

**LINCOLN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
February 18, 2020**

**1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, & ROLL CALL**

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Marci Baker	Commissioner	Present	
Kim Blackerby	Commissioner	Present	
Joshua Brainerd	Commissioner	Present	
Patti Kroen	Chair	Present	
Lenny Nelson	Commissioner	Excused	
Miles Schlesinger	Commissioner	Present	
MacNeale Smith	Commissioner	Present	

**2. AGENDA CHANGES OR REVISIONS**

Chair Kroen welcomed Commissioner Mac Smith and asked him to introduce himself. Commissioner Smith is invested in the long-term growth of Lincoln City. He is a homeowner and business owner.

There are no agenda changes.

**3. MINUTES**

**3.1. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Feb 4, 2020 6:00 PM**

<b>MOTION:</b>	Commissioner Marci Baker pointed out that the minutes indicated incorrectly that she voted on a motion on the Final Order for Devils Lake RV Park that she was not present for. The motion and vote to approve the February 4, 2020 minutes included that correction.
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>Miles Schlesinger, Commissioner</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Kim Blackerby, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Brainerd, Kroen, Schlesinger, Smith
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

**4. FINAL ORDERS, RESOLUTION, & WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

**4.1. Final Order (FO 2020-03) for CUP 2020-01 and SPR 2020-01 Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Design Review for Northwest Natural resource center at 2815 NE 36th Drive**

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Final Order (FO 2020-03) for CUP 2020-01 and SPR 2020-01 Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Design Review for Northwest Natural resource center at 2815 NE 36th Drive</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>Kim Blackerby, Commissioner</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Marci Baker, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Brainerd, Kroen, Schlesinger
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	MacNeale Smith
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

**4.2. Final Order (FO 2020-02) for APP 2020-01 Lawson, et al Appeal of Eclevia dwelling as an unlimited use vacation rental dwelling**

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Final Order (FO 2020-02) for APP 2020-01 Lawson, et al Appeal of Eclevia dwelling as an unlimited use vacation rental dwelling</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>Marci Baker, Commissioner</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Miles Schlesinger, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Brainerd, Kroen, Schlesinger
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	MacNeale Smith
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/DELIBERATIONS**

**1. CPA & ZC 2020-01 Scrutton et al**

Chair Patti Kroen introduced the public hearing and read the required script. She asked the commissioners whether they had any ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest or bias to report. Commissioner Baker said that she worked for the Scruttons 5 or 6 years ago but declared that it does not affect her ability to make decisions based on the criteria. There were no other declarations of ex parte contacts, conflicts of interest, or bias.

No challenges from the audience to any of the commissioners participating.

Chair Kroen read the required statements. She asked Ms Skinner to read the substantive criteria.

Chair Kroen summarized the public hearing procedures.

**5.1.1. CPA ZC 2020-01 Scrutton et al Zone Change: Request to rezone approximately 2.06 acres from Multiple-Family Residential (RM) to Recreation-Commercial (RC) zone**

**2. Staff Report**

Planning and Community Development Director, Anne Marie Skinner presented the staff report.

The property consists of 8 tax lots with 2.06 acres currently in the Residential Multifamily (RM) zone. The request is to change the comprehensive plan designation to commercial

recreation district with zone of Recreation Commercial. Ms Skinner summarized the location and the surrounding uses, and described the history of the application and public notices that were sent related to it. Portions of the site are in the local and distant tsunami evacuation zones. Portions of the site are located in the VE flood hazard area. The site contains no delineated wetlands and no significant riparian areas. The portion of SW 3rd street immediately abutting the site represents an aesthetic resource (as indicated on the City maps). But the site itself does not contain any. The subject property is in the bluff erosion zones.

Staff considers this to be a major revision because the requested change from residential to commercial represents a qualitative change as well as a spatial change (8 tax lots). The request must conform to the statewide planning goals and be consistent with un-amended portions of the comprehensive plan. If the zone change is approved, the site may be used for any of the uses allowed in the RC zone. Ms Skinner read the list of such permitted uses.

