

1. 2:00 P.M. Agenda

Documents:

[2024-10-15 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda.pdf](#)

2. Meeting Material

Documents:

[Cascadia Final Code Rec..Pdf](#)

[Theilacker Letter To The PC - HIP Implementation.pdf](#)

[2024-09-17 PC Minute Summary.pdf](#)

[Planning Commission Issues List.pdf](#)

[Building Activity 10-15-24.Pdf](#)



CITY OF YACHATS
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, October 15, 2024, at 2:00 pm
To Be Held Via Zoom & In Person Located at:
Commons Bldg., Civic Meeting Room 1
441 Hwy 101 N., Yachats OR 97498

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82730920856>

Meeting ID: 827 3092 0856

Regular Meeting

- I. Meeting Called to Order
- II. Announcements and Correspondence
- III. Citizens' Concerns (limited to items not on the agenda, 5-minute limitation per person)
- IV. Public Hearings
- V. Ongoing Business
 - a. Appoint members to Housing Project Management Team
- VI. Reports
 - a. Commission Chairs' Meeting
 - b. Planner's Report
 - c. Meeting Summary
 - d. Issues List
- VII. Other Business
 - a. From Commission
 - b. From Staff

This meeting is open to the public and all interested persons are invited to attend the ZOOM Meetings. This meeting will be audio taped. All items to be considered by the Commission must be submitted to City Hall no later than one week prior to the meeting. The minutes of this meeting is the Audio Tape which will added to the packet after the meeting within 24 hours. In accordance with ORS 192.630, City of Yachats will make a good faith effort to provide accommodations for any person desiring to attend a public meeting, if the request is made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting time; a sign language or foreign language interpreter may be available, with advance notice. Call City Hall at 541- 547-3565 or Oregon Relay 1- 800-735-2900 (TDD) two days in advance. POSTED 10/10/2024 By: Kimmie Jackson, Recorder



MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Yachats Planning Commission

FROM: Rachel Cotton and Jamin Kimmell, Cascadia Partners

DATE: June 20, 2023

PROJECT: Yachats Housing Needs Analysis

SUBJECT: Measures to Accommodate Needed Housing

Background

A key finding of the HNA for the City of Yachats is that measures are required to expand capacity for townhomes/plex units and multi-family units to meet the 20-year projected housing need.

These measures must be implemented prior to, or concurrent with, adoption of the HNA into the City's Comprehensive Plan. These measures are necessary for establishing compliance with ORS 197.296 and OAR Section 660-024-0050(4), which require that the City maintain capacity on buildable lands within the UGB to meet 20-year housing needs.

The purpose of this memo is to evaluate preliminary options for code amendments that would address this issue. The memo presents an analysis of multiple options to address the capacity deficit for both townhome/plexes and multi-family housing. Each option includes a description, a summary of its impact on housing capacity, and considerations for implementation. The appropriate option(s) will be selected and implemented as part of a future development code update project.

These measures represent potential implementations of Strategy #1, Strategy #3 and Strategy #4 included in the Housing Strategies and Tools section of the HNA document. These measures are the minimum actions necessary to address the capacity deficits for townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing. However, the analysis indicates that not every strategy would be effective at addressing the capacity deficits on its own. As a result, some of these options must

be adopted simultaneously. Other variations of these strategies can be implemented in addition to these measures to further expand capacity for needed housing types and remove barriers to housing development.

