to limit the FAR (not the square footage), and incentivize additional dwellings by increasing FAR?
- How would the incentive to give-back square footage to a first dwelling with additional dwellings work?
- Are there square footage expectations / limitations for an additional dwelling?

- Where are these details included for review?

Thank you for taking my concerns and suggestions into consideration.

Kind regards,

Toni Plato

Chris Bird

From: Karen Reddick Yurka <msshoebox@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 6:07 PM
To: Constance Burton
Cc: City Planning
Subject: Re: Housing and Zoning changes

Hi Connie,

That is the correct address to send comments. The meeting tomorrow is a workshop, at which public testimony will not be taken. I'll make sure your comments are included in the open hearing on June 9.

Thank you for your interest in planning!
Karen

On May 31, 2025, at 6:50 AM, Constance Burton <bun.burton@gmail.com> wrote:

Good morning, Karen.

I sent this to Planning Commission on Wednesday but never got a response that it would be considered as testimony for the upcoming hearings. Can you verify that it will be ? I appreciate all you do for the community in your quiet, careful, considerate manner.

Respectfully,
Connie Burton

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

From: **Constance Burton** <bun.burton@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, May 28, 2025 at 11:03 AM
Subject: Housing and Zoning changes
To: <planning@ci.manzanita.or.us>

To the Planning Commissioner,

After assisting with gathering input from neighbors and friends regarding a vision for Manzanita for the next 20 years, I did not hear the desire for smaller lots, 3-story apartment buildings, or relaxation in parking regulations. Developers may want those things, but our neighbors do not. Also reflected in the comments of our community members was that everyone wants trees and green spaces maintained. Smaller setbacks means less vegetation.

When parking is not adequate, there is a visual impact, but there is also a social impact.. Neighbors are irritated by neighbors and/or visitors. The territorial instinct flares up, and it affects how folks feel about their personal space.

Please provide at least one off-the-street ON-SITE parking space per dwelling. Two spaces, as is the current rule, would be even better.

Thank you for serving our community.

Respectfully,
Connie Burton

Building

From: jlb-sam@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 2:10 PM
To: City Planning
Subject: 94-5 Zoning Ordinance and 95-5 - 09Jun2025
Attachments: Pine Ridge HOA storage area issues.pdf

Manzanita Planning Commission,

We are providing testimony for the Commission to consider as you update Manzanita City Ordinances 94-5 and 95-5. The materials we have reviewed demonstrate the City's thoughtful process to comply with State regulations and support a livable and inclusive community.

We are writing to ask that the proposed amendments clarify the zoning and land use requirements – specifically for visual screening, setbacks and height restrictions – for a pay-to-park long-term recreational vehicle storage area. We are long-time homeowners in the Pine Ridge HOA community; the neighborhood is in the Manzanita Urban Growth Boundary and is in the Residential Manufactured Dwelling (RMD) zone. The current pay-to-park long-term recreational vehicle storage area in this community dramatically changed its usage in 2021 and has no visual screening on the residential and street sides and we believe that visual screening is required.

Homeowners and lot owners in the neighborhood need City plans review approval for residences and structures to ensure compliance with setbacks and height restrictions. However, the current pay-to-park long-term recreational vehicle storage area has no height restrictions and no setbacks to the residence side or street side. We believe setbacks are required that there should be height restrictions.

As we understand it, property within the UGB should be compliant with Manzanita regulations because it is earmarked for annexation in the future. We are requesting clear regulations for where long-term recreational vehicle parking areas are allowed and for visual screening, setbacks and height restrictions for these areas.

We have attached a brief handout with photos to help illustrate the issues.

Thank you for your consideration,
Steve and Jane Minnick
10400 Pine Ridge Dr.

Building

From: Anupam Narayan <anarayan99@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 7, 2025 5:29 PM
To: City Planning
Subject: Questions on the proposed new zoning rules

Dear Commissioners:

I understand that you have all been studying this topic for almost a year. Thank you for your time and study. Reading zoning laws is almost as much fun as reading greek for the average person and unfortunately not organized or presented in an easy to understand way.

I hope you will bear with me as I ask my questions which are primarily focused on: how will this new zoning change the character of a small 600 full time resident community like Manzanita and how will it affect livability on my street.

Question1: Please share the key requirements of the new State law as compared to what we have today and then compared to what is being proposed. This needs to be in a simple table.