The comprehensive plan has a number of goals that need to be satisfied as well as statewide planning goals. Ms Skinner described how the proposed zone change satisfied or did not satisfy each of the comprehensive plan goals. Goal 1, *Land Use Planning Goal*, is not satisfied. Goal 2, *Citizen Involvement Goal*, is satisfied. Goal 3, *Public Services and Utilities Goal*, is generally satisfied. Goal 4, *Urbanization Goal*, is satisfied. Goal 5, *Natural Hazard Goal*, is not satisfied. Goal 6, *Housing Goal*, is not satisfied. Goal 7, *Economy Goal*, is not satisfied. Goal 8, *Aesthetic Goal*, is not applicable. Goal 9, *Transportation Goal*, is satisfied for vehicular traffic. Goal 10, *Energy Goal*, is partially satisfied. Goal 11, *Overall Environmental Goal*, is satisfied. Goal 12, *Shoreland, Beaches, Dunes, Estuary, and Ocean Resources Goal*, is satisfied. Ms Skinner did not elaborate on the compliance of the proposed zone change with the Statewide Planning Goals, but she did note that such is discussed in the written staff report.

Commissioner Blackerby asked about language in the staff report referring to 8 tax lots and five different ownerships. That was a typo and should refer to six ownerships. Chair Kroen asked if any of the properties are currently licensed as vacation rental dwellings. Ms Skinner replied that she will have to check. Commissioner Baker asked about staff's logic in determining that the proposed change is not consistent with the land use planning goal because there is no RC zone RC from SW 3rd to SW 36th street, while everything to the east is commercial. Ms Skinner replied that staff was looking at the border. That in the entire area north to south, east to west, there was no RC.

### **3. Applicant Testimony**

Richard Townsend, Townsend Planning and Design and applicants' representative, and Karen Scrutten, one of the applicants, addressed the Planning Commission.

Mr Townsend spoke directly to the contents of the staff report, saying that the report raises a lot of points and that he was not sure that he could address all of them in 15 minutes. To the north of the property is the RC zone. Currently the lot line abutting with the RC zone is 450 ft long. If the zoning change is approved, there will be 150 feet abutting between the RC and RM zones - a reduction of the abutment between the zones by 70%.

There is a difference between the application and the staff report in the measurement of the lot sizes, which is the difference between including just the developable land above the bluff (application) vs the entire lot sizes (staff report). The site has had RM zoning for many years

and nobody has tried to develop multi family there. It is assessed at \$2.8M for the 8 lots, which is expensive for multi-family development. The possibility of the site being developed as RM is very small. With the addition of front yard and bluff setbacks required in RM, what is left of the site for development is little more than half an acre. A multi-family development at the site would only produce a small number of dwelling units that would command a very high price. Apartments ARE allowed under the RC zone. In the purposes of the RC zone, the code says that residential and multi-family housing is permitted.

Goal 1 of the Comprehensive Plan is about process and policy. It sets up a process for how changes are supposed to be processed. What makes the proposal a major change is the change from residential to commercial. Goal one sets out a process for such changes and contemplates that such changes are going to occur. The staff report states that the zone change would introduce a new zone in the area but says that because of that is not consistent. Going through the process is what is consistent with the goal. The comprehensive plan contemplates that this type of change. It is designed to reflect the changing circumstances in community desires and standards.

Mr Townsend indicated that the applicants have no argument with the staff report analysis for Goals 2-4. Related to Goal 5, he argued that the staff report does not say why being in the erosion zone and the tsunami zone means that is not consistent with Goal 5. There is nothing in the code that says if a property is in the erosion zone you can't build on it. As long as you jump through the hoop of getting a geotechnical report and the report says that structures can be built, they can be built. There is nothing in the code that talks about the tsunami evacuation zone. The Beat the Wave analysis says that after the shaking stops you can get out of the tsunami zone at a slow walk. The fact that the property is in the tsunami evacuation zone means there may have to be controls but that is not prohibitive.