Options to Address Capacity Deficit for Townhomes/Plexes and Multi-Family Housing

- Option 1: Reduce Minimum Lot Size Per Unit
- Option 2: Establish a Minimum Density Standard in R-3, R-4, and C-1 Zones
- Option 3: Define and Allow a Wider Range of Housing Types
- Option 4: Reduce Minimum Lot Size Per Unit and Define and Allow a Wider Range of Housing Types

Options to Address Capacity Deficit for Townhomes/Plexes and Multi-Family Housing

Option 1: Reduce Minimum Lot Size per Unit

DESCRIPTION OF CODE OR MAP CHANGE

Option 1 implements reduced minimum lot sizes for all housing types in all zones that allow residential uses, with the exception of no changes to the minimum lot size for single family dwellings in the Single Family and Duplex (R-2) zone and duplexes in the Commercial (C-1) zone. This option also removes maximum density standards in the Single-Family, Duplex, and Multi-Family (R-3) and Single-Family, Duplex, Multi-Family, and Motel (R-4) zones, for the purpose of regulating density through minimum lot sizes and with a single standard rather than potentially introducing a conflict by having two separate density standards. These recommendations are detailed in Figure 1.

Under this option, it is assumed that the minimum lot size reduction results in minor changes to the housing mix in higher density zones (R-3, R-4, C-1). Townhouse/plex units increase from 10% to 15% of units while single-family detached dwellings decrease from 60% to 55% of units in these zones. This results in an overall housing mix across all zones of 11% multi-family and 9% townhouse/plex. Overall average density across all zones increases from 4 units/gross acre to 5.5 units/gross acre.

Figure 1. Minimum Lot Size and Max Density Recommendations

	R-3		R-4		C-1	
	Existing (sf)	Recommended (sf)	Existing (sf)	Recommended (sf)	Existing (sf)	Recommended (sf)
Single Family or Manufactured Dwelling	6,000	3,000	6,000	3,000	6,000	3,000
Cottage cluster	—	—	—	—	—	—
Duplex	7,500	5,000	7,500	5,000	5,000	5,000
Triplex	6,000+ 2,500/du	6,000	5,000+ 2,500/du	6,000	7,500	6,000
Quadplex	6,000+ 2,500/du	7,000	5,000+ 2,500/du	7,000	2,500/du	7,000
Townhouses	—	1,500/unit	—	1,500/unit	—	1,500/unit
Multifamily (5+ Units)	6,000+ 2,500/du	1,000/unit	5,000+ 2,500/du	1,000/unit	2,500/du	1,000/unit
Maximum Density	12 du/ac	None	12 du/ac	None	—	—

	R-1		R-2	
	Existing (sf)	Recommended (sf)	Existing (sf)	Recommended (sf)
Single Family or Manufactured Dwelling	7,500	7,000	6,000	6,000
Cottage cluster	—	—	—	—
Duplex	—	—	7,500	6,000
Triplex	—	—	—	—
Quadplex	—	—	—	—
Townhouses	—	3,500/unit (max 2 units)	—	2,500/unit (max 3 units)
Multifamily (5+ Units)	—	—	—	—

Recommended change to minimum lot size

IMPACT ON HOUSING CAPACITY

Option 1 addresses the capacity deficit for townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing. Reducing minimum lot sizes in all residential zones increases the estimated capacity of townhome/plex housing by 25 units and of multi-family housing by 21 units (Table 1). This option would meet the 20-year need for townhomes/plexes, with a surplus of 2 units. This option would also meet the 20-year need for multi-family housing, with a surplus of 17 units.

CONSIDERATIONS

- Benefits:** Reducing minimum lot sizes enables land to be used more efficiently and increases the capacity for needed housing within the UGB, particularly given high land costs in Yachats.

- **Drawbacks:** Increasing allowed density alone without implementing new allowances for additional housing types and/or imposing a minimum density standard in higher density zones does not guarantee that higher density development will occur.

Table 1. Housing Capacity, Option 1

Housing Type	20-Year Need	Existing		Projected	
		Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)	Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)
Single-Family Detached	190	251	61	319	129
Townhouses/Plex	38	15	-23	40	2
Multi-family (5+ Units)	32	28	-4	49	17
Manufactured Homes in Parks	11	32	21	46	35

Option 2: Establish a Minimum Density Standard in R-3, R-4, and C-1 Zones

DESCRIPTION OF CODE OR MAP CHANGE

Setting a minimum density standard of between 8-10 dwelling units per acre in the R-3, R-4, and C-1 zones would facilitate development of needed types of housing in addition to single-family-homes, while still allowing for development of higher density single-family housing on smaller lots. Accessory dwelling units are not typically included in density calculations but could be included as an additional means of meeting minimum density requirements.

