

1 Depoe Bay Planning Commission
2 Regular Meeting
3 Wednesday, September 9, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.
4 Depoe Bay City Hall
5

6 PRESENT: G. Steinke, L. Giammanco, B. Taunton, P. Leoni, R. Hageman, J. Speer
7 ABSENT: J. Hayes
8 STAFF: City Planner L. Lewis, Recording Secretary C. Duering
9

10
11 I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

12 Hageman called the Meeting to order and established a Quorum at 6:01 P.M.
13

14 II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 12, 2015 Regular Meeting.

15
16 Motion: Speer moved to approve the Minutes of August 12, 2015 Regular Meeting as written. Steinke seconded.
17

18 Hageman stated that Speer was not present at the Meeting and probably shouldn't make the Motion. Speer
19 withdrew his motion.
20

21 Motion: Steinke moved to approve the Minutes of August 12, 2015 Regular Meeting as written. Giammanco
22 seconded.
23

24 Vote: Motion passed.
25 Ayes: Giammanco, Taunton, Hageman, Steinke
26 Abstain: Leoni, Speer
27

28 III. ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

29 There was none.
30

31 IV. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

32
33 A. Case File: #2-GEO-PC-15
34 Applicant: Enoch & Suzanne Addison
35 Agent: John Manca, Blue Mountain Contractors, Inc.
36 Application: Geologic Hazards Permit
37 Zone, Map and Tax Lot: Residential R-5 PD (View of the Bay Planned Development)
38 09-11-05-DC #04600
39 Location: 485 Whale Watch Court
40

41 Hageman noted the following applies to all Public Hearing Items (Agenda Item A. and B.)
42

43 Hageman said Testimony and evidence given must be directed toward Criteria described by the City Planner, or
44 other Criteria in the Code that the Testifier believes apply to the request. Failure to raise an issue, accompanied
45 by statements or evidence sufficient to afford the Commission and the parties an opportunity to respond to the
46 issue precludes appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals on that issue. Application materials or other
47 evidence relied upon by the Applicant had been provided to the City and made available to the Public.
48

49 Hageman explained the Public Hearing procedure: He will call for Planning Commissioner ex-parte contact,
50 conflict of interest or bias to declare. There will be an opportunity to object to any Planning Commissioner
51 hearing the Case. Applicants will have the opportunity to present information relevant to their Application,
52 followed by Testimony in support of the Application, then Testimony in opposition, with the Applicant having the

1 opportunity for rebuttal. Unless there is a request to hold the Record Open, Testimony will be closed and the
2 Commission will enter into Deliberations on the Application.

3
4 Hageman asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, conflict of interest, or bias to declare. There was
5 none. Hageman then asked if anyone had objection to any Planning Commissioner hearing the Case. There was
6 no objection.

7
8 Lewis summarized the Staff Report (copy attached to original of these Minutes). He noted: (1) When the View
9 of the Bay Planned Development was approved in the 90's one of the Conditions of Approval was that a Geologic
10 Hazards Report be submitted and approved prior to approval of any Building Permit; (2) No Written Testimony
11 was received.

12
13 Hageman asked if the Commissioners had any questions to address to the City Planner. There was brief
14 discussion regarding: (1) The Planning Commission should read the Report and rely on the Engineer Geologist's
15 recommendations as the expert. Their role is to ensure the Engineer's recommendations are identified and
16 adhered to; (2) Condition of Approval Item 6. Declaration.

17
18 The Applicant was given an opportunity to testify and answer questions from Commissioners.

19
20 John Manca, Blue Mountain Contractors, (P.O. Box 190) Gleneden Beach, stated he is the designer and builder
21 for this project. He noted: (1) Subject Lot is possibly the only flat Lot in View of the Bay; (2) Owners were
22 unable to attend, they live in Utah and plan to retire in Depoe Bay; (3) Proposing a two-story Home with two
23 single-car garages meeting the DBZO Setback Standards for a Corner Lot. The Engineered Plans have been
24 prepared, just waiting for approval of the Geologic Hazards Permit in order to proceed with the Building Permit
25 Application.

26
27 There was brief discussion between the Applicant and the Planning Commission regarding: (1) Clarification on
28 the 20 ft. Setback illustrated on the Drawings; (2) Unenclosed Decks cannot extend more than 1/3 of the Required
29 Setback; (3) An Overhang/Eve cannot project more than two ft. into the Required Setback; (4) Consider Options –
30 Continue the Public Hearing and request the Applicant to submit an updated Plan meeting the DBZO Setback
31 Standards; require the Applicant to Submit updated Plans meeting the DBZO Setback Standards for review by the
32 City Planner prior to approval of the Building Permit; or require the Applicant to submit a Variance to the Setback
33 Standards.