Question 2. If Manzanita is going beyond what the new State law requires, please explain the rationale.

Question 3. Is it true that a 5,000 sq ft lot can be partitioned into Four 1,250 sq ft lots and each of those lots can have a dwelling unit without any on site parking requirement? And that each dwelling unit could be a small mobile home?

Question 4. Can any lot in the city be subdivided into 1,250 sq ft lots? Or are small lots restricted to certain areas of the city?

Question 5: What are the requirements for areas like Neahkahnie, Nehalem, adjacent County areas or Cannon Beach?

Question 6: What alternatives to creating 1,250 sq ft lots for middle housing were discussed to provide middle housing in the Manzanita area? And will there be income qualification tests for purchase or rent of middle housing? Or caps on rent or sale price so that they truly make a difference?

Question 7: Did you do a survey on how much middle housing is needed and how much is already under development?

I am sure there are other questions that will arise. I do wish the information on the City's website actually provided clarity. Instead the focus seems to be the process.

And, once again thanks for all your work on this subject and, through a conversation, helping some of us better understand the rationale for these changes, what is next and its potential impact.

Best,

Anupam Narayan

Anupam Narayan
Manzanita and Portland, OR
New Delhi, India

+91 99 1063 2762 (India Mobile)

1-480-628-8377 (US Mobile)

anarayan99@gmail.com

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/anupamnarayan/>

Building

From: Jennifer Rammer <jenniferrammer@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 7, 2025 8:42 PM
To: City Planning
Subject: Lot size changes

Please don't approve lots smaller than 5000 SF. This will ruin the look of Manzanita and create more parking issues. It will also create over priced lots as a builder might be able to put more homes on the basic 5000 sf lot. Don't do it!

Thank you!

Jennifer Rammer
253-279-5403
Sent from my iPhone

Manzanita Planning Commission

June 9, 2025, Public Hearing testimony of Chip Greening, 585 Ridge Road, Manzanita

These observations and opinions are the views of a Manzanita resident, not those of a land use planning or middle housing expert.

Summary of testimony on middle housing amendments to the housing sections of the Zoning Ordinance

- Slow down the amendment process to ensure that the commission and the council fully understand the proposed zoning ordinance changes and have the confidence that the changes finally adopted are in the best interest of the city and its residents.
- Acknowledge that inclusion of middle housing in Manzanita is no guarantee that homeownership will become more affordable for buyers of modest means.
- Acknowledge that most of the burdensome regulations we are being asked to accept were never intended for small cities. They were developed for the urban conditions and land use challenges of large cities with populations over 25,000. No one would seriously contend that Beaverton, an urban environment with a population of 96,000, is remotely comparable to Manzanita (population 650). Nevertheless, we are told to abide by the same middle housing rules.
- Question whether the commission or council must accept all the recommendations of the city's consultant or whether the commission and council should exercise their own judgment to decide what middle housing regulations are best suited for Manzanita.
- Reconsider whether some current proposals (minimum lot size, floor area ratio formula, parking limitations, and form-based zoning) that are not required by state law or the middle housing model code are in the city's best interest. Reconsider whether to adopt those ideas or modify them to fit the Manzanita community.

The well-intentioned intent of SB 406

County leaders urged legislators to pass SB 406 because they thought the new law would ease the county's housing shortage. The result is a law that defines 15 Tillamook County communities (seven cities and eight unincorporated urbanized areas) as large "cities" for purposes of certain land use laws. By operation of this law, Manzanita is deemed to be a large city (over 25,000) subject to middle housing mandates for both middle and large cities. ORS 197A.015 and 197A.420.

That new status makes Manzanita subject to the middle housing laws and rules now under consideration. No one knows whether this approach will ease the county's housing shortage. Nor does anyone know whether the changes will make Manzanita housing "less unaffordable" as one commissioner has said. The risk is that a well-intentioned law will have unintentional and undesirable consequences.

Slow down the train

Manzanita will not have an approved set of "customized" middle housing rules by July 1, the unrealistic deadline set by SB 406. On that date, the state's [model code](#) for medium and large cities will govern new Manzanita building applications. The city manager has proposed a schedule for approval of the Manzanita ordinance changes but acknowledged at the June 4 council meeting that the process could be extended if the planning commission or council need more time to understand the proposed changes. Since the city will operate under the model code anyway for new building permits, there is no need to rush to a decision. The commission and council should take the time needed to understand these major changes and hear more from the community.