Related to Goal 6, granting the zone change will have little to no effect on the availability of housing. The staff report says will the zone change will take 2+ acres out of the housing supply. The housing needs analysis looked at the amount of land needed and the supply we have. There is more RM land in supply than is identified as needed. Also the site is not 2 buildable acres, and only two of the lots are not built. So in total there is 1/4 acre of buildable land coming out of what is already a 50 acre surplus. The only difference is that multi-family would be a conditional use in the RC, which is a good thing because it gives the city more control and would be subject to the city's commercial design standards.

Mr Townsend expressed agreement with the staff report analysis for Goal 7 and acknowledged the requirement in Goal 8 for a report that needs to be done for development within 100 feet of an aesthetic resource.

Related to Goal 9, Mr Townsend said that any new development will have to put in sidewalks, and the City's Transportation System Plan has provisions for sidewalks from Hwy 101 to 9th as well as shared roadway markings for bicycles. Related to Goal 10, any new construction will have to comply with building code standards.

There are six houses on the site now. Three of them are vacation rental dwellings (VRDs). There could be as many as 8 VRDs there, which isn't bad. You would be hard pressed to find a place less impacted by VRDs because all of the surrounded use is commercial. In the area are dumpsters and abandoned buildings. Transient visitors will be focusing on the ocean. It is a great place for VRDs. There is a topographic change that isolates this area.

Commissioner Baker asked about the estimated traffic increase of 91 trips per day, which was done in comparison to Hwy 101, and whether the analysis looked at traffic on Ebb. People will be making a left turn there with no light, presenting the potential for traffic to get backed up. Mr Townsend responded that it isn't a problem because the increase in traffic is so minor. ODOT has not commented that there needs to be changes to the facilities.

Commissioner Blackerby asked why the applicants want the zone change. Karen Sutton, one of the applicants, replied that she has 10 grand children and that they want to be able to pass the property on to them. Mr Townsend elaborated that when the City made changes to the VRD rules, VRDs were disallowed in the RM zone. Nonconforming VRDs cannot be transeferred as VRDs. If the Suttons want to hand the property down to their grandkids, they can transfer the house, but the use cannot be transferred. They want to maintain the value of the house as a VRD. Commissioner Blackerby asked about the motivation for the applicants who do not currently have VRDs. Is the motive to create a whole block of VRDs? Mr Townsend responded that the purpose is not to create a block of VRDs.

Commissioner Blackerby asked whether, by making the site commercial, down the road someone could take half of the site and propose a restaurant. Any of the uses allowed in the RC zone would be permitted.

Chair Kroen asked about references to "annexation" in the application. Those were typos. Chair Kroen pointed out that the land use goal is not just process. It is also a framework for the comprehensive plan.

#### **4. Public Testimony**

##### **A. Testimony in Favor**

None

##### **B. Neutral Testimony**

None

##### **C. Testimony in Opposition**

None

#### **5. Rebuttal**

My Townsend requested that the record be left open. The record will remain open until February 25th at 5 pm. The applicant waives the right to submit final written argument.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Leave the record open until February 25 at 5 pm</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>MacNeale Smith, Commissioner</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Miles Schlesinger, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Brainerd, Kroen, Schlesinger, Smith
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

2. ANNEX 2020-01 and CPA/ZC 2020-02

Chair Patti Kroen introduced the public hearing and read the required script. She asked for declarations of ex parte contact, conflict of interest or bias. Chair Kroen declared that the topic of the proposed annexation was brought up at a meeting of the Roads End Improvement Association. Mr Townsend gave an overview to that group and mentioned that rezoning could mean as many as 80 new lots. That group was told about this public hearing. Chair Kroen indicated that participating in the Roads End meeting did not cause her to pre-judge the application and that she is not prejudiced by contact. Commissioner Blackerby indicated that he was also at the Roads End meeting and that he was also not prejudiced by the contact.