34
35 Motion: Giammanco moved to approve Case File #2-GEO-PC-15 (Geologic Hazards Permit) and
36 adopt the Conditions of Approval (Items 1. Thru 7.) as recommended by the City Planner with the
37 stipulation that the Applicant submit revised Drawings adhering to the Deck/Overhang/Eve Setback
38 Standards for approval by the City Planner. Speer seconded.

39
40 Vote: Motion passed.

41 Ayes: Taunton, Leoni, Hageman, Speer, Steinke, Giammanco

42
43 It was the consensus of the Commission to direct L. Lewis to prepare the Findings, Conclusion and Final Order
44 for Hageman's signature. Lewis noted prior to the Building Permit Application Approval the revised Plans will
45 need to be submitted illustrating adherence to the DBZO Setback Standards.

46
47 B. Case File: #1-PD-PC-15 (Continued)

48 Applicant: Brian Plechaty, Plechaty Properties L.L.C.

49 Application: Amendment to Planned Development

50 Zone, Map and Tax Lot: Residential R-4 PD (Little Whale Cove Planned Development)

51 09-11-08-CD #00100

52 Location: West Side of Highway 101 between South Point Street and Singing Tree

1 Hageman noted the “Raise it or Waive it” Rule still applies.
2

3 Hageman asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, conflict of interest, or bias to declare. Leoni declared
4 she was absent from the last Meeting, after reading the pertinent literature she asked the Chair questions as
5 explanation. Hageman declared he was contacted by a citizen who provided Testimony in Opposition of the
6 Application stating they are no longer opposed and why they requested the Planning Commission Keep the
7 Record Open. Hageman then asked if anyone had objection to any Planning Commissioner hearing the Case.
8 There was no objection.
9

10 Lewis summarized his Memorandum dated September 3, 2015 (copy attached to original of these Minutes).
11 Written Testimony was received from Linda Perez, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Mike and
12 Lynda Johnson, Fran Recht, and William Peck (copies attached to the Memorandum). Written Testimony was
13 received after preparation of the Memorandum from: John and Joanne Wikoff, Patricia Neal, and the Little
14 Whale Cove Homeowner’s Association, Inc. (copies attached to original of these Minutes).
15

16 Hageman reminded the Audience: (1) The goal of a Continued Public Hearing is to address the additional
17 material submitted by the Applicant and Written Testimony; (2) Little Whale Homeowner Association CC&R’s
18 and meeting negotiations/discussions are not a factor in the approval/denial of the Application – The Planning
19 Commission has to determine if the Application is in compliance with the applicable Depoe Bay Zoning
20 Ordinance (DBZO) Standards/Criteria; (3) Brief synopsis of the Planning Commission’s approval of a 3-Phase
21 Mini Storage Facility (includes Boat and RV Storage – No Testimony stating this type of facility is needed)
22 located approximately a block and a half from the Subject Property (started Phase 1 construction yesterday); (4)
23 Whether or not the Depoe Bay Community needs what is being proposed does not give the Planning Commission
24 liberty to make it fit and ignore the Depoe Bay Zoning Ordinance (DBZO).
25

26 The Applicant was given an opportunity to testify and answer questions from Commissioners.
27

28 Brian Plechaty, (58 N.E. East Devils Lake Road, Otis), testified he provided the additional Drawings illustrating
29 the information requested by the Planning Commission and would answer any questions.
30

