

**WALDPORT PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 26, 2018
MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

THE WALDPORT PLANNING COMMISSION WILL MEET ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2018 AT 2:00 P.M. IN THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING ROOM, 125 ALSEA HIGHWAY, TO TAKE UP THE FOLLOWING AGENDA:

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
2. MINUTES: (January 22, 2017)
3. CITIZEN COMMENTS AND CONCERNS
4. CORRESPONDENCE – None
5. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None
6. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:
 - A. Planning Report
 - B. Waldport Development Code Amendments
 - D. Other Issues*
7. COMMISSION COMMENTS AND CONCERNS
8. ADJOURNMENT

*Denotes no material in packet

The Council Chambers are accessible to all individuals. If you will need special accommodations to attend this meeting, please call City Hall at (541)264-7417 during normal business hours.

Notice given this 20th day of February 2018

City of Waldport

**WALDPORT PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 22, 2018
MEETING MINUTES**

1. ROLL CALL: Chair Woodruff called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Commissioners Kelleher, Phillips, Woodruff, Yorks and Barham answered the roll. Commissioner Stole was absent. A quorum was present.

2. MINUTES: The Commission considered the minutes from the December 4, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Barham clarified that the words "Kelsie Lane" should be followed by "to Forestry Lane" in the reference under Commission Comments and Concerns. He **moved** to approve the minutes as amended. Commissioner Phillips **seconded**, and the motion **carried** unanimously.

3. CITIZEN COMMENTS AND CONCERNS: None.

4. CORRESPONDENCE: None.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None.

6. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

A. Case File #2-CU-PC-16, Review Conditions of Approval: City Planner Lewis noted the Commission had originally approved the conditional use in October of 2016 with a set of conditions, including fence completion by June of 2017. Subsequently, the Planning Commission had extended the fence completion to October of 2017. The fence is still not completed. Mr. Lewis noted that most of the conditions of approval have been completed, with the exception of the fence. The posts are visible but many have not been permanently placed, though the west side and a portion of the north side have been constructed. He indicated that the applicant stated he had the materials, and was anticipating several loads of sand, but Mr. Lewis ascertained that the statement about the sand was not factual. Mr. Brandel had been cited into Municipal Court for noncompliance, and Judge McCrum decided to defer the issue to the Planning Commission, noting that the fines would be less significant than the impact of a revocation of the conditional use permit. Commissioner Kelleher asked about consequences if the fence is not completed, and Mr. Lewis responded that the woodcutting business would not be a permitted use and would have to be removed. If that was not done immediately, the City could reinstate the citation process and commensurate fines for noncompliance. Commissioner Woodruff noted that when the applicant had requested a three month extension, he had made the motion to grant four months instead, yet the work was still not completed.

Mr. Brandel addressed the Commission, explaining that he had obtained two bids for the necessary work to channel the standing water on the property, but neither one could do the work for at least a month. When they had attempted to install the posts on the east/northeast corner of the property, they had encountered a spring. The water, along with subsequent precipitation, has created a large pool. They have brought in 24 loads of gravel, but the fact that December and January of this year have been warmer than normal has had an impact on their income. In response to a query from Commissioner Phillips, Mr. Brandel stated that they had found the problem in August but were able to get the north side completed. The water is now running over the whole center of the property and they are having difficulty finding dry places for storing their wood. Commissioner Barham indicated that he had reservations about continuing the approval of the conditional use, as the applicant has known about the problem for five months. He wondered if this was the

best place for this operation. Mr. Brandel responded that they had difficulty finding an area where their operation would be allowed, and though the property owner won't assist with the water problem, the rental rate was more than reasonable. Commissioner Yorks noted that the ditch work may not fix the problem, Mr. Brandel responded the two contractors assured him it would. Financial problems had prevented them from completing the fence in October, but they now have all the materials. It's just a matter of taking care of the water. Commissioner Woodruff **moved** to extend the completion date for fifteen days. If the work is not completed, the conditional use permit will be revoked. Commissioner Barham **seconded**. Commissioner Yorks **moved** to amend the length of time to thirty days. The motion to amend died for lack of a second. The original motion then **carried**, with Commissioners Phillips, Woodruff, Yorks and Barham voting "Aye", Commissioner Kelleher voting "Nay". The completion deadline will be February 6th. Mr. Lewis clarified that this meant that if the fence is not completed, the conditional use permit is revoked, and all operations will cease at that time. The Commission agreed.