There were no challenges from the audience.

Chair Kroen asked Ms Skinner to read the applicable substantive criteria. She then read the rules and summarized the procedures for the hearing.

**5.2.1. Annex 2020-01 CPA ZC 2020-02 Woods One: Annexation of approximately 11.15 acres, comprehensive plan map amendment and zone change from Lincoln County's Residential (R-1-A) to Lincoln City's Single-Family Residential District (R-5) and R-1-5 Zone**

**2. Staff Report**

Ms Skinner presented the staff report, summarizing the applicant, the site, the proposed annexation and zone change, and the surrounding zoning and uses. The site is surrounded by city limits, and is in the Urban Growth Boundary, which is the area designated for future city growth.

There were two previous efforts to annex the site. In 2005 Kirk Wardius asked that the site be annexed and retain the county single-family 6000 sf lot size. That effort did not include a development plan. Council denied the request with a number of reasons including inability to assess the impacts of development without a development plan. There were also concerns about impacts to traffic and about the ability to supply water and other services. A 2014 attempt to annex the site included a comprehensive plan amendment/zone change and a preliminary development plan. The applicants proposed 71 dwelling units. The effort also included a development agreement. The City Council denied that attempt as well. In the final order, the City Council found that there was not a demonstrated need for residential lands, and that the level of commitment toward workforce housing was inadequate. The current

request includes the annexation and zone change request but does not include a development agreement and does not include a development plan.

Ms Skinner described the public noticing effort. She referred to the analysis in the staff report looking at the comprehensive plan and Statewide Planning Goals and asked the commissioners whether there were any questions about the analysis. Chair Kroen asked about language under Goal 6, Housing. Ms Skinner indicated that language saying the application is inconsistent with Goal 6 is an error and that the proposal is consistent with Goal 6.

### **3. Applicant Testimony**

Richard Townsend, the consultant on behalf of Woods One LLC, and Karen and Steven Woods, the owners of Woods One LLC, addressed the Planning Commission.

Mr Townsend expressed agreement with staff that the application is consistent with the goals in the comprehensive plan and with the Statewide Planning Goals. He said that he would like to address the things that have changed since the 2005 and 2014 annexation attempts when the two different prior owners were denied annexation. In the 2005 annexation there were 3 issues that Council raised, stating an inability to assess the impacts. The rules have changed - because of the size of the property there will have to be a Planned Unit Development (PUD) where before there would have only been a subdivision. The 2014 annexation did include a development plan and the Planning Commission did recommend approval.

Proposing the annexation and zone change without a proposal or plan for the PUD was what the former planning director and City Manager recommended doing. One of the reasons for this approach is that a PUD is very expensive to prepare with a lot of engineering and design work. The applicants did not want to go through the hoops and spend the money required if the site was not going to be annexed.

Chair Kroen asked about the plan created for the 2014 annexation attempt and there was some conversation about whether the previous plan could be reused. The applicants answered that they do not own the plan that was prepared previously but that they are planning on doing something similar.

At the time of the second annexation attempt there was a glut of housing. A lot has changed since then. Lot values are up. Bayview is thriving. Another thing that they were concerned about in 2014 was workforce housing. The problem is that the City Council never said how much workforce housing is enough. That is something that can be worked out in the development agreement. The Woods are willing to negotiate a development agreement. The amount of workforce housing is subject to negotiation and needs to be worked out.

The conditions that led to previous denials are very different now. We agree with staff that everything that needs to be consistent is consistent.

Chair Kroen said that the 2017 housing needs assessment determined that there was a substantial surplus of residentially zoned land - enough through 2036 - and that she doesn't believe that the assessment included the City's Villages property. Mr Townsend replied that the assessment included all of the lands within the UGB. However, those other developable lands will cost a fortune to bring services to. What you want to do is develop those lands first that are most easily served, and the subject property is that - it is an ideal spot for

development. Because of topography, a substantial portion of the site will be left undeveloped.