31 There was lengthy discussion between the Applicant, City Planner, and the Planning Commission regarding: (1)
32 Applicant has seen and is fine with the requested twelve conditions submitted by Boards of the Little Whale Cove
33 Homeowner’s Association and Innisfree Patio Homes Condominium Association; (2) Electronic gate entrance
34 will only allow card access during the hours of operation; (3) Dump station and wash rack are only accessible to
35 tenants; (4) Intended use – Parking Area implies temporary/short-term versus Storage Area implies long-term; (5)
36 Tenants could be Little Whale Cove residents or non-residents; (6) Stonebridge Planned Development has a
37 Parking Area for RV/boats; (7) DBZO defines Parking Area as *A designated area containing four (4) or more*
38 *parking spaces that has access and provides maneuvering area external of the road right-of-way* and does not
39 define Storage; (8) The DBZO Off-Street Parking and Off-Street Loading Requirements Item 8. *Parking areas*
40 *used for public or private parking lots under the Conditional Use in an R-4 zone must have garbage containers*
41 *available for garbage which may be generated by users of the parking lot. Such garbage containers must be*
42 *emptied on a regular basis and not less than weekly. Parking lots shall be posted with the following sign: “No*
43 *Camping or Overnight Use” and shall have their hours posted. Parking lot hours shall not extend beyond 10:00*
44 *p.m. or open earlier than 4:00 a.m....;* (9) Applicant is confident the design is more than adequate for RV/boat
45 maneuvering; (10) Lease rules will not allow for RV or boat repair/maintenance on-site; (11) Little Whale Cove
46 survey regarding RV ownership; (12) Light Industrial Zone L-1 and Retail Commercial Zone C-1 allow for
47 storage uses; (13) Applicant referred to the Little Whale Cove CC&Rs specifically regarding Tract D and the
48 development of ancillary buildings and also stated he relied on the City Planner for DBZO code
49 interpretation/compliance (meeting with him during the Application process).
50

51 Hageman called for Testimony in support of the Application.

1 Bill Peck, owner at 255 S.W. Shining Mist, Little Whale Cove, noted that he submitted a letter (copy attached to
2 the City Planner's Memorandum). He stated his respect and appreciation of the Planning Commission's work and
3 effort. He expressed the following: (1) Believes the purpose of the Planning Commission and the Depoe Bay
4 Zoning Ordinance (DBZO) does allow for consideration of reasonable compatibility and the effects to
5 adjoining/surrounding land uses and adjacent property owner's concerns are relevant; (2) Cited Section 6.1020
6 Authorization to Grant or Deny Conditional Use Permit Item 2 ...*the Planning Commission may*
7 *impose...additional conditions which are considered necessary to protect the best interests of the surrounding*
8 *area...*; (3) Familiarity with Zoning Ordinance and specifically emphasized the relationship between the DBZO
9 Planned Development Section and the Little Whale Cove CC&R's. He noted a previous decision by the Planning
10 Commission referenced the Little Whale Cove CC&R's and highlighted items stated in his letter; (4) Cited
11 Section 3.040 Residential Zone R-4 Item 1. Uses Permitted Outright, e. *Recreational vehicle (unoccupied) or boat*
12 *stored on a lot in combination with an approved building*; (5) He also noted Item 2. Conditional Uses Permitted,
13 p. *Parking Area* as mentioned in the Staff Report; (6) The Planned Development Section says ...*any uses*
14 *permitted in R-1 through R-5 Zones may be permitted...*; (7) Reiterated his concern/fears stated in his letter
15 regarding apartment buildings and his experience with Planned Communities with RV/boat storage and
16 mentioned there is nothing more commercial than 12-30 apartments; (8) He compared the impact of each Use to
17 the Little Whale Cove Community.

18
19 Peck thanked the Planning Commission for their time and Hageman thanked Peck for his testimony. He
20 appreciated that he read the DBZO and attempted to interpret the code as most people speak with emotion.

21
22 There was brief discussion regarding the original approval of the Little Whale Cove Planned Development versus
23 the approval of the Tract D Expedited Land Division for a total of twelve Residential Units with a three-year time
24 limit for tentative approval.

25
26 Mike Johnson, resident of Little Whale Cove, 140 S.W. Comorant, noted he also submitted a letter (copy attached
27 to the City Planner's Memorandum) and provided additional comments: (1) Regarding RV/boat ownership in
28 Little Whale Cove and the survey results from owners registered with the Little Whale Cove HOA website (101
29 responses – 10% have either a boat or RV); (2) He restated as in his letter the reasons why he and his wife believe
30 RV/boat storage is better for the Little Whale Cove Community and overall Depoe Bay; (3) He was unaware until
31 this evening of the approved Mini Storage Facility with RV/boat storage on the east side of Hwy. 101 and is
32 concerned with aesthetics of a second RV/boat storage facility in such close proximity.

33
34 A Commissioner interjected that the approved Mini Storage Facility with RV/boat storage is in the Light
35 Industrial Zone L-1 and is a Use Permitted Outright. Hageman allowed the Applicant to
36 speak. Plechaty acknowledged that (1) Halvorson-Mason developed Little Whale Cove and any development on
37 the Subject Site will ultimately impact Little Whale Cove residents (why he got them involved) and their property
38 values; (2) Obviously apartments are a better investment, however a lot of Little Whale Cove residents are
39 opposed; (3) Twelve percent of retirees own RVs and the Proposed Use is normal in a Planned Development
40 Community. Hageman responded that he believes we all understand Plechaty is an entrepreneur and needs to
41 increase the value of his investment.