Under this option, it is assumed that the minimum density standard has no impact on projected housing mix. Overall housing mix across all zones is 9% multi-family and 5% townhouse/plex. Overall average density across all zones increases from 4 units/gross acre to 4.3 units/gross acre.

IMPACT ON HOUSING CAPACITY

Option 2 does not address the capacity deficit for townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing on its own. This option would need to be paired with an additional strategy or strategies, such as reducing minimum lot sizes and/or allowing additional housing types, to be effective at addressing the deficit. Requiring a minimum density in higher-density zones increases the estimated capacity of townhome/plex housing by 2 units and of multi-family housing by 2 units (Table 2). This option would not meet the 20-year need for townhomes/plexes, with a deficit of 21 units. This option also would not meet the 20-year need for multi-family housing, with a deficit of 2 units.

CONSIDERATIONS

- **Benefits:** Establishing a minimum density standard in higher density zones could preserve buildable land in these zones for needed townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing when paired with changes to other standards such as reducing minimum lot sizes.
- **Drawbacks:** Establishing a minimum density standard alone without implementing new allowances for additional housing types and/or reducing minimum lot sizes in higher density zones does not guarantee that multiple unit developments will occur.

Table 2. Housing Capacity, Option 2

Housing Type	20-Year Need	Existing		Projected	
		Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)	Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)
Single-Family Detached	190	251	61	260	70
Townhouses/Plex	38	15	-23	17	-21
Multi-family (5+ Units)	32	28	-4	30	-2
Manufactured Homes in Parks	11	32	21	34	23

Option 3: Define and Allow a Wider Range of Housing Types

DESCRIPTION OF CODE OR MAP CHANGE

Option 3 would allow accessory dwelling units and cottage clusters in all zones allowing residential uses and would create new definitions for these housing types. It would allow duplexes in the Single Family (R-1) zone and Triplexes in the Single Family and Duplex (R-2) zone. It would also allow manufactured dwelling parks as an outright use in any residential zone that has a density range of 6-12 units per acre to comply with State Statute.

Under this option, it is assumed that the projected housing mix only changes in the R-1 zone. Townhouse/plex units increase from 0% to 10% of housing in the R-1 zone. Overall housing mix across all zones is 8% multi-family and 10% townhouse/plex. Overall average density across all zones increases from 4 units/gross acre to 4.3 units/gross acre.

IMPACT ON HOUSING CAPACITY

Option 3 does not address the capacity deficit for townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing on its own. This option would need to be paired with an additional strategy or strategies, such as reducing minimum lot sizes and/or requiring minimum densities in higher density zones, to be effective at addressing the deficit. Allowing a wider range of housing types increases the estimated capacity of townhome/plex housing by 19 units and of multi-family housing by 0 units (Table 3). This option would not meet the 20-year need

for townhomes/plexes, with a deficit of 4 units. This option also would not meet the 20-year need for multi-family housing, with a deficit of 4 units.

CONSIDERATIONS:

- **Benefits:** Nearly every residential zone in Yachats excludes some housing types which may otherwise be appropriate and compatible in the district. Increasing the supply of land where higher density housing types are allowed removes a major barrier to developing lower cost housing.
- **Drawbacks:** Allowing new housing types alone without complementary reductions in minimum lot sizes and/or requiring a minimum density in higher density zones does not guarantee that multiple unit developments will occur.

