

1 City of Yachats  
2 **Planning Commission**  
3 Regular Meeting and Work Session Summary  
4 February 15, 2022  
5

6 **I. CALL TO ORDER**

7 Work Session began at 2:02 pm

8 **Present:** Loren Dickinson, Jacqueline Danos, Ariana Carlson, John  
9 Theilacker, Lance Bloch, Chair, Christine Orchard, Dayna Capron, Neal  
10 Moprhis, Acting City Manager, Katherine Guenther, John Theilacker

11 **CIC REVIEW (0.56)**

12 Dickinson advised that Bloch's version could be used as a starting point and  
13 each commission member can present their input. He also suggested that the  
14 Commission look at the Coos County version as it some interesting aspects  
15 and good points.

16 (2:32) Danos summarized her written input. Felt CIC is about land use and  
17 not all aspects of local government. Then spoke about advisory capacity to  
18 the Planning Commission and referred to a UO report regarding citizen  
19 involvement versus citizen advisory and summarized the difference.

20 (5:48) Discussion on Danos' input. Theilacker indicated it is a two way street.  
21 The CIC needs to educate the Yachats community regarding land use issues  
22 but also it needs to bring community concerns back to the Commission.

23 (7:09) Bloch mentioned advisory was at the bottom and asked where Danos  
24 saw this in relation to the Planning Commission. Danos indicated she thought  
25 it was the Commission's desire to have a CIC report to the City Planner and  
26 not directly to the Commission. The Planner would be able to determine how  
27 the concerns from the CIC would be addressed.

28 (9:02) Orchard advised she was fine with Danos' input but indicated she  
29 thought the CIC was dealt with at the last meeting where they took the  
30 information from the consultant and Bloch sent his subsequent email.

31 (9:37) Dickinson advised that since some additional, useful information has  
32 been gained since the last meeting he felt that could be taken into account  
33 and Bloch's version could be modified to create a final document.

34 (10:38) Danos reiterated that the first goal on the outline from last month  
35 indicates "all aspects of local government: and it should be land use. In  
36 addition she indicated that the document from Coos Bay is a Citizens'  
37 Advisory Committee outline, not a Citizens' Involvement Committee outline.

38 (11:31) Dickinson advised he agreed with Danos commentary provided and  
39 felt a monthly newsletter was an excellent idea; it is a way to get continuous  
40 information out to the community as well as using the community voice  
41 section on the website.

42 (12:34) Orchard questioned whether the newsletter would be separate from  
43 the City newsletter. Danos explained that she thought it could be an update in  
44 the regular monthly newsletter from the City. She also highlighted that a CIC  
45 is not an advocacy group and cannot advocate for a specific project. She

1 continued by asking if an Ordinance needed to be created and if so, she felt  
2 the terms needed to be very specific.

3 (14:18) Bloch discussed the options available – either a directive or a  
4 recommendation. Voiced his concern about being too prescriptive with a  
5 volunteer community group and felt it best to be a little informal.

6 (15:30) Dickinson concurred but felt it was good to be prepared if Council  
7 came back and asked for something different.

8 (15:54) Guenther gave a quick description of the differences between a  
9 commission and a committee.

10 (17:29) Danos advised that going through it there is a lot of overlap with the  
11 other commissions with regard to planning She felt that this a CIC would  
12 need information from the other commissions too as they also do land use  
13 work. Discussion held on CIC working between the commissions and  
14 channeling information.

15 (18:56) Guenther advised that before increased staff shortages occurred, the  
16 monthly Commission Chair meetings were extremely helpful and productive.  
17 She felt there is an opportunity there to get a snapshot of what each  
18 Commission is working on and where they overlap .It is City Manager, the  
19 Mayor and Commission Chairs. That could be a place to have a CIC member.

20 (21:00) Discussion held regarding including this in the “duties” list and  
21 continued discussion of what advocacy means to the group. Advocating a  
22 certain concept as opposed to advocating a particular project. Danos felt the  
23 purpose of the CIC is informational and making sure the City honors the state  
24 goals for land use.