42
43 There was no further Testimony in favor. Hageman called for Testimony in favor with conditions other than
44 those stated in the letter from the Little Whale Cove Homeowner's Association, Inc. There was none.

45
46 Linda Perez Salazar, 1150 S.W. Morning Walk, Little Whale Cove Resident, acknowledged the Chair's earlier
47 comments and was unsure if she would be able to present the Testimony she had prepared prior to the Meeting,
48 but as the Meeting progressed she observed that others had expressed their personal views. Hageman responded
49 please do. She proceeded to read into the record her written comments (submitted to the Recording Secretary and
50 attached to original of these Minutes). There was brief discussion between Perez Salazar and the City Planner
51 regarding: (1) Upon a Conditional Use Approval the Approval runs with the Land, not with the Owner; (2) There
52 is no limit to the number of RV Storage Units in Depoe Bay.

1 Richard Salazar, 1150 and 1055 S.W. Morning Walk (ground zero at this particular juncture), thanked the
2 Planning Commission for their service. He announced that he is a Certified CERT volunteer and is concerned
3 with RV chemicals and the health/environmental hazards (explosions, etc.) and distributed a United States
4 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Alert for RV, Boat and Mobile Home Owners and Park Operators about
5 Safe Wastewater Disposal (copy attached to original of these Minutes). He applauded the decision to approve the
6 Storage Facility in the Light Industrial Zone, it fits. He read into the record his Written Testimony (submitted to
7 the Recording Secretary and attached to original of these Minutes) and expounded on each of the five reasons
8 identified in his Written Testimony why he is not in favor of the current proposal for a commercial use of the two
9 acre site by the developer, Plechaty Properties, L.L.C. In closing he reiterated his concerns are the dangers,
10 potential hazards, and really it just doesn't fit in a residential model and asked for the Planning Commission's
11 consideration.

12
13 There was no further Testimony in opposition. The Applicant was given an opportunity for rebuttal.

14
15 Brian Plechaty, provided additional Testimony: (1) He knows the Property Owner (Knotts) of the approved Mini
16 Storage Facility and they own several nice Mini Storage Facilities with outdoor RV/boat storage throughout
17 Lincoln City; (2) He is proposing heated, indoor storage, low profile structures (Hwy. 101 above) with green
18 metal siding and believes they would disappear into the woods (unnoticeable entrance to the City) unlike an
19 apartment complex; (3) The nice looking apartments that were presented as an option at the Little Whale Cove
20 Meeting are exactly as would be proposed – They are a quality builder, but it would have to pencil; (4) He
21 reiterated that he relied on the City Planner to determine if his Proposal is an acceptable Use; (5) He has had an
22 overwhelming amount of support – There are a number of out-of-town owners who are unable to attend HOA
23 Meetings. In conclusion he thanked the Planning Commission for their time and service.

24
25 The Public Hearing was closed and Deliberations began.

26
27 Hageman called for discussion.

28
29 Comments included: (1) Request for clarification of the Proposed Use in a residential area and the difference
30 between Parking and Storage and can there be Storage without a Residence; (2) Ancillary is a word from the
31 Little Whale Cove CC&R's – The DBZO uses Accessory Use; (3) DBZO allows for occupancy of an RV as a
32 dwelling provided a valid Building Permit has been issued for construction; (4) There is a need for housing that is
33 less expensive than home ownership in Depoe Bay.

34
35 Cited the following DBZO: (1) Article 3, Section 3.410 Planned Development Zone (PD), Item 2. General
36 Requirements, c. *A Planned Development may include any Uses Permitted Outright or Conditionally in the*
37 *underlying Zone. Where the underlying Zone is Residential, any Uses permitted in R-1 through R-5 Zones may be*
38 *permitted when compatible with each other and harmonious with adjacent Uses.* The Proposed Use is a
39 commercial entity for profit in the middle of a residential area; (2) Article 4. Supplemental Regulations, Section
40 4.030 DBZO Off-Street Parking and Off-Street Loading Requirements, Item 8. *Parking Areas used for public or*
41 *private Parking Lots under the Conditional Use in an R-4 Zone must have garbage containers available for*
42 *garbage which may be generated by users of the Parking Lot. Such garbage containers must be emptied on a*
43 *regular basis and not less than weekly. Parking Lots shall be posted with the following sign: "No Camping or*
44 *Overnight Use" and shall have their hours posted. Parking Lot hours shall not extend beyond 10:00 p.m. or open*
45 *earlier than 4:00 a.m. If the Property Owner suffers, permits or fails to enforce the parking prohibitions, the*
46 *Planning Commission may review the Conditional Use Permit;* (3) Article 1. Introductory Provisions, Section
47 1.030 Definitions Item 3. Accessory Use: *A Use subordinate and normally incidental to the Main Use of a*
48 *Property and located on the Same Lots as the Main Use.*