Table 3. Housing Capacity, Option 3

Housing Type	20-Year Need	Existing		Projected	
		Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)	Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)
Single-Family Detached	190	251	61	248	58
Townhouses/Plex	38	15	-23	34	-4
Multi-family (5+ Units)	32	28	-4	28	-4
Manufactured Homes in Parks	11	32	21	34	23

Option 4: Reduce Minimum Lot Sizes and Define and Allow a Wider Range of Housing Types

DESCRIPTION OF CODE OR MAP CHANGE

Given that Option 3, to define and allow a wider range of housing types, was found to be ineffective on its own, an additional option (Option 4) combining Options 1 and 3 is presented here. This option reduces minimum lot sizes as is detailed under Option 1 and defines and allows a wider range of housing types as is detailed under Option 3.

Under this option, it is assumed that the minimum lot size reduction results in a minor change to the housing mix in higher density zones (R-3, R-4, C-1). Townhouse/plex units increase from 10% to 15% of units while single-family detached dwellings decrease from 60% to 55% of units. Further, townhouse/plex units increase from 0% to 10% of housing in the R-1 zone. This results in an overall housing mix across all zones of 11% multi-family and 13% townhouse/plex. Overall average density across all zones increases from 4 units/gross acre to 5.5 units/gross acre.

IMPACT ON HOUSING CAPACITY

Option 4 addresses the capacity deficit for townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing. Reducing minimum lot sizes and allowing a wider range of housing types increases the estimated capacity of townhome/plex housing by 57 units and of multi-family housing by 21 units (Table 4). This option would meet the 20-year need for townhomes/plexes, with a surplus of 18 units. This option also would meet the 20-year need for multi-family housing, with a surplus of 17 units.

CONSIDERATIONS:

- **Benefits:** Nearly every residential zone in Yachats excludes some housing types which may otherwise be appropriate and compatible in the district. Increasing the supply of land where higher density housing types are allowed removes a major barrier to developing lower cost housing.
- **Drawbacks:** Allowing new housing types and reducing minimum lot sizes without requiring a minimum density in higher density zones does not guarantee that higher density development will occur.

Table 4. Housing Capacity, Option 4

Housing Type	20-Year Need	Existing		Projected	
		Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)	Capacity	Surplus (Deficit)
Single-Family Detached	190	251	61	286	96
Townhouses/Plex	38	15	-23	34	18
Multi-family (5+ Units)	32	28	-4	28	17
Manufactured Homes in Parks	11	32	21	34	23

Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on this analysis, it is recommended, at a minimum, that the City reduce minimum lot sizes (Option 1) and consider pairing that change with allowing for a wider variety of housing types (Option 4). Reducing minimum lot sizes is essential for removing barriers to, and encouraging, development of multi-family and townhouse/plex units. Implementing other code updates without reducing minimum lot sizes is unlikely to resolve the capacity deficit for these housing types.

It is also important to note that this analysis finds that it is not strictly necessary for the City to rezone land from R-1 to the R-3 or R-4 zones (Strategy #2 in the HNA) in order to address the capacity deficit for multi-family and townhouse/plex units. However, rezoning remains an important strategy that can further expand opportunities for these housing types.

These findings can be used to inform decision-making as Yachats implements measures to expand capacity for townhomes/plexes and multi-family housing to comply with ORS 197.296 and OAR Section 660-024-0050(4) prior to, or concurrent with, adoption of the HNA into the City's Comprehensive Plan.

October 14, 2024

Mr. Marc Sakamoto, Chair
Yachats City Planning Commission
Yachats, OR 97498

Cc: Katherine Guenther, City Planner
Bobbi Price, City Manager

Dear Mr. Sakamoto:

Regarding Cascadia Partners 10-1-2024 Scope of Work and Budget for City Code Amendments, I'm attaching a memo sent from Cascadia Partners to the City's Planning Commission near the completion of their work on the Housing Implementation Plan in June of 2023. It's important for you and your fellow Commissioners to read this, as it gets specific with regard to recommended Code change options and the consultant's selection of two of the options for implementation. When former Planning Commissioner Jacqueline Danos and I read this memo at the time, we thought there was much more that the consultant could do to "fix" the Code. We hoped to "push" Cascadia to do more when DLCD actually funded the Code amendment grant, but then the grant was not funded and she and I left the PC.

