

**CITY OF MANZANITA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
June 9, 2025**

- I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Chair Reddick-Yurka called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.
- II. ROLL:** Planning Commission members present were: Karen Reddick-Yurka, Bert Gregory, John Collier, Thomas Christ, Brad Berman, Lee Hiltenbrand, and Frank Squillo. Staff present were: City Manager Leila Aman, Third Party Planner Scott Fregonese, Building Official Scott Gebhart, housing subject matter expert Marcy McInelly and permit tech Chris Bird.
- III. AUDIENCE:** There were 50 persons in the audience.
- IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** There were no public comments.
- V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 2, 2025 –**

A motion was made by Lee Hiltenbrand , seconded by Thomas Christ, to approve June 2, 2025 minutes as written. Motion passed unanimously.

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 4:05 p.m.

- VI. PUBLIC HEARING: ESTABLISH A 26-LOT SINGLE FAMILY SUBDIVISION WITHIN THE APPROVED HERON'S REST PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; ZONE: SPLIT ZONED MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R2 AND R3); LOCATION: LOCATED AT THE APPROXIMATE EAST END OF HALLIE LANE AND TO THE WEST OF SOUTH 3RD STREET; APPLICANT: NATE PALMER**
 - 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 no conflict of interest, no bias, or ex parte contact and that they visited the site or were familiar with it.
 - D. CHALLENGE TO ANY COMMISSIONER FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST, BIAS OR EX PARTE CONTACT – None**

- E. STAFF REPORT** – Third Party Planner Scott Fregonese presented the staff report and described the application. He then presented the staff’s findings of facts, conclusions, and recommended conditions of approval of the design review.
- F. GENERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** – It was asked about in the prior view of the PUD there were 15 diagonal parking spaces but now there are 13 diagonal spaces with two spaces in the uppermost northwest and southwest corner. Concern was shown for the availability of space for vehicular movement coming out of the garages adjacent to those two parking spaces. A follow-up question to staff focused on why there were ccrs and bylaws and if planning commission approval would mean an endorsement of those materials. Conversation turned to a prior condition of approval of the PUD for a pedestrian / bicycle easement on the private drive between 3rd and Hallie and how that easement didn’t show up on any of the plans. It was then commented about the plat that there might be some of the walkways and parking may encroach into the platted area of private homes. Staff was then asked about timelines for phasing for the project and when amenities would be added.
A question about the bond and what is covered was then asked of staff.
- G. APPLICANTS’ PRESENTATION** – The applicants presented some background information and the reasons for the Commission’s approval of their subdivision review.
- H. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS** – A comment was made that all prior projects that were approved have required utilities and improvements in place before any construction takes place. It was then asked about why the applicants wouldn’t do all civil engineering at one time and what would happen if construction were to have paused or stopped after phase 1. The applicant was then asked if the designed water lines would be turned over to the city of Manzanita and if the designed sewer lines would be turned over to Nehalem Bay Wastewater when completed. The topic again turned to parking and the two outlying parking spaces on the northwest and southwest corners and the ability of homeowners adjacent to maneuver their cars out of their garages. A follow up question was asked regarding the sidewalks on 3rd being in the public right of way. There were then concerns and questions about if only phase one gets completed and what would happen to the overall project and if there were any fallbacks if that were to happen. Staff was then asked if there needed to be right of use easements for the area of land between the property line and the curb of 6 houses and if the city needs to be indemnified since the driveways extend into the city right of way.
- I. TESTIMONY PRO** – A member of the audience had a question on how 26 homes with 37 parking spaces work and another member stated that the owners of the project would be a great asset to the community.
- J. TESTIMONY CON** - None
- K. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING** – Reddick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 5:18 p.m.
- L. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS** – It was asked of staff what the

conditions of approval were and what the commission would be approving. Conversation turned to what problems and risk might ensue if construction does not proceed beyond phase 1. Comments then centered on not having a clear and objective standard for denying based on what might happen in the future. It was then commented that the city will need to mitigate the risk of the private driveways being in public space. A question was asked about the ccrs and the limiting of short-term rentals as well as all of the houses in the project being built at the same time. It was then mentioned that HOA's cannot make rules that trump local/state/federal laws.

M. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION -

A motion was made by Bert Gregory seconded by John Collier to approve the application with two conditions:

- 1. The public access easement through the site for pedestrian and bicyclists be recorded and signage to the effect be installed and maintained by the applicant.**
- 2. There is a written agreement between the applicant and the city for the installation and maintenance of the improvements in the public right of way.**

The motion carried unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE ITEM

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES: Chair Reddick-Yurka introduced the application being considered, described the public hearing process, and opened the hearing at 5:38 p.m.