49
50 Additional Comments: (1) Accessory Uses in Planned Developments are generally owned by the HOA and not
51 available/open to the public. If a commercial entity is determined to be an allowed Accessory Use, then a
52 precedent is set for other Uses (i.e. grocery store, gas station, liquor store, strip mall, etc.) within a Planned

1 Development; (2) Parking versus Storage – Parking is temporary/transient and Storage is permanent; (3) DBZO
2 does not state that Parking doesn't include Vehicle Storage – Most codes rely on some amount of common sense.
3

4 The DBZO specifically identifies and separates Storage from Parking in the following Sections: (1) Storage is
5 Permitted Outright in the Light Industrial L-1 Zone (includes automobile, truck, trailer, and boat) and Parking is
6 separately Permitted Outright; (2) Boat Storage is Permitted Outright in the Marine Commercial Zone M-C and a
7 Conditional Use in Retail Commercial Zone C-1 and Planned Marine and Recreation Zone M-P; (3) Parking is
8 separately Permitted Outright in the Retail Commercial Zone C-1; (4) Cited *A RV (unoccupied) or boat, stored on*
9 *a lot in combination with an approved building* is Outright Permitted in Residential Zones R-1 thru R-5 (noted
10 RV and boat are singular); (5) Parking is Permitted Outright in the Commercial Zone C-1; (6) Cited Section 3.040
11 Residential Zone R-4 Item 2. Conditional Uses Permitted, p. *Parking Area, meeting the requirements of 4.030 of*
12 *this Ordinance.*
13

14 Further discussion ensued: (1) If Vehicle Parking includes Vehicle Storage then other commercial entities (i.e.
15 RV Lot, Mobile Home Lot, and Used Car Lot) could also be considered Parking; (2) Recognize that the Planning
16 Commission needs to render decisions based/constrained on the Proposal meeting the Criteria/Standards of the
17 DBZO and strive to separate the emotion from the decision. In this situation, we don't abdicate our
18 responsibilities as human beings, neighbors, and citizens of a small community that we cherish and value and
19 support. It is also nice to encourage or show support for business people who want to develop their property; (3)
20 Expressed appreciation for the comments presented (both pro and con) and the Applicant's presentation and
21 revisions as requested; (4) There has not been a commercial venture of this nature requested in a Residential Area
22 or Planned Development (over the last 8 years). Development of a Mini Storage/Apartment Unit Facility was
23 approved in the Light Industrial Zone L-1; (5) Stonebridge Planned Development has a Lot for RV Storage
24 approved as an Accessory Use (not a commercial entity, exclusive for residents/owners, similar to a HOA
25 recreational facility/community building, gazebo, etc.); (6) Once one entity is allowed to engage in a Commercial
26 Use in a Residential Zone then you lose all argument against future petitioners; (7) Doesn't fit the requirements
27 for Conditional Use Approval – Not harmonious with the surrounding properties. Proposed Use is a Commercial
28 Use not permitted in the Residential R-4 Zone. Apartments, Manufactured Homes, etc. are considered harmonious
29 in a Residential Zone; (8) Reiterated that affordable/rental housing is needed in Depoe Bay; (9) Potential negative
30 impact to surrounding property values; (10) Zoning of adjacent/surrounding properties (varies from R-4 Planned
31 Development, R-2, L-1, C-1, and R-1); (11) If the Application is approved the Conditions recommended by the
32 City Planner (Staff Report) and the Conditions submitted by the Little Whale Cove HOA (since the Applicant has
33 agreed to them) would apply.
34

35 Hageman called for a Motion:
36

37 Motion: Leoni moved to deny the Applicant's Application (Case File #1-PD-PC-15 – Amendment
38 to Planned Development) to put Commercial Property in the R-4 Zone. Taunton seconded.
39