Please read the attached memo and look at the specific options recommended. Then compare those simple Code changes with their proposed scope of work (and budget). I don't understand why Cascadia Partners is now so vague as to their scope of work. In fact, their scope doesn't describe any specific changes. (I think their proposal is simply a boilerplate; they use it for many municipalities. This does Yachats no good.)

Since Cascadia was specific with regard to a series of needed Code changes in their Housing Implementation Plan when completed in June of 2023, why can't their scope actually reflect that work? I'm concerned that their proposed "concept work" will simply be a repeat of the work they already performed with the Planning Commission for the HIP.

Also Cascadia is proposing a total of **152** hours of consultant time to develop the code concepts and code amendments. If you look at the changes they recommended to the Code in the HIP, the work involves mostly expanding each residential district's list of permitted uses, and tweaking the area (min. lot size) and bulk (min. yards, lot coverage, etc.) requirements. That should take a skilled planner no more than a day to do. Adding definitions, ADU requirements, and updating the City's manufactured housing standards would add maybe another two to three days of professional planner work (someone skilled at writing zoning code). Amending the Comprehensive Plan's policies to match the Code requirements maybe would take another day of time for one person. Adding in a few Planning Commission work sessions for one of their staff to explain the changes and obtain feedback could use maybe another day or two of a planner's time. That's less than **50** hours assuming 8 hours per day. But they're proposing three times that. Is that all time for travel?

As someone who's authored a lot of code updates, and not knowing the specifics of their proposed work, this proposal appears to have a lot of undocumented hours, and proposes up to 17 months to complete fairly simple Code (and Comprehensive Plan) amendments? To me, this effort should really take no more than 6-8 months from start to getting in front of Council for adoption.

Bottomline, the City (and DLCD) should be asking what happened to all the knowledge Cascadia gained from working with Yachats on the HIP? They had provided in that document (accepted by the Planning Commission) specific recommendations for the City to pursue in amending its Code and its Comprehensive Plan. This proposal surprisingly is lacking all that. I thought Cascadia was a pretty good consultant for the initial housing work, which is why I'm so surprised with this really weak proposal.

Sincerely,

John Theilacker (retired professional planner and former AICP)
Yachats, OR



CITY OF YACHATS
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
September 17, 2024

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Marc Sakamoto at 2:00 p.m. in the Civic Meeting Room of the Yachats Commons. Members present: Loren Dickinson, Mary Aebi, Jim Paul, Jolene Gosselin, Craig Hogan, and Tod Davies (zoom). Staff: Katherine Guenther, Planner (zoom) and Recorder Kimmie Jackson.

Audience: 11

I. Announcements & Citizens' Concerns None.

III. Ongoing Business

Accessory Dwelling Unit Zoning Discussion

The commission discussed the definition and implications of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in different zoning areas. The group agreed that an ADU is defined by the presence of a kitchen, bathroom, and sleeping area. However, it was noted that the rules change when an ADU is added to an existing R1 zone, turning it into an R2 or R3 zone. Also discussed the potential for more lenient parking requirements for ADUs, which could influence the choice between building an ADU or a duplex. The conversation ended with the question of whether the code defines what a kitchen and bathroom are.

Accessory Dwelling Unit Kitchen Requirements

The commission discussed defining a kitchen for accessory dwelling units; and agreed that a stove is required but were uncertain what qualifies as a stove; addressed concerns about homeowners adding kitchens after inspection. A member proposed establishing clear kitchen requirements for 80 units; discussed measuring the city's accessory units and the need for more housing stock. The conversation ended with an open question about identifying units when kitchen components are unclear.

