



CITY OF MANZANITA

Development Services

655 Manzanita Avenue – Manzanita Oregon 97130

P.O. Box 129, Manzanita, OR, 97130-0129

Phone: (503) 812-2514 | TTY Dial 711

devservices@ci.manzanita.or.us

BEFORE THE MANZANITA PLANNING COMMISSION ORDER OF DENIAL

PLANNING FILE: #26040

REQUEST: Variance to reduce required off-street parking spaces from four to two.

LOCATION: 519 Laneda Avenue, Manzanita.

APPLICANT: Steeplejack Burgers & Beers.

The above-named applicant applied to the City for a Variance approval to reduce required off-street parking spaces from four to two on property within the Commercial (C-1) zone. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the above request on August 10, 2026.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MANZANITA HEREBY ORDERS that the Variance request be DENIED and adopts the findings of fact and conditions of approval in Exhibit A attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein. The effective date of this ORDER is 20 days following the date specified below.

This ORDER may be appealed to the City Council by an affected party by filing an appeal with the City Manager within 20 days of the date specified below. A request for appeal, either as a de novo review or review on the record, must contain the items listed in City Ordinance 95-4, Section 10.160 and may only be filed concerning criteria that were addressed at the initial public hearing. The complete case is available for review at the office of Development Services, 655 Manzanita Avenue, Manzanita, Oregon.

Date: 08/13/26

City of Manzanita Planning Commission


Frank Squillo, Chair

I. BACKGROUND

- A. APPLICANT: Steeplejack Burgers & Beers.
- B. PROPERTY LOCATION: The property is located on the north side of Laneda Avenue, 120 feet east of its intersection with North 5th Street. The site address is 519 Laneda Avenue, and the County Assessor places the property within Township 3 North; Range 10 West; Section 29AC; Tax Lot 14900.
- C. PARCEL SIZE: The property contains approximately 5,400 square feet.
- D. EXISTING DEVELOPMENT: The subject property contains a restaurant, fronts a public street, and serviced by public facilities.
- E. ZONING: Commercial (C-1).
- F. ADJACENT ZONING AND LAND USE: Land to the west, east, and south is also located within the C-1 zone and contains a mix of commercial uses. Middle Housing 2 (MH-2) zoned property containing residences is located to the north.
- G. REQUEST: The applicant is requesting approval of a Variance to reduce required off-street parking spaces from four to two.
- H. DECISION CRITERIA: Review of this application shall be based on the following provisions in Ordinance 95-4: Section 3.040 (C-1 Zone); Section 4.090 (Off-Street Parking); and Article 8 (Variances).

II. APPLICATION SUMMARY

- A. The subject property contains an existing restaurant of approximately 1,600 square feet of floor area. Per Ordinance 95-4, Section 4.090.3.(m), a restaurant requires at least one off-street parking space per 400 square feet of area - in this case, the business requires four off-street spaces. Currently, the site contains four spaces: two in the rear yard served by an easement and two spaces fronting along Laneda Avenue.
- B. The applicant intends to make minor modifications to the building and grounds. Planned improvements call for the removal of the two parking spaces along Laneda Avenue. In turn, the applicant intends to place three benches and two barrels in the vacated spaces, thereby providing additional outdoor seating for the restaurant's customers. The proposed reduction in the amount of required parking requires approval of a variance before improvements can occur.
- C. A Variance is subject to provisions in Article 8 of Ordinance 95-4, with the Planning Commission authorized to review the application. For the record, this review addresses only the proposed variance to the parking requirement in the C-1 zone.

- D. An adjacent property owner responded to the application. They were not opposed to the reduction in parking and replacing the parking spaces with additional seating. However, they opposed placing any additional seating in the rear of the restaurant due to noise concerns. The City received no other comments.

III. CRITERIA AND FINDINGS - VARIANCE

- A. Article 8 contains the provisions to address variance applications. Section 8.010 notes the Planning Commission may authorize variances from the requirements of this Ordinance where it can be shown that owing to special and unusual circumstances related to a specific lot, strict application of the Ordinance would cause an undue or unnecessary hardship. No variance shall be granted to allow the use of property for a purpose not authorized within the zone in which the proposed use would be located.

FINDINGS: The proposal would modify a qualitative standard by decreasing the required number of parking spaces. Based on provisions in Ordinance 95-4, a variance is the only available option to permit the reduction.

- B. Section 8.020 establishes the specific review criteria. Each criterion, and associated findings, follows:

1. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of the property have no control.

FINDINGS: The applicant did not identify any exceptional or extraordinary circumstances to support the variance request. Maintaining parking spaces off Laneda is problematic as vehicles must go back out to enter the street. This maneuver can be hazardous to vehicles and pedestrians. The location of parallel parking spaces near the driveway entrance further reduces sight distance for a driver.

2. The variance is necessary for the preservation of a property right of applicant substantially the same as owners of other property in the same zone or vicinity possess.

FINDINGS: The issue is whether the variance is necessary for the preservation of the owner's property rights. The site contains an active restaurant that the owner sees fit to continue investing in and current parking meets Ordinance standards. Reducing the required parking has the net effect of providing an additional "right" to the property owner as the vacated parking spaces now become available to seat additional customers.

3. The variance would not be materially detrimental to the purposes of the Ordinance, the Comprehensive Plan, or to property in the same zone or vicinity in which the property is located, or otherwise conflict with the objectives of any City policy.

FINDINGS: Ordinance 95-4 requires businesses, under most circumstances, to provide off-street parking. This is necessary to reduce on-street parking demand. The only exception are commercial developments along Laneda Avenue that are located on property containing less than 5,000 square feet in area. This exception does not apply to the subject site. Therefore, a reduction in parking is contrary to the intent of the parking standards in Ordinance 95-4.

4. Variance request is the minimum variance which would alleviate the hardship.

FINDINGS: As noted in item "1.", the applicant did not identify a particular hardship associated with the property that requires a decrease in parking of both spaces.

- C. While there may be benefits to vehicle and traffic safety, there is no evidence that the reduction in required parking is the result of an extraordinary condition or circumstance that is beyond the control of the property owner. Further, denial of the variance does not eliminate the owner's right to continue operating the restaurant.

IV. DECISION

Based on the above, the Planning Commission finds the proposal does not comply with the applicable Variance criteria and therefore DENIES the request.