Ask DLCD to adapt the rules to small cities

It is not a given that Manzanita must comply with the entire model code for large cities. DLCD wrote those regulations years ago, never intending that the comprehensive and burdensome rules would apply to small coastal cities. The law (ORS Chapter 197A) only requires that 15 Tillamook County communities allow middle housing in all residential zones.

The commission and council should not accept the consultant's view that Manzanita must comply with the complex model code. We can accommodate middle housing in ways that work for Manzanita and ask DLCD staff to adjust the rules to recognize that small cities are fundamentally different than large ones. Small coastal towns like Manzanita have different needs and resources than large cities like Beaverton. Did the legislature really intend to subject Manzanita to the overreaching regulations applicable to large cities? Let's not just throw our hands up and cave in to the planning "experts" in Salem. If we don't ask, we won't know whether DLCD staff will adjust the requirements to fit our circumstances.

Some examples that the city has choices, not mandates, in the current housing ordinance proposal

Some parts of the proposed amendments are not, as represented, required by state law. Most of the detailed provisions in the consultant's proposal are lifted directly from the model code. There are only a few "customized" provisions that are Manzanita's choice to accept, modify, or reject.

Parking restrictions

The parking provisions in the proposal have shifted over the four commission meetings. In the March meeting, some commissioners expressed enthusiasm for limiting on-site parking in favor of more on-street parking. The latest proposal removes any required on-street parking, but it's not that simple. The model code has 62 references to parking restrictions that depend on the type of housing and size of the middle housing project.

Examples: A jurisdiction cannot require any off-street (on-site) parking for duplexes or accessory dwelling units (ADUs) (p. 3). The off-site parking rules for triplexes and quadplexes depend on the lot size and other factors (p. 11).

Before adopting any parking scheme, the planning commission and city council should inform themselves of the full scope of the model code's parking restrictions.

Minimum lot size

There is *no* state law or regulation that mandates a minimum lot size of 1,250 square feet or *any other lot size*. The model code anticipates that minimum lot sizes will vary from city to city. Several commissioners have expressed support for the proposed 1,250 square foot minimum, which is one possible choice, but the commission should not adopt 1,250 because they believe it is a state mandate. Manzanita can decide on its own minimum lot size

So how did the consultant conclude that Manzanita must adopt the 1,250 square foot lot size? She has never clearly explained her reasoning, but seems to have derived 1,250 from the model code's requirement that townhouses be permitted in every residential zone. But an earlier version of the proposal stated that "the minimum lot size for townhouses is 1,500 sf." (See image at right.)

Manzanita's current minimum lot size in residential zones is 5,000 SF for single family homes or duplexes, but no "less than 2,500 square feet per dwelling unit."

The consultant appears to have concluded from this admittedly confusing language that the city's minimum lot size is 2,500. Because the [model code](#) (Chapter 5(B)(2), p. 31.) requires that two townhouses be allowed any single family lot, Manzanita's new minimum lot size must half of 2,500 square feet. That conclusion is at odds

Commented [MM1]: Current minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet. Many current lots are smaller than the required minimum. Proposing to eliminate the required lot width and depth standards (40 feet and 90 feet /85 feet, respectively). Housing type-specific standards combined with FAR, setbacks, and parking requirements will have greater determinative effect on lot size. For example, to comply with state middle housing rules, the minimum lot size for townhouses is 1,500 sf, although townhouses can be built on smaller lots.

Commented [MM2]: No change from current standard.

Commented [MM3]: No change from current standard.

Commented [MM4]: No change from current standard.

Commented [MM5]: Proposing to use the current FAR limitation that applies to C-1 (.65:1)

Commented [MM6]: Current maximum height: 28.5 feet.

April 28 Draft Code Amendments, p. 261

with the comments on the April 28 proposal (above) that state, "The current minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet."

Why would the consultant look back to the city's old minimum lot size standard to reach her 1,250 square foot conclusion when the proposal intends to remove that old standard? (See excerpt below from May 30 proposal, p. 31.) The consultant has

~~(3) Standards. In an R-2 zone the following standards shall apply:~~

~~(a) The minimum lot size shall be 5,000 square feet for single family or duplexes, and shall not be less than 2,500 square feet per dwelling unit.~~

not explained this reasoning to the planning commission. Whatever the consultant's reasoning, there is no state mandate for a specific minimum lot size. The planning commission can simply pick a minimum lot size to recommend to the city council, which could be 1,250 square feet if commissioners understand they are making a *choice* they believe to be in the best interest of the city.

