

Pacific City/Woods Citizen Advisory Committee (PC/W CAC) Land Use Planning (LUC)

**Minutes of the PC/W CAC LUC Meeting on Monday, September 14, 2015, at 5:30 pm
Kingfisher Room, 34950 Brooten Road
Pacific City, Oregon**

FINAL VERSION -- 10-17-15

The meeting was called to order at 5:42 pm by Ilean Rouse, Past-Chair.

1. Self-introductions – David Yamamoto – LUC Chair

Everyone at the meeting introduced themselves. There were 9 people present, including the following LUC members: David Yamamoto, Barb Taylor, Larry Rouse, Ilean Rouse, Ken McKenzie, Bud Miller, Mary Jones, and Gene Johnson.

2. Tillamook County Department of Community Development (DCD) VARIANCE, 815-15-000311-PLNG: Wriggle – David Yamamoto –

After reviewing the Variance Request package, the LUC members voiced their opinions and exchanged information about the specifics it contained. There was recognition that the existing dwelling was probably built before setbacks were in place, and that the existing “rope fence” was not on the west property line but well into the ROW. Some supported the request and others voiced their objections, citing the requirements in the REVIEW CRITERIA furnished by the DCD, especially Section 8.030: Review Criteria. Specifically on Subpart (1), the lot was purchased last in 2007 when current LUO requirements were in place; therefore, the request does not satisfy this requirement since the need for the Variance was “self-created.” Under Subpart (4) there was a lengthy discussion about “reasonable alternatives” available, including construction of the dwelling on the back (east side) of the lot, across the existing stream. It was also noted that the way the new house is presently sited, the reality is that there will be no parking area in front of it without vehicles using the ROW. Normal requirement is two spaces 8’ X 20’, and granting the Variance would result in two that are 7’ X 20’. But a porch and steps shown on the drawing of the structure would stick out at least six feet into the “parking area.” The impact of vehicles being parked in the ROW, as well as no access to the back (east side) of the lot were discussed as safety concerns. It was also stated that the lack of adequate space for parking is a common problem along Ferry Street. As for the request for a three foot setback to the south of a new structure, this will result in a problem when someone wants to build on the adjacent lot. However, it was mentioned that the lot is less than 50 feet wide (49.56’), so the LUO setback rules (SECTION 3.333) may not apply. After all this discussion, there was a general agreement that we did not have enough information to fully evaluate the Variance Request. Therefore, a motion was made and seconded as follows: “The Pacific City-Woods Citizen Advisory Committee Land Use Committee on the subject of VARIANCE, 651-15-000311-PLNG: Wriggle that, based on the information available, we do not support approval of this request because the requirements under LUO, Section 8.030: REVIEW CRITERIA, Subparts (1) and (4) are not met.”

There were a few more comments, and it was agreed to include the following in any letter sent to the DCD.

“Concerns that we think need to be addressed include the following items:

- a) More justification is needed for the reduction of the front lot setback from the required 20 feet to 7 feet for several reasons. For one, this places the new dwelling extremely close to the ROW and there is lots of traffic on Ferry Street. In addition, the reduced size of the parking to 7' X 20' is a safety issue, because as presented in the Request, the house will be within seven feet of the property line, so any vehicles parked in front of the structure will be in the ROW for Ferry Road. In addition, there are a porch and steps shown on the proposed plan, so nothing could be parked within at least six feet of the house. All this considered together, we suggest this is not an acceptable situation.
- b) A to-scale drawing of the lot including a clear location of the stream, road, structure, and parking is needed to clarify the amount of the property available for siting of the house.
- c) On the second page of the owners' request there are two reasons listed for not building on the back (east side) of the lot. The first is because of the 'substantial more cost' to locate utilities under the creek. An estimated cost of this work is needed to evaluate whether this makes building east of the stream an unreasonable alternative.
- d) An estimate of the square footage that is east and west of the stream (front and back of the lot) is also needed to help answer questions about alternatives for siting of the structure. This would address the second reason listed on the second page of the owners' request for not building on the back (east side) of the lot.”

A vote by a show of hands was taken with the following results. 6 YES votes, 2 NO votes (1 by proxy of a committee member who had to leave earlier in the meeting), and 0 ABSTENTIONS. Given the divided outcome, a Minority Opinion may be prepared and submitted to the DCD along with the results of this vote.

The Meeting was adjourned at 6:49 pm.

Please see our website at www.pacificcitywoodscpac.org for additional information.

The PC/W CAC meetings provide citizens an opportunity to interact with all community members on issues important to our area. These are public meetings and everyone attending is encouraged to participate.

*For further information contact Anne Price – CAC Chair
Phone (503) 965-5108. E-Mail address neighboranne@icloud.com.*