40 Vote: Motion passed.

41 Ayes: Leoni, Hageman, Speer, Steinke, Giammanco, Taunton
42

43 Hageman thanked the Audience for attending and invited them to attend future Planning Commission Meetings.
44 He shared that the Planning Commission recently approved the Whale Watch Planned Development Master Plan
45 (Zoned C-1 and R-1; Mixed Use – Residential and Commercial Uses) at the north end of town and probably the
46 biggest thing that could impact this community and nobody came.
47

48 The Applicant asked the City Planner several questions regarding other potential Uses on the Subject Property.
49 Discussion ensued. Hageman advised him to meet with the City Planner at a later date.
50

51 Recess: 7:35 – 7:41 p.m.
52

1 V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2 Hageman announced that the first Public Hearing on the Proposed Text Amendments (Parking and Planned
3 Development Sections) is scheduled for the next Planning Commission Meeting. There was brief discussion
4 regarding: (1) The version of the Draft Proposed Text Amendments sent to initiate the 45-Day Notice to Oregon
5 Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD); (2) As the Public Hearing process progresses the
6 Planning Commission is allowed to make changes to the Draft; and (3) Ultimately when the Amendments are
7 approved, then a Notice of Adoption is sent back to Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
8 (DLCD) noting any changes that were made. Hageman reported on the status of the Proposed Text Amendments
9 at the August 15th City Council Meeting – He anticipates the Public Hearing at the City Council level will be held
10 early next year.

11
12 VI. NEW BUSINESS

13 There was none.

14
15 VII. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON SCHEDULE AND REPORT

16 Leoni reported on the following items: (1) Interview/Appoint Applicants City Council Position No. 3; (2) Public
17 Relations Trip to Washington D.C. Trip; (3) Depoe Bay U.S. Post Office Mail Delivery; (4) Recipient of U.S.
18 Coast Guard Meritorious Public Service Award – Loren Goddard; (5) Coast Avenue Improvements Pre-Design
19 Report; (6) Proposed Ordinance No. 303 – An Ordinance Declaring a Ban on the Sale of Recreational Marijuana
20 by Medical Marijuana Dispensaries, and Declaring an Emergency; (7) Harbor Commission Membership
21 Qualifications; (8) Legal Services; (9) Engineering Services Proposals – Water Reservoir Earthen Dam Project;
22 and (10) Parking Master Plan.

23
24 Lengthy discussion ensued regarding: (1) U.S. Post Office mail delivery and Lillian Lane; (2) Status of the
25 Harbor Commission; (3) Harbor funding, expenses, and maintenance issues; (4) Importance of the Harbor, the
26 heart of this community, as it relates to Depoe Bay as a whole; and (4) Role of the Planning Commission in
27 relationship to the Harbor.

28
29 VIII. PLANNER'S REPORT

30 Lewis reviewed the Planner's Report – Land Use Activity August 6, 2015 thru September 2, 2015 (copy attached
31 to the original of these Minutes).

32
33 IX. PLANNING COMMISSION CONCERNS

34 Steinke appreciated the careful deliberation this evening. Taunton thought it was a good Meeting. Leoni noted it
35 was a difficult decision – We always try to accommodate people, but she couldn't find enough reasons to say yes.
36 Hageman agreed. Discussion ensued between the City Planner and the Planning Commission regarding tonight's
37 comments; the interpretation of the Depoe Bay Zoning Ordinance; and the consideration of future Text
38 Amendments. Giammanco felt the process was good, exchange was understandably spirited, but felt there was an
39 element of win-win that left the room. He appreciated the leadership, discussion, and felt the correct decision was
40 made. Speer commented that he learned a lot, overall impressed, and glad to be a part of it. Hageman interjected
41 that he is glad to have both Speer and Giammanco on board. Hageman shared a joke about the Supreme Court
42 and engineers.

43
44 Hageman advised the Planning Commission to be prepared for questions regarding the Proposed Text
45 Amendments once the Notification of the Public Hearing is mailed. Lewis clarified: (1) The full Text
46 Amendment language is not stated in the Notice, just a summary; (2) The Notice is mailed to every Property
47 Owner within Depoe Bay City Limits.

48
49 There was a brief exchange with the one remaining audience member and the Planning Commission.
50
51

1 X. ADJOURN
2 There being no further business, the Meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

3
4
5
6
7 _____
8 Roy Hageman, President
9

10
11 _____
12 Carla Duering, Recording Secretary