B. Planning Report: Mr. Lewis reviewed the activity report. Commissioner Woodruff noted that surface water appears to be a problem in the entire area by the golf course.

C. Development Code Amendments: Mr. Lewis reviewed his written memorandum and the process for making amendments to the development code. The Commission had a brief discussion about the staff-offered considerations for areas of the code that need review. Commissioner Barham asked about the code compliance complaint and enforcement process. Commissioner Woodruff noted that the Commission had previously asked that copies of the code enforcement report be included in the monthly packets. Following a brief discussion, the Commission requested that they be provided hard copies of the development code for their review.

D. Other Issues: None.

7. COMMISSION COMMENTS AND CONCERNS: Commissioner Phillips asked about Christmas decorations, wondering if there is anything the Commission can do to address this issue. Staff noted that historically this has been a Chamber activity, not something the City has been involved with, other than providing labor from Public Works for things like installing the tree decorations.

8. ADJOURNMENT: At 3:10 p.m., there being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Reda Q. Eckerman
City Recorder

APPROVED by the Planning Commission this ____ day of _____, 2018.

SIGNED by the Chair this ____ day of _____, 2018.

Ray Woodruff, Chair

City of Waldport
2018 LAND USE / BUILDING PERMIT ACTIVITY

Date	Application/ Activity	Applicant	Zoning	Tax Map/Lot Location	Description	Status
1/22/18	Building Permit	David Wood	R-1	13-12-25AA/1800 910 Tara Ln	Two new 2 nd level decks to single family dwelling	Pending revision of one deck to meet setback standard. Revised plan approved 1/26/18
1/26/18	Building Permit	Lincoln County School District	P-F	13-11-30/901 2750 Crestline Dr	Addition to accessory building	Approved 1/26/18
2/9/18	Property Line Adjustment	Paul & Shari Virtue	R-2	13-11-19CA/600 465 Pacific View Dr	Property line adjustment	Pending additional conversation with applicant

For the Period January 16, 2017 through February 19, 2017

February 16, 2018

To: Waldport Planning Commission

From: Larry Lewis, City Planner

Re: 2018 WALDPORT DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS

At the February 22, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, we can begin discussion on the list of code amendments. The initial step is gaining an understanding of each subject, identifying the issues if any, and determining if there is a need for a code amendment. At subsequent meetings we can draft updated code language.

INITIAL DRAFT LIST OF CODE AMENDMENTS

A. Multi-Family Housing Lot Sizes

Sections 16.12-16.24. The City has had at least two people say an impediment to multi-family development (work force and affordable housing) is the small lot size of multi-family zoned property. Is this a valid concern? If so, is there anything to change in the development code to address this?

B. Recreational Vehicle (RV) Occupancy

Sections 16.12-16.24. RVs are allowed to be parked and stored on lots however they are not allowed to be occupied. RV occupancy has become more prevalent over the past few years. Should there be consideration to allow RV occupancy under certain conditions?

C. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

ADUs, sometimes called “mother-in-law units”, are a way to increase smaller, more affordable housing. Should ADUs be allowed in certain zoning districts with standards?

D. Screen Outdoor Storage in D-D Zone

Section 16.30. Screening outdoor storage is required in the commercial zoned districts but not in the Downtown District.

E. Food Trucks/Mobile Vending Regulations

Do food trucks/mobile vending stands need regulatory standards?

F. Look at other C-1 Standards that should be in the Downtown District (D-D)

Section 16.30

G. Conex Containers – Restrict, Prohibit, At Least in the D-D Zone

Sections 16.12-16.32. Should conex or other types of containers be allowed to be placed on properties? If so, should some zoning districts, e.g. the Downtown District, prohibit containers. If allowed should there be any restrictions other than current setback restrictions?

H. Planned Industrial Zone (I-P)

Section 16.36. Review standards.

I. Planned Development – Overall Review and Update

Section 16.60. Overall look at the Planned Development ordinance, i.e. procedure, exceptions, explanations, etc.

J. Subdivision and PD Time Limits

Sections 16.60 and 16.100. The time limits of tentative subdivision and preliminary plan approvals for PDs do not match development market conditions.

K. Notification for Land Use Applications

Section 16.108. For planned development and subdivision applications, the City has received complaints that the notice of the Planning Commission public hearing is not distributed to as many property owners as it should be. State law requires notices be sent to property owners within 100' of the perimeter of the subdivision/PD property. The City sends notices within 250' of the subdivision/PD property.

L. Appeal Timing and Proceedings

Section 16.108. Review and update timing, proceedings, and requirements of the appeal process.