25 (27:50) Orchard expressed concern about adding to the City Planners’ job.  
26 Guenther advised she currently doesn’t have a job description but they are  
27 working towards putting together information for the position such as  
28 description, rate of pay and hours. She advised that Council had voted to  
29 increase her time to four (4) days a week. She felt that this group could  
30 actually be a time saver for her in terms of reaching people.

31 (30:01) Danos indicated what she visualized for a CIC is also an educational  
32 aspect, i.e. the lighting ordinance. She suggested having a space in City Hall  
33 and a person from CIC being available during the work day to answer  
34 questions to free up time for the Planner, City Manager or staff. Discussion  
35 ensued.

36 (35:32) Dickinson referred to Bloch’s document and indicated that under  
37 duties along with long range planning, he also felt they might have input on  
38 ordinances, codes, etc. Bloch explained his choice of wording.

39 (37:16) Guenther gave further explanation of what long range planning means  
40 in this area – more of a collaborative approach as opposed to day-to-day  
41 operations.

42 (38:02) Another comment from Dickinson was that he would like to have in  
43 the description that this committee have no advocacy or input on quasi  
44 jurisdictional issues, specific issues, projects, etc. Discussion continued on  
45 advocacy and distribution of information.

1 (44:13) Theilacker indicated he thought it should be specified under #4 of  
 2 duties insert “any city initiated comprehensive plan, etc.” Discussion was held  
 3 regarding city initiated versus citizen initiated.

4 (48:53) Bloch voiced his concern that if the requirements of the committee are  
 5 too restrictive it will be hard to get people to serve on the committee. He  
 6 wants to promote that citizens have a part in making decisions in the City.

7 (50:51) Danos indicated that the CIC is the bridge between the citizens and  
 8 the Commissions. The CIC will communicate a citizen’s idea to the  
 9 appropriate commission. The CIC makes sure the citizenry at large are heard.  
 10 Danos felt that Hui Radomski and Katherine could help insert the appropriate  
 11 language.

12 (53:27) Bloch felt that the document was adequate and that it came down to  
 13 leaving it as is, or inserting the words “city initiated”. He felt strongly that those  
 14 two words would severely inhibit the Commission’s ability to get member for a  
 15 CIC.

16 (54:09) Discussion held as to bringing the issue to a vote in regular session.  
 17 Bloch was hopeful a consensus could be reached without a vote. Danos  
 18 questioned what the vote was for and Bloch indicated it was to approve the  
 19 document and send it to City Council. Discussion continued.

20 (59:00) Bloch read back the notes and changes made to the document.

- 21 1. Increase citizen involvement in land use planning issues of local  
 22 government.

23 Duties:

- 24 3 Outreach and education are the primary duties of the CIC.
- 25 5. Have a representative attend Yachats City Council meetings when  
 26 requested.
- 27 6. Have a representative available to attend the monthly Commission  
 28 Chair meeting in order to increase communication between  
 29 commissions and committees.
- 30 8. Duties are exclusive of being involved in issued that are being covered  
 31 in quasi- judicial hearings, i.e. hearings on variances, conditional land  
 32 use, etc.
- 33 9. Identify an individual who can keep hours at a desk in City Hall, these  
 34 hours to be specified between City Planner and CIC.

35 (1:01:18) Danos felt that the wording about quasi-judicial was cumbersome  
 36 and off putting. She felt that having a line indicating what the CIC is NOT is  
 37 clearer. *It is not an advocacy group and it is not an advisory or decision  
 38 making group.*

#### 39 **Relationship to the Planning Commission:**

40 Facilitating communication between citizens and the City.

41 (1:05:10) Discussion on who the CIC reports to.

42 Dickinson concluded the work session at 3:05 pm.

43 Chair, Bloch called the regular session to order at 3:05 pm.

#### 44 **II. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE (1:06:43)**

45 (1:07:02) Dickinson advised Committee that there has been no word from  
 46 DLCD regarding the parking study.

1 (1:07:26) Danos advised the kick-off meeting for Housing Needs Assessment  
 2 Grant is February 23<sup>rd</sup> at 11 am. Bloch asked if the information would be on  
 3 the website and Danos advised it was not a public meeting.