Addressing Unofficial Housing Units in Yachats

A member proposed a simple code change to address the issue of unofficial housing units in Yachats, which the Planner confirmed would be assisted by consultants through Grant and DLCD. The team discussed the potential benefits of legitimizing these units, including improved health and safety, and added value to the houses; discussed the challenges of tracking and regulating rental rooms in the city, with the planner suggesting a survey to determine the number of shared water meters. The conversation ended with the assumption that each unit in a building should have a separate door, indicating the

1 number of units in the building. Also discussed the census data, its accuracy, and the
2 housing needs analysis conducted by Portland State University.

3 4 **Discussing Vacant Home Rentals and Growth Projections**

5 It was discussed charging a fee or tax on vacant homes to encourage owners to rent them
6 out; suggested discussing this with the mayor and city manager. It was mentioned the
7 Council is reviewing utility rates. They acknowledged potential parking issues with renting
8 large homes to multiple unrelated individuals, which is limited to two additional people by
9 legal definition; discussed the 30% population increase from 2020 to 2024 due to the
10 pandemic and remote work, with the planner noting the potential for more remote work.
11 The planner praised the housing plan's professionalism while noting some unpopular
12 recommendations.

13 14 **Addressing Housing Affordability and Density Challenges**

15 The commission discussed the issue of single-family houses dominating the residential
16 zones in their city, leading to a lack of affordable housing; and considered the possibility
17 of incentivizing higher density zones, such as multifamily units, but acknowledged the
18 legal challenges and potential backlash from property owners. It was suggested that the
19 city's growth would continue regardless, with more people moving in and more houses
20 being built; also discussed the lack of control the city has over how existing houses are
21 used, with no incentive for property owners to disclose their rental arrangements. The
22 conversation ended with the understanding that the city's growth and housing issues are
23 complex and require further exploration.

24 25 **City Housing Needs and Efficient Resource Use**

26 The meeting revolved around the discussion of the city's housing needs and the potential
27 for growth. The participants agreed that the city should not overbuild and should prioritize
28 the efficient use of existing resources. They also discussed the need for a 20-year
29 buildable inventory within the city limits, as required by the State of Oregon. The idea of
30 incorporating higher density housing in commercial zones was also brought up, but it was
31 decided that the city should not build residential housing in commercial zones. The
32 participants agreed to put together a list of questions for the consultants to address, and
33 they also discussed the need for the city to provide services to all residents within the city
34 limits. The conversation ended with the suggestion to reserve commercial land for its
35 intended use.

36 37 **Housing Plan Discussion and Implementation Strategy**

38 The commission discussed the complexities of a housing plan, particularly the balance
39 between commercial and residential areas. They agreed to revisit the plan and address
40 any questions or concerns before the next meeting; also considered the potential for
41 upzoning some residential areas to accommodate higher density. It was emphasized the
42 importance of pragmatism in their approach, suggesting they should not wait for a perfect
43 solution but instead focus on a sensible plan. The next meeting will focus on the housing
44 implementation plan and any outstanding questions. A question was raised about the
45 city's obligations, specifically the 6-mile radius beyond the city limits as mentioned in the
46 Oregon Revised Statutes; and expressed uncertainty about how the city could influence
47 planning in that area. One member suggested not focusing on this issue at the moment
48 and instead moving on to other agenda items.

Wetlands Inventory, Fire Code, and Title 9 Updates

The planner confirmed that DSL and Pacific Habitat are communicating on the local wetlands inventory. The mayor and city manager escalated the communications to several state contacts to expedite inventory approval. The Planner reported a new county fire code adding a permitting step. Updates were given on the parking plan and title 9 to Council, with uncertainty about the latter's agenda; said the DLCD was still reviewing title 9 changes that Council could potentially review in October, but the decision was Council's. The members are concerned about restarting the process if Council found issues. The planner said the changes were minor and unlikely to violate laws. The city manager confirmed the City Council meeting was rescheduled to October 23rd.

City Council Meeting and Comprehensive Plan Update

The group discussed the upcoming City Council meeting and the need for external consultation on updating the Comprehensive Plan, which believe is within the budget. The planner suggested focusing on the housing part of the plan and tying it to the new code, with Kimmie agreeing to discuss this in the next work session. The city manager suggested involving Cascadia partners to support the group in moving forward with each section of the Comp review. Will be discussing all city fees plan to bring it to the city council in November.