FAR and the square footage cap

Some citizens and policymakers have initially struggled to understand the concept of a floor area ratio formula, or FAR, but the idea is simple: limit the size of a house that can be built on a particular lot. (See sidebar.) This formula does not regulate the building's footprint on the lot, which will be governed by other factors such as setbacks. The FAR formula and the proposed 3,000 square foot cap on any residential building are just different ways of controlling the scale of residential buildings. The city's current zoning ordinance, section 1.030, defines FAR, and section 3.040(3)(j) sets a FAR value of .65:1 for the commercial zone.

The current ordinance does not set a FAR standard for residential zones, but the May 30 proposal (p. 136) adopts the commercial zone's value of .65:1 for all new residential zones. In answer to a planning commissioner's question in an earlier commission meeting, the consultant said that the FAR would include the garage, but the May 30 proposal does not clearly state whether a garage is included in the FAR formula.

What's the impact of the proposed FAR limit? Someone who wants to build a new home on any size Manzanita lot would not be granted a permit for a building with a FAR exceeding .65:1. Separately, the proposal would cap the

WHAT IS FAR?

Floor area ratio ([FAR](#)) is the ratio of a building's total floor area (including multiple levels) to the size of the piece of land upon which it is built. This value is not related to the building's footprint on the lot. A multi-story building's footprint on a lot is smaller than the total floor area.

The formula is $\text{FAR} = \text{gross floor area} / \text{area of the plot}$

Example: The FAR for a building with total square footage of 3,000 SF on a 5,000 SF lot is

$\text{FAR} = 3000 / 5000 (.6:1)$

total floor area of any residential building, including the garage, at 3,000 SF, an effective FAR of .6:1.

Examples: The proposal would require one off-street parking space for a single family residence but does not prohibit more off-street parking spaces. A 2,000 square foot house without a garage on a 5,000 SF lot would have an FAR of .4:1 (2000/5000). A 2,000 square foot house with an attached 400 square foot, two-car garage (including space for a furnace, water heater, and storage) would have an FAR of .48:1 (2400/5000). On a 1,250 square foot lot the .65:1 FAR would limit the size of any single family residence to 812.5 square feet (.65 x 1250). A 200 square foot, one-car garage, would limit interior living space to 612.5 square feet.

State regulations do not require a specific FAR or the 3,000 SF cap on residential buildings. The model middle housing code's FAR standards for triplexes and quadplexes, for example, have FAR limits (table below) that are substantially more generous than the Manzanita proposal. The FAR decision is another *choice* that the commission and the council should make that reflects our city's environment.

6. Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The maximum floor area ratio for all buildings onsite, cumulatively, is based on the minimum lot size for a detached single family dwelling in the same zone, as provided below:

Minimum Lot Size for Detached Single Family Dwellings	Maximum FAR
3,000 sf or less	1.4 to 1
More than 3,000 sf, up to and including 5,000 sf	1.1 to 1
More than 5,000 sf, up to and including 10,000 sf	0.7 to 1
More than 10,000 sf but less than 20,000 sf	0.6 to 1
20,000 sf or more	0.4 to 1

See p. 11, [Model Middle Housing Code for Middle and Large Cities](#)

Form-based zoning vs. use-based zoning

Form-based zoning is a method of regulating urban land development that focuses on the physical form and design of buildings rather than just their uses. This approach aims to create walkable, vibrant communities by ensuring that new developments are compatible with their surroundings and enhance public spaces. Some commissioners enthusiastically support this change in Manzanita's approach to zoning, but state law does not require a switch to form-based zoning. This change in zoning philosophy is another *choice* that the commission and the council should adopt only after deciding whether the change is in Manzanita's best interest.

6/8/25

Hello City Council

I have been a homeowner since 1997.

I love the small town vibe of our quaint little town of Manzanita.

We have the stores, restaurants, cute shops, coffee shops to host our visitors and serve our community.

Regarding this middle housing ordinance; I am not in approval of proceeding forward.

If its such a good strategic move that enhances and maintains the small town vibe of Manzanita, then why was it not implemented years ago? What's changed?

My understanding is Tillamook and Manzanita city managers lobbied this to be a mandated ordinance for Tillamook County. I question if this was self serving or if it was blessed by the Manzanita City Council who serve in the best interest of the residents of Manzanita? Do these individuals even live in our community?