### 4 **III. CITIZEN CONCERNS**

5 None

### 6 **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

#### 7 **A. Election of Officers**

8 (1:09:34) Bloch apologized for not doing this in December or January and  
 9 advised that he and Dickinson would not be offended if someone else was  
 10 nominated.

11 (1:10:33) Dickinson nominated John Theilacker as co-chair. Danos  
 12 seconded the nomination.

13 (1:10:48) Orchard nominated Lance Bloch to continue as Chair Dickinson  
 14 seconded the nomination.

15 (1:11:49) Bloch called the vote for John Theilacker as Co-Chair of the  
 16 Planning Commission.

17 **Vote:** Danos, aye; Orchard, aye; Carlson, aye; Theilacker, aye; Dickinson,  
 18 yes; Block, yes. **Nomination carried unanimously.**

19 (1:13:09) Bloch called the vote for himself to remain as Chair of the  
 20 Planning Commission.

21 **Vote:** Danos, aye; Orchard, aye; Carlson, aye; Theilacker, aye; Dickinson,  
 22 yes; Block, yes. **Nomination carried unanimously.**

#### 23 **OLD BUSINESS**

#### 24 **A. Discussion of CIC, Vote**

25 (1:14:07) Bloch asked the Commission if after hearing his reading his  
 26 interpretation of the CIC document after the work session if they felt  
 27 comfortable voting on it.

28 (1:14:43) Orchard indicated the changes were minor and she was  
 29 comfortable voting Dickinson and Carlson agreed with her.

30 (1:15:11) Theilacker questioned if the Commission could vote today but  
 31 see a revised document before the March meeting and before it went to  
 32 Council. Bloch responded that he can have the changes made and  
 33 emailed to the Commissioners tomorrow but advised that once a vote was  
 34 taken, the document would be approved. Discussion was held regarding  
 35 the legality of that.

36 (1:18:40) The Commission agreed to have Bloch write up the changes and  
 37 email them to the Commissioners and the Planner.

#### 38 **B. Further Tasks for Planning commission**

39 (1:19:54) Bloch indicated the Future Tasks list included in the meeting  
 40 packet and referred to comments received from Danos and Theilacker. He  
 41 mentioned projects in process:

- 42 1. Parking recommendations
- 43 2. Fences, hedges and walls
- 44 3. Buildable lots inventory
- 45 4. Accessory dwelling units
- 46 5. Wetlands survey

1 Items to be discussed are:

- 2 6. Comprehensive Plan Audit
- 3 7. Water conservation recommendations
- 4 8. Architectural standards
- 5 9. Building heights review

6 Bloch advised other items could be added to the list is desired by the  
7 Commission.

8 (1:21:31) Bloch then referred to Theilacker's Proposed Projects  
9 Discussion held regarding review of Codes and Ordinances. Dickinson spoke  
10 of how it will be an enormous task but would be helpful to the City. He  
11 indicated that Item 8 and 9 of the current task list would fit into that but that  
12 Architectural Standards are an enormous task and something that the  
13 Commission shouldn't tackle.

14 (1:24:13) Danos felt that the items on the task list all come down to  
15 comprehensive plan review and referred to several of the projects currently  
16 being undertaken.

17 (1:26:24) Guenther advised she could start compiling a list of code sections  
18 that could be reviewed and/or updated/corrected. Discussion on city and  
19 county codes permits, and review of plans was held.

20 (1:35:17) Bloch broke down how to approach the goals and actions of a  
21 comprehensive plan.

- 22 1. Is this plan/goal important today?
- 23 2. Are the actions being taken appropriate today?
- 24 3. Are the actions reflected in Ordinances?

25 (1:36:18) Theilacker indicated he agreed with Guenther and felt that the  
26 Municipal Code should be focused on first while work is going into other parts  
27 of the Comprehensive Plan. Danos agreed.

28 (1:38:16) Bloch requested that Guenther make an itemized list of items  
29 confusing along with Code Sections and indicate what makes them confusing.