Next Steps

- All commissioners to review the housing implementation plan, housing needs analysis, and buildable lands inventory documents before the next meeting.
- All commissioners to prepare questions about the housing plans for discussion at the next work session.
- Planner to send a copy of the Measure 56 notice to the city manager for the City Council meeting notice.
- All planning commissioners to attend the October 23rd City Council meeting where Title 9 updates will be discussed.
- The planner to review the comprehensive plan and select a housing-related goal to focus on at the next work session.
- The planner to follow up with Cascadia Partners on their timeline for the housing implementation plan work.
- The city recorder is working on an analysis of surrounding communities' fees for presentation to City Council in November.
- Planner to look for recordings of previous Cascadia Partners presentations to share with commissioners.

Meeting adjourned at 3:21pm

By: Kimmie Jackson, Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION ISSUES LIST as of 10/08/24

Item #	Description	Assigned	Due Date	Status
1	Schedule next training session	KG		03/12: KG to talk to Hui about guidance on best practices to update Comp Plan. 02/23: Coordinate with Hui on next topic(s) and date.
2	Complete Wetland Inventory	KG		10/08: State Lands reviewing some minor discrepancies. 09/16: City Mgr. has contact in state govt and is escalating. 08/19: Mayor using state contact to escalate. 05/21: KG contacted by State Lands. We are next in line for review. 04/16: KG sent email to State for update. 04/09: No update. 03/12: No update from ODSD. Link to State Lands Inventory to be added to links page. 02/23: Pending response from ODSD.
3	Continue Implementation of Yachats Parking Mgmt Plan	LD		10/08: Public Works reports that all projects in plan that can be completed have been completed. Closed. 06/11: Continuing to make progress on various projects. 05/14: Public works to provide city with update. 04/16: LD to meet with Public Works tomorrow for update. 03/19: LD sent email and will meet with Public Works to discuss. 03/12: Public Works will probably implement portions of the plan at a time. LD to meet with Public Works to discuss next steps.
4	Obtain City Council approval of updates to Title 9			10/08: On schedule to present at next City Council meeting on 10/23. 09/12: Update from KG that with delay of review by DLCD and internal issues may not make City Council agenda until Nov. 06/11: Reviewed and approved changes to building height calculation. KG to send update to DLCD with approved changes. 5/21: Final draft approved by commission. KG to advise DLCD of changes. 05/14: At DLCD for review. Completed review of draft with PC today. Final review 05/21. Postponed public meeting to 07/16. 04/09: Waiting on marked up version. Review in 05/14 Work Session. Present in public meeting 06/18. 03/12: PC members to review and familiarize themselves with content. Need review schedule added to application. KG to put out marked up version. 02/23: Need review by DLCD.

5	Amend Title 9 for Housing Implementation Plan			10/08: Reviewed Statement of Work. Discussed various aspects of how project will proceed. Will discuss members of PMT at next meeting. 06/11: Cascadia Partners to start in the fall. 05/21: Will start review of Plan for new commissioner in 06/11 meeting. 05/14: Funding for implementaion approved by state. Waiting to see review scope of work document from Cascadia Partners. Will review plan with PC. 03/12: Waiting to see if 2024 State budget contains money to fund another round of grants. KG to check if what other communities. 02/23: Determine if there will be a next round of DLCD funding. Contact Cascadia Partners to get estimate of cost of hiring them to complete task. have made changes for HIP.
6	Revise/update City Comprehensive Plan			10/08: Identified Goals that may need updating. 09/17: Will start review of plan with next work session. 03/12: PC to wait on #1, #5 or #8 before proceeding. 02/23: Commissioners to review existing and prioritize which section(s) to work on.
7	Update application fees	KG		10/08: City Mgr reports continued progress on review. 09/17: City Mgr review almost complete. 06/11: Now part of general review of all city fees. 03/12: Bobbie committed to meet with KG soon. 02/23: KG to meet with Bobbi to set fees.
8	Ordinance for ADU's			09/17: Discussed definition of ADU. Will defer until Cascadia Partners. 08/20: Have agreement with most major policy decisions. Will continue at next meeting. 07/09: Began review of various approaches to regulation. If time permits, will continue review 07/16. 06/11: Commissioners to research documentation and laws in other cities. To discuss in 07/09 meeting. 05/14: On hold to see if can be included with HIP. Collecting information from various sources. 04/09: Present concept in public forum prior to writing ordinance. 03/12: KG to look at getting copies of Waldport ordinance as well as relevant parking ordinances.
11	Consolidate minor updates to ordinances			06/11: On hold until after completion of #4. 04/16: Minor error in Fences and Hedges standard pointed up need to identify and consolidate into one list other minor changes/corrections to ordinances. KG to retrieve existing list for review.