Maybe you could clarify the background as to how we got here and who was pushing the plan?

I also question if its a well thought out plan; my understanding of 36 counties that are in this population bracket; only one county, Tillamook County, has asked to be included. Why are not the other counties jumping on board if its such a great plan?

Has Manzanita done an impact study?

What are the pro's and con's to the plan. What is the impact on our small town vibe? Can the city be more specific on why we are doing this?

I would like to cite, Mr. Chip Greening submission on this issue. He is very articulate about some very legitimate concerns.

Regards

John Turina

8855 Pelican Lane

Building

From: Toni Plato <toni.plato@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 8, 2025 9:16 PM
To: Leila Aman
Cc: City Planning; Andrew Plato
Subject: Re: Housing Ordinance Concerns & Questions

Hi Leila,

Thank you for your response to my email. I have one follow-up question.

You stated, *"The intent of limiting the first dwelling to 3,000 ft² is that it incentivizes two dwellings on a site. For example if someone wanted to build a 4,500 square foot home they would not be able to unless they provided another unit on site. This could be an ADU, or duplex."* Does this mean that if someone wanted to build (or increase) a first dwelling above 3,000 sq ft, it is possible if they also build a second dwelling and if it stays under the FAR limit? Or is the 4,500 sq ft home from your example inclusive of the second unit, meaning the first dwelling is still limited to 3,000 sq ft?

Thank you for your patience with this follow up question. My concerns are based on understanding the limitations that will be imposed on property owners in Manzanita.

Please consider including the diagrams used in the planning sessions to explain the form-based approach with a visual of the "jello molds" in the ordinance. I think that will make it easier for people to understand.

I plan to attend the hearing online on Monday. Thank you for sharing my concerns with the Planning Commission.

Kind regards,

Toni Plato

On Wed, Jun 4, 2025 at 4:00 PM Leila Aman <laman@ci.manzanita.or.us> wrote:

Hi Toni, Thanks for taking the time to review the amendments and send in your questions and for your patience with my reply. We have added your letter to the record for the hearing on June 9 and it will be shared with the Planning Commission in advance of that hearing. I have addressed your questions below in [blue](#). Definitely participate in the hearing on Monday if you can – while it is not an interactive Q&A session you can certainly raise any questions or concerns you may have in that venue – you may also, of course provide additional comment in writing. If we receive it by noon on June 9th the PC will receive it in advance of the hearing.

Best,

Leila



Leila Aman

City Manager

City of Manzanita

Phone: 503.812.2514

a: 167 S 5th Street | PO Box 129 | Manzanita, Oregon 97130

e: lanan@ci.manzanita.or.us | w: <https://ci.manzanita.or.us>

From: <toni.plato@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 3:38 PM

To: City Planning <planning@ci.manzanita.or.us>

Cc: Leila Aman <lanan@ci.manzanita.or.us>; Andrew Plato <andrew.plato@gmail.com>

Subject: Housing Ordinance Concerns & Questions

To Members of the Planning Commission,

My husband and I have a home in Manzanita. I have been watching the meetings about the changes to the housing ordinances and have a few concerns and questions to consider before your June 2 meeting.

Concerns for Consideration:

1. The explanation of form and the changes to the envelope of the property is conceptually challenging to comprehend, but the diagrams used in the planning meeting discussions are essential to understanding the form-based approach. These are not included in the documents to review although they are part of the presentation in the videos.

2. The proposed square footage limitation for the first dwelling was increased to 3,000 square feet. This has not been updated in the draft materials for review. It still says 2,500 in the code amendment summary, and the only other place in the draft materials where it states the 3,000 sq ft cap is in a small footnote to the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) maximum in attachment C.

3. This square footage cap includes garage space, which is not clearly stated in the draft materials and was not specified at the City Council 5/14 work session.

I include the first three points because the implications that these limitations would place on first dwellings may not be fully clear to those who have not watched the Planning Commission meetings or who are not familiar with how FAR works.

4. I would also like to address the proposal to set both a maximum FAR for a first dwelling on a property AND a maximum square footage. It seems that one or the other would suffice, and the FAR maximum seems fair as it is proportional to the lot size as opposed to a square footage limit set to all properties, no matter what shape or size. Limitations to both square footage and FAR seem overly constraining.