Chair Kroen asked how the east side of the development will be accessed. Mr Townsend answered that the east side will be accessed by going around the drainage area - that he does not think that a bridge is necessary and was not identified in the development plan from 2014. The applicants displayed a map from the 2014 development plan. The map was not entered into the record.

Commissioner Baker said that it is interesting that the applicants are requesting the zoning be changed to R-1-5, which is a new zone to the area, and asked why they didn't chose one of the existing adjacent zones. Mr Townsend answered that because the site is in such a good location, it is a good idea to maximize the number of units on the land. There is conversation about building a significant number of affordable housing units - which makes it hard to make any money on the development. The more units you can have that are market-rate units, they end up subsidizing the affordable units. Commissioner Baker asked whether the request for R-1-5 is because of lot size. Mr Townsend answered that it is not just because of lots size. Commissioner Baker expressed concern that the request for R-1-5 zoning is because it is the one that allows unlimited VRD uses if a space comes available. In the R-1-7.5 and Roads End zones that wouldn' be possible. Mr Townsend answered that the request for R-1-5 is not about VRDs at all and said that he does not expect to see VRDs at all or at least not for a long time.

Commissioner Smith asked about the impacts of development at the site. Mr Townsend replied that there was a traffic study done previously, that public works has said that there is capacity for water and sewer, and that police impacts will be marginal. There will be substantial space left undeveloped, so there will be opportunities on site for recreation. Mr Townsend said that the vast majority of extra traffic will be on Logan Road with some on Port. Logan Road is congested down by Safeway and down by the traffic light, but is a lightly traveled road up by the subject site. Chair Kroen pointed out that everyone who lives in Roads End has to travel down that road and that it is dangerous. Mr Townsend answered that improving that portion of road is identified in the transportation system plan as something that needs to be done.

Commissioner Smith asked what is preventing the applicants from pursuing additional development through the county. Mr Townsend answered that the number one obstacle is water and guaranteed access to water.

Commissioner Blackerby pointed out that the proposed annexation and zoning are the subject of the hearing, and that the Planning Commission will look at any development in the future, if there is any. He asked about the several times that the staff report refers to promises not being binding without a development agreement. Mr Townsend answered that it is true and that the Woods are willing to grant an easement (for the drainage way for the City's water tower), which would come in the negotiation of a development agreement, which has to be approved by the City Council. There will have to be a hearing for the master plan. And another hearing for the final master plan. And if development is phased, which it probably will be, each phase will also be subject to hearing by the planning commission.

Ms Skinner pointed out that there is an application form for a development agreement, which the applicants have not submitted. Chair Kroen asked what happens if the applicants do not submit a development agreement. Ms Skinner replied that they would have to develop as per

the current code. The development agreement provides flexibility in how the applicants move forward and flexibility for the city. It is a negotiation.

Chair Kroen said that it is confusing that the first annexation attempt was unsuccessful because there was no development plan, and the second attempt was unsuccessful in spite of having a development plan. And now the current applicants have chosen to submit without a development plan. Mr Townsend responded that what the Planning Commission has to consider is the application in front of them. The laws have changed. The facts of the community have changed. The Woods are more than willing to negotiate a development agreement. Assuming that the annexation and zone change are approved, there will be an effort to do that.

#### **4. Public Testimony**

##### **A. Testimony in Favor**

None

##### **B. Neutral Testimony**

None

##### **C. Testimony in Opposition**

Patrick Dunn, a neighbor, addressed the Planning Commission. He began by explaining that during the 2015 denial of the proposed annexation, the City Council had difficulty forming a quorum and had to vote with a smaller group than normal after three Council members had to recuse themselves.

Mr Dunn explained that his objective is to ensure that the proposed annexation does not cancel the reforestation requirement of the 1971 Forest Practices Act resulting in a further period of blighted property. The property was clear cut in 2012. Reforestation is required and overdue. He expressed concern that the proposed annexation will not remedy the Forest Practice Act requirements, leaving the property blighted.