30 (1:41:02) Guenther said she would like to do "housekeeping" first by clarifying  
31 what the intent was when writing the Code. She suggested picking a few and  
32 working through them in an hour long work session. Bloch agreed.

33 (1:41:38) Theilacker inquired if it would be acceptable for Planning  
34 Commissioners to also submit sections of the Code they found troubling.

35 (1:41:53) Guenther indicated that it is important for the public to be able to  
36 understand the Code when they are anticipating building so the more input  
37 the better. She asked that the specific sentence(s) be highlighted and then  
38 have an indication as to what is confusing about it.

39 (1:44:03) Orchard bought up Dickinson's comment about Architectural  
40 Standards and suggested that it struck from the priority list. After further  
41 explanation as to what would be involved and discussion, the consensus was  
42 that architectural standards will be kept in mind but there is no need for a  
43 separate ordinance for Architectural standards. Discussion was held on  
44 sending Title 9 information to all Planning Commissioners and not just to the  
45 Planner.

1 (1:50:51) Guenther brought up that the updated database of property  
2 ownership is needed and she is working on that.

3 (1:52:52) Theilacker indicated that in City Zoned Ordinance in Municipal Code  
4 that a text or map amendment that notice of hearing to published and post it  
5 in 3 or 4 conspicuous places in town. As long as the use of the property is not  
6 being changed not every property owner needs to receive notice.

7 **V. PLANNER REPORT**

8 (1:56:18) Guenther apologized and advised there is no monthly report or a  
9 report for 2021. She had been involved in the City Manager transition and is  
10 hopeful she'll be spending much more time as Planner and will be able to do  
11 them in the future.

12 (1:57:11) Guenther provided an update on Agate Point. She had a call with  
13 the consultant on Saturday and they thought they'd have something for the  
14 March meeting but hadn't realized the meeting was on the 15<sup>th</sup>, not the  
15 22<sup>nd</sup>. One or all of the individuals have a scheduling conflict in April so she  
16 thinks it will be May at the earliest. She did receive a "moderate" tweak to the  
17 plan.

18 (1:59:04) Guenther also advised she is expecting plans in the next day or so  
19 for an interesting project in Quiet Water and as soon as it is on the schedule  
20 she'll get out specifics. It will most likely come in the form of a variance.

21 (2:01:16) Danos asked if there was any update on the properties on the hill  
22 regarding the over-excavation and Guenther advised there is nothing to report  
23 on that. Work has been stopped.

24 (2:02:00) Orchard asked for an update on building permit requests and  
25 Guenther advised they are still coming in and indications are it is going to be  
26 a busy season this coming year.

27 (2:02:47) Danos asked if Roslund was moving forward with his plans and  
28 Guenther advised he had to make a slight change in the plans which  
29 pertained to ODOT and not the City However everything pertaining to the City  
30 on the original plan is still the same.

31 (2:04:17) Bloch emphasized that it would be very helpful to have a 2021  
32 Annual Report and a monthly report before every meeting to have reference  
33 points to work from.

34 (2:04:47) Guenther advised the information is there it just needs to be  
35 consolidated. She advised that was a reasonable request and s hopeful that  
36 will happen as she drops a job and a half.

37 (2:05:22) Danos advised she went through the last years' permits for the  
38 grant.

39 (2:06:45) Guenther advised that there has been a large turnover in the  
40 Lincoln County Planning Department. She relied on their permit database  
41 which was helpful as it would list tasks that needed to be completed. They  
42 have stopped using that so it takes longer to get the information she needs.

43 **VI. OTHER BUSINESS**

44 **A. From the Commission**

45 (2:08:29) Orchard brought up the representative for the Commission Chair  
46 meeting for Finance and advised Danos had done it for many years. Does  
47

1                   the Commission want someone in those meetings? Discussion held on  
2                   the state of the Finance Committee.

3                   **B. From the Staff**

4                   None

5                   Meeting adjourned at 4:16 pm.

6                   Transcribed by Contractor, L.F. Barrett, March 13, 2022