5. It was stated in one of the planning sessions that additional FAR and/or square footage would be granted to incentivize building additional dwellings. But it was not clearly stated how this would work.

Questions:

- Why not choose to limit the FAR (not the square footage), and incentivize additional dwellings by increasing FAR? FAR allows us to also regulate both the amount of site coverage and square footage at the same time. It also controls the building envelope.
- How would the incentive to give-back square footage to a first dwelling with additional dwellings work? The updated amendments now have the 3,000ft² included. The materials you were referring to was the working draft of the amendments. I am not sure I completely understand your question. The intent of limiting the first dwelling to 3,000 ft² is that it incentivizes two dwellings on a site. For example if someone wanted to build a 4,500 square foot home they would not be able to unless they provided another unit on site. This could be an ADU, or duplex.
- Are there square footage expectations / limitations for an additional dwelling? No, the square footage will be limited by way of the floor area ratio on the site.
- Where are these details included for review? The updated ordinance amendments are on the city's website and were updated after the planning commission work session on June 2. This is the adoption ready version that PC will be considering on Monday, June 9th at 4pm.

Thank you for taking my concerns and suggestions into consideration.

Kind regards,

Toni Plato

Building

From: jo@josdomain.com
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 8:23 AM
To: City Planning
Subject: housing ordinance question

I received answers to these questions last week, but know that other affected residents may like to hear the explanations as well.

1. Would you explain in more detail why and how the new City of Manzanita ordinances regarding middle housing and zoning will pertain to the UGBs (Urban Growth Boundaries)?
2. There are several Home Owner Associations in both Manzanita and its UGBs. They have covenants and restrictions that do not allow subdivision of lots, may prohibit multi-family homes, or prohibit homes under a certain square footage. Will these new regulations apply to these HOAs? All area HOAs?

June 9, 2025

Dear Planning Commissioners and City Council,

I'm concerned that decreasing lot size dramatically won't address the very real affordable housing shortage we face in Manzanita and the villages. I'm concerned that the consequences of these changes may exacerbate challenges we already face and haven't dealt with.

There are about 600 full time residents and around 1300 homes. Some of those homes stand empty all year. Is there a way to incentivize these homeowners to rent these houses as month to month as long-term rentals?

Will the dwellings built as a result of smaller lots simply be more second homes that stand empty most, if not all, the year? Or will these homes be bought as investment properties by people and used solely as short term rentals?

How will the number of new dwellings increase the number of vacation rentals? How do we make sure these dwellings are used as housing for people who live and work here?

By decreasing lot size to a minimum of about 1200 square feet how do we protect the trees and native plants? We already see a number of rental houses surrounded by gravel parking lots with little to no landscaping or trees. How do we incentivize homeowners and builders to not remove trees and native plants that are so vital to wildlife habitat and maintain the beauty of this place?

Where do we park all the cars if lots are too small to include parking?

When we did the Comp Plan exercise at the Pine Grove a couple of years back I remember the environment here as being important to so many people. How do we save what's left?

We need housing for people who live and work here. Working people deserve nice places to live. I agree that reducing lot size to allow the building of ADUs and duplexes and small homes for people who live here is a good idea but how do we deal with all the challenges?

There are consequences to this decision. I always think it's better to figure out what they are before taking action so rules can be set in place to protect what we have before we lose it.

Sincerely,
Kim Rosenberg

Building

From: Stephanie & Dietmar and Freddie <dstudioimages@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 9, 2025 10:53 AM
To: City Planning
Subject: Two Questions for 6/9 Public Hearing

Dear Planning Commission:

My first question is pertaining to "rear" setback requirements.

During the June 2nd Work Session it was briefly mentioned (about 33 minutes into the meeting) that the City would be keeping its current "rear" setback requirement of 10 feet.

Would the Planning Commission consider allowing exceptions (for example: a 5-foot rear setback) for those specific properties where existing structures would potentially limit the opportunity to build/add a middle housing unit/dwelling such as an ADU to a property with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet?

Offering an option permitting a property with an existing SFR the ability to add an ADU without having to modify the existing structure in order to meet the current rear setback requirement of 10 feet seems like it might be an important consideration.

My second question is a request for clarification. On Page 77 in regard to parking requirements, it references "NO space required for dwellings under 500 square feet or ADU's."

Does this mean literally under 500 sq. ft (499 sq. ft.)

OR

Does it mean 500 sq. ft. or less.

Please clarify.

Thank you,
Stephanie Simpson