VII. PUBLIC HEARING: 95-4 ZONING ORDINANCE; THE CITY OF MANZANITA IS PROPOSING UPDATES TO THE MANZANITA CITY ZONING ORDINANCE 95-4 TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH OREGON LAW RELATED SPECIFICALLY TO MIDDLE HOUSING; LOCATION: CITYWIDE

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 no conflict of interest and no bias with respect to the proposed changes to 95-4.

D. STAFF REPORT – Housing subject matter expert Marcy McNelly presented code amendments and changes from the last work session in zoning ordinance 95-4.

E. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS – Staff was asked for clarity on how many homes could be put on a 5000 square foot lot. It was asked if an ADU could be placed on a two-townhouse lot as long as it meets the .65 floor area ratio. A follow-up question about floor area ratio was asked if a garage is included in the .65 formula. Concern was shown that adding garages to the floor area ratio would limit development capacity for the dwelling and that in prior discussions the garages would be left off the FAR. It was stated that in earlier conversation that garages would not count for the total square footage but be included in the floor area ratio formula. Conversation turned to the Heron's Rest application that was approved with smaller lot sizes than the minimum size the new zoning ordinance calls for. The idea of a .70 floor area ratio was broached if a lot would have two or three units to allow for a garage in that development. It was suggested that that the commission accept the proposal as staff have written it with a clear recommendation that the city council also look at garages, the 3000 square foot limit, and .65 floor area ratio.

F. TESTIMONY PRO - None

G. TESTIMONY CON - A member of the community spoke about how small affordable homes can help many people in larger cities and lower priced areas. Middle housing was not intended for smaller cities and if these issues are need to do. It was also said that state requirements do not apply to 35 of the 36 counties in Oregon, with 500 cities not bound by middle housing rules. Doubt was shown on who the new zoning ordinances would actually help. Another member stated that the new zoning ordinances were written for bigger cities like Beaverton and that the city of Manzanita should slow down on the zoning adoption. It was also stated that Oregon is considering a bill that would change the rules for small cities. Another community member agreed with the prior speakers and had issue with size limits of homes and using the floor area ratio. There was support shown for more varieties of housing in the city. The next community member questioned why the city was adopting a code stricter than the model code and if new development will be affordable and within reach of the people the code is trying to help. Another citizen asked how Pineridge and the urban growth boundary would be affected. A community member asked how these limitations would affect properties and homeowners and how new development would be affordable.

H. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING – Redick-Yurka closed the public testimony at 6:53pm.

I. DISCUSSION BY COMMISSION MEMBERS - Staff was asked how Manzanita ended up in the large city model and if House Bill 2138 would negate a lot of what the commission is working on. An earlier question, why are we doing this, was answered by the county being in dire need of more affordable housing and if cities aren't forced to adopt then affordable housing won't be built. It was stated there could be unintended consequences to adoption that housing won't be addressing the housing shortage and new development will attract part time residents. Conversation turned to the importance of someone being able to purchase a home in Manzanita and live there on a full-time basis that can afford it. It was stated that the rental market in Tillamook County is less than one percent vacant and one goal of the new law was more long-term rental opportunities in the city. A follow-up comment mentioned that it was time to do something even if the end results were not the desired outcome. Concern was shown that there is little understanding for everyone signing up for in regard to the new rules. It was countered that Manzanita is too expensive for not only the people who want to live in Manzanita but also work in Manzanita. A comment was made about what the new rules don't accomplish and the impact on the community in general. It was stated that the community was already suffering from unintended consequences from leaving the

housing code alone for 30 years and there needs to be an effort for more housing diversity and home equity for future generations. It was then asked amongst the commission members if they were ready to move forward. A couple of commission members stated they would like to continue discussions for clarity and not recommend it to city council at this time.

J. DECISION BY COMMISSION WITH MOTION –

A motion was made by Bert Gregory, seconded by Thomas Christ to approve and adopt as written the new zoning amendments and revisions to the Manzanita land use ordinance with a recommendation to approve from the city council and a review of the ordinance within 5 years to understand if additional modifications are needed. Five of the commissioners voted aye with commission members Hiltenbrand and Berman voting nay. Motion passed

The Planning Commission hereby adopts the proposed amendments as written, including the proposed new zone districts, and recommends that the city council hold a public hearing and conduct the first reading of the ordinance at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

VIII. GENERAL UPDATES: Planning commission chair Reddick – Yurka stated that the city council will hold a work session on this decision on June 11 and a hearing date will be set at that meeting or a subsequent meeting as determined by the city council. The public hearing on ordinance 95-5 land division is continued to a date of September 8, 2025 at 4pm.

IX. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Reddick-Yurka adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

**MINUTES APPROVED THIS 9TH
DAY OF JUNE 2025**

Karen Reddick-Yurka, Chair

ATTEST:

Leila Aman, City Manager/Recorder

Planning Commission
June 9, 2025