Chair Kroen asked whether the timber from the site was sold when the trees were removed. Mr Dunn said that it was, as far as he knows. He has pictures of the commercial logging trucks Chair Kroen asked whether the trees have to be grown for harvest in order for the cutting to be considered a commercial forest activity. Mr Dunn said that the law is unclear. Chair Kroen pointed out that people who buy a piece of property and decide to clear a portion of that property are not required to reforest that property. Mr Dunn agreed. He said that the forestry service is busy with commercial logging - that's where the violations are - and they don't have a lot of time. The replanting of the subject site is small potatoes and would amount to the equivalent to a traffic ticket. He argued that it does not, however, negate the letter of the law and the forest practices act. Chair Kroen said that she is going to make the assumption that Mr Dunn's concern with the removal of the trees has to do with degradation of habitat. Mr Dunn answered that he is, and that his backyard looks at that property. He lost several of his trees to sunburn when the trees were cut. The property has sat there for over five years. It has invasive species and nothing has been done. Mr Dunn said that he came to ask what is to prevent the property from sitting there for another five years or indefinitely if the annexation is approved.

Chair Kroen addressed Mr Dunn, saying that she hears his concern and understands it. She said that if the annexation goes through and the zoning goes through, that there will be other hearings with the Planning Commission, and she expects to see him there with his input on the planning of the trees and the vegetation.

Steve Woods, one of the applicants, addressed the Planning Commission. He said that 240 seedlings per acre is a standard required amount of planting. He said that he has had to replant a logged-off property before. If the subject property is rezoned, it is not practical to do the replanting because are planning on developing the site. Chair Kroen said that she hopes that, if the annexation and zone change are approved, he takes the concerns and the impact that the logging activity had on the neighbors and consider some kind of planting screen that would assist them in getting some of that back.

There was no additional public comment.

**5. Rebuttal**

There was no request to leave the record open or continue the hearing.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Close the Hearing and the Record</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>Marci Baker, Commissioner</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Joshua Brainerd, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Brainerd, Kroen, Schlesinger, Smith
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

**7. Deliberation**

Applicant waives the right to provide written final argument.

Chair Kroen said that when she considers these types of things - annexing additional land into the city - she has to look at how much land is already here and the impact that the addition could have. You have to look at what wins and what loses. The City has a surplus of land right now and is doing everything that it can think of to encourage development in certain parts of the city. This is particularly true of the Villages, which has potentially thousands of lots. They are even working on an urban renewal district that will fund development in the Villages, identifying the undeveloped land as blighted. Also, many of the projects that are being funded through the public urban renewal process are to address aging infrastructure. Water systems in Roads End are from the 1970s and work will be needed there. She said that she is concerned about money needed to bring 80 new hookups when there are hundreds of failing hookups in the vicinity. Traffic problems in the area have been understated. The actions that have been discussed to address those issues are all money that would be diverted by development at the proposed site. The application narrative states that the development would be beneficial to Roads End. It says that the development would provide a more pleasing entrance to Roads End. Chair Kroen said that she drives that road several times a

day. More often than not she sees wildlife on that lot. She sees deer on that lot. If the clear cut had been appropriately addressed, it would be much more pleasing than a row of houses. The role of the Planning Commission is to decide the merits of the application based on the law and based on its consistency with our planning goals and the Statewide Planning Goals. However, a statement that the development will be beneficial to Roads End is not accurate. The traffic on Logan Road would not be beneficial. She said that she has been stuck in traffic on Logan Road. When you think of the hazards associated with those of us in Roads End, there is the one road in and one road out. Adding a bunch of houses that would all load out on to Logan Road is a significant impact. The traffic at Hwy 101 is an issue, and now we are talking about adding an additional 80 houses. And until the long talked-about extension of 47th to the golf course, there is no other access to 101. Any development agreement or and planned development will have a heavy lift in terms of approval without some significant thought given to those issues.