12	Content for city social media			10/08: Need to identify resource on commission to provide content.
CLOSED PLANNING COMMISSION ISSUES				
9	Add to Urban Growth Boundary			4/09: State passed legislation allowing for increase of UGB up to 50 acres with reduced requirements. Should city pursue? With no expressed need to expand, decided not to pursue. CLOSED
10	Credit at COG			05/14: With state funding for HIP and money in budget from planning consultation, will not need COG. CLOSED. 04/09: City has credit at COG for possible consultant. Could we use for HIP? Bobbi to look into this. May not be that straightforward.

City of Yachats Building Activity
January 1 - October 15, 2024

Project Name	Description	Parcel #	Address	Zone	Opened	Status
KAHN	New SFD	14-12-26-BC-7400	100 Gimlet Lane	R1	11/2/23	Permit Issued
SCHWARTZ	New SFD	14-12-26-BC-5900	1045 Horizon Hill	R1	11/27/23	Permit Issued
WARREN	New SFD	14-12-26-CC-1201	235 Jennifer Dr	R1	12/20/23	Permit Issued
ADOBE	Remodel	14-12-22-DD-0100	1555 Highway 101 N	R4	1/9/24	Permit Issued/Ready
KAY	New SFD	14-12-27-AC-3800	897 Ocean View Dr	R1	1/10/24	Permit Issued
SEBASTIAN	Enclose Carport	14-12-27-AC-2900	972 Ocean View Dr	R1	2/7/24	In Review (LC)
AVIANI/SIEGEL	Addition to SFD	14-12-34-AA-2600	42 Mitchell Lane	R1	3/5/24	Permit Issued
SCOBERT	New SFD	14-12-26-CB-5503	412 East 2nd St	R1	3/26/24	Permit Issued
CITY OF YACHATS	Rehab existing walls	14-12-27-DA-8000	328 West 3rd St	PF	5/2/24	Ready to Issue
THORNTON	Addition to SFD	14-12-26-CB-2800	565 East 2nd St	R1	5/13/24	Ready to Issue
DAKIN/ADERHOLD	New SFD	14-12-26-BB-1900	1150 Saki Lane	R1	5/21/24	Permit Issued
OLSON	New SFD	14-12-27-AD-14600	101 10th St	R1	6/11/24	Permit Issued
BONNETT	New SFD	14-12-27-DD-3900	200 Shell St	R1	7/3/24	Permit Issued
CITY OF YACHATS	Pavilion - Change of Use	14-12-27-DA-4500	441 Highway 101 N	PF	8/28/24	Ready to Issue
NANCE/ORR	Addition to SFD	14-12-26-CD-3700	368 Combs Circle	R1	9/5/24	In Review (LC)
GREENE	New Manufactured Home	14-12-27-AA-1002	1175 King Street	R3	9/11/24	In Review (LC)
CITY OF YACHATS	Replace existing library	14-12-27-AC-5800	560 West 7th Street	PF	10/2/24	In Review (LC)