Commissioner Smith agreed that the proposed rezoning would make an island of R-1-5 in the midst of the other zones. We are talking about creating a more densely used area that seems to be inconsistent with the surrounding area. Chair Kroen pointed out that there are two decisions: a decision on the annexation and a decision on the zone change.

Commissioner Blackerby agreed with Chair Kroen's comments on the impacts of new development to Roads End and the community. He said he thinks that there are a number of undeveloped areas in the city that are just as ugly as the clear-cut site. And that there are some areas that are developed in the city that are just as ugly in the sense of code enforcement. Addressing the applicants he said that they want to develop the property and that it is going to cost them to make it a better place than it is now. He said that he doesn't think that it is a great entry into the city and that if he were the only one voting, he would say that it has to be something that is more advantageous to the city than the developer.

Commissioner Brainerd said that anything that improves the current state of the site is better.

Commissioner Schlesinger said that he thinks the property looks horrible as it is now. It needs to be part of the community. He expressed concern that there is not a plan. The site is an eyesore now and has been an eyesore since they logged it in 2012. He said that he would be in favor of progressing with the proposal. We get another crack at it when it comes back around as a PUD. He also said that he thinks that it is appropriate to have as many lots as possible in Lincoln City so that more people can afford housing.

Commissioner Baker said that she sees an issue with the impact on traffic of 80 new units - especially with sounding like the goal with R-1-5 is about maximizing density. It makes sense to annex. The R-1-5 zoning seems to be inconsistent with the comp plan. It seems like a pretty hard line to throw in a zone next to others where it doesn't exist.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Motion to recommend approval of the request for annexation</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>Marci Baker, Commissioner</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Joshua Brainerd, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Brainerd, Kroen, Schlesinger, Smith
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

**5.2.9.**

Commissioner Brainerd said that he needs more information on the zone change. He agrees that traffic is an issue in the area.

Chair Kroen said that if workforce housing needs to happen, the density of development needs to come up. She said that she is torn because the city has no workforce housing. But there is no guarantee that workforce housing will be built, even if the change to R-1-5 zoning is approved.

Ms Skinner noted that the Planning Commission can recommend approval or they can recommend denial of the zone change.

Commissioner Schlesinger asked whether the Planning Commission can recommend approval with the recommendation that a percentage be made developed as affordable housing. Ms Skinner replied that it is not a conditional rezone.

Commissioner Blackerby asked what happens if the rezone is denied. Ms Skinner replied that if the City Council agreed with the recommendation and denied the rezone, the existing county zoning would remain and city staff would have to administer the county zoning on the site.

Commissioner Blackerby said that his opinion is to approve the rezone and deal with how the city controls what we would like to see down the road.

Commission Baker pointed out that the zone allowed by the Planning Commission will determine what development is allowed down the road.

Ms Skinner added that there are certain requirements that have to be met regardless of the zone (sidewalks, etc). Regardless of the zone the will have to do a new traffic impact study.

<b>MOTION:</b>	<b>Recommend approval of the R-1-5 zone</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	<b>Patti Kroen, Chair</b>
<b>SECONDER:</b>	<b>Kim Blackerby, Commissioner</b>
<b>AYES:</b>	Baker, Blackerby, Kroen, Schlesinger, Smith
<b>NAYS:</b>	Joshua Brainerd
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Lenny Nelson
<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Passed</b>

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

None

**7. NEW BUSINESS**

None

**8. PLANNING COMMISSION TRAINING**

Training is scheduled for the March 3, 2020 meeting.

**9. REPORTS & COMMENTS**

None

**10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & NEXT MEETINGS**

A hearing for a conditional use permit for a six-plex in a general commercial zone is scheduled for the next meeting. Also deliberations and a recommendation on the Scrutton CPA & ZC.

**11. ADJOURN**

Respectfully submitted,

---

James White  
Assistant Planner

---

Patti Kroen  
Chair