

**MINUTES**  
**BROOKINGS PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
JUNE 5, 1990

The regular meeting of the Brookings Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Brookings City Hall on the above date with the following Commission members and staff in attendance.

Earl Breuer, Chairman	John Bischoff, Planning Director
Mary Jane Brimm	Nancy Corrigan, Secretary
Judi Krebs	Holly Perin, Secretary
Jeff Holmes	
John Herzog	
Ted Freeman Jr., Vice Chairman	

Commissioner David Soiseth was absent

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Brimm, second: Commissioner Herzog) the Planning Commission approved the minutes of the Commission regular meeting of May 1, 1990.

**FINAL ORDERS AND FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Brimm, second: Commissioner Holmes) the Planning Commission adopted the Final ORDER and Findings of Fact Document in the matter of Planning Commission action on the application for a variance to allow a minor partition located on the south side of Ransom Avenue approximately 200 feet east of Third Street, in the R-1-6 Zone submitted by John and Catherine Bryson.

2. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Herzog, second: Commissioner Brimm) the Planning Commission adopted the Final ORDER and Findings of Fact Document in the matter of Planning Commission action on the application for a minor partition located on the south side of Ransom Avenue approximately 200 feet east of Third Street, in the R-1-6 Zone submitted by John and Catherine Bryson.

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION ALSO TOOK THE FOLLOWING ACTION**

1. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Krebs, second: Commissioner Herzog) the Planning Commission approved a request for a minor partition on a 0.43 acre parcel to create two lots located on the west side of Third Street between Easy Street and Ransom Avenue within an R-1-6 Zone submitted by C.P. Bennett.

Further, the Commission directed staff to prepare the Final ORDER and Findings of Fact document containing conditions of approval to be presented to the Commission at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

2. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Brimm, second: Commissioner Freeman) the Planning Commission approved a request for a minor partition on a 2.54 acre parcel located on Old County Road at the easterly extension of Pacific Avenue within an R-3 Zone submitted by Arrowhead Land and Cattle Company, S. John Zia, representative.

Further, the Commission directed staff to prepare the Final ORDER and Findings of Fact document containing conditions of approval to be presented to the Commission at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

3. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Freeman, second: Commissioner Krebs) the Planning Commission approved a request for final plat map for a 3.01 acre subdivision located on the north side of Ransom Avenue, approximately 140 feet west of Paradise Lane within an R-1-6 Zone submitted by Wiggins Electric Inc., B & D Surveys, Ltd., representative.

Further, the Commission directed staff to prepare the Final ORDER and Findings of Fact document containing conditions of approval to be presented to the Commission at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

4. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Krebs, second: Commissioner Freeman) the Planning Commission approved a request for final plat map for a 2.64 acre subdivision located on the west side of Fifth Street adjacent to the south side of the City Limits within an R-1-10 Zone submitted by Sam and Susan Williams.

Further, the Commission directed staff to prepare the Final ORDER and Findings of Fact document containing conditions of approval to be presented to the Commission at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

5. By a 5-0 vote (Commissioner Holmes abstaining) the Planning Commission denied a request for minor partition on a 3.10 acre parcel located between Marina Heights Road and Marina Dr. (Pipeline Road) approximately 1/2 mile east of Old County Road submitted by Miller Contractor, Inc., Charles A. Simpson representative.

6. By a unanimous vote (motion: Commissioner Herzog, second: Commissioner Holmes) the Planning Commission approved and recommended to City Council new wording for Section 112 of the Land Development Code regarding Flag Lot Development.

## **ORAL REQUESTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

This item was introduced by Chairman Breuer after the WRITTEN REQUESTS AND COMMUNICATIONS section of the agenda and not under ORAL REQUESTS

Mr. Amin requested that the commission consider the possibility of allowing a deferred improvement agreement for street improvements rather than require them at time of construction. He felt that since his motel did not take access from Oak Street, he should not have to make improvements to Oak when he adds more units to his motel complex. He would be willing to sign a deferred improvement agreement for Oak Street. In response to a question as to what the ordinance requires and what the policies are, the Planning Director stated that in the commercial areas it has been the policy to ask for street improvements at the time of construction or improvement of the property. The reason for this was to gain the improvements as the area developed rather than wait for 51% of the area to come under an deferred improvement agreement. He went on to state that some people had expressed the idea that this policy might be an obstacle to development; The formation of the Urban Renewal District might also have an affect on the way this policy may be applied. Mayor Hummel spoke before the commission stating the City Council had considered the matter at a work-study session the previous week but had not come to any conclusions. The city has made people do improvements in the past and cannot now allow exemptions because of hardships but there may be a way to reduce the burden somewhat. One of the problems is that the policy was established by staff and not the City Council and that he personally did not like the single sidewalk at a time concept. The Mayor went on to discuss the formation and role of the urban renewal district and in answer to a question by commissioner Krebs expressing concern for Commission involvement in the renewal district and coordination of projects in and out of the district, stated the he expected strong staff involvement once the district was formed. No further action was taken in this matter.

## **PROPOSITIONS AND REMARKS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Commissioner Brim stated that it had been brought to her attention that Old County Road had been widened and that one staff member had given permission to proceed and that it was her opinion that the matter should have come before the Planning Commission. Her concern was that the City is very strict with other people on these matters and the City should follow the same procedures. Mayor Hummel stated that a related matter was going to be the subject of an appeal before the City Council and that he would prefer that the matter not be discussed at this time. No further discussion followed.

Commissioner Krebs commented that she was concerned that the Planning Commission was not kept more informed as to the status of projects such as the Fifth Street construction and that the ordinances say that the Commission should be informed. The Commission's only way of knowing what is happening at these meetings is to attend City Council meetings or to read about it in the paper and Commission members are not able to answer questions about these project for the public. She expressed concern for the Commissions ability to coordinate development if they are unaware City projects, never get reports on the number of building permits issued, etc.

Commissioner Holmes expressed concern for the road situation in the Oregon Driftwood Shores area and how they were going to be widened or improved given the topography and geology of the area. Also how were sewer and water lines going to be place in the roads.

Chairman Breuer asked why he was the only Commissioner to receive an invitation to the reception for Mr. Fujita? Mayor Hummel responded that it was because Mr. Breuer was the chairman of the City Council in 1962 when Mr. Fujita made his first visit.

#### **PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT**

This Item was taken out of sequence.

The Planning Director reported that at a previous hearing the Commission had discussed a nonconforming use that was allowed to be reinstated on property located on Hassett Street, belonging to Mr. Mark Colegrove, specifically a truck storage and repair facility in a R-1-6 Zone. At that meeting staff had stated that complaints of noise and odor from the truck, early hours of operation, and that there was more that one truck stored on the property had been received. At that meeting the Commission was of the opinion that the problem could be solved by a letter to Mr. Colegrove expressing these concerns and informing him that the use only one truck to be kept on the property.

The Planning Director informed the Commission that it had come to staff's attention that there was not a house on the property and therefore the truck facility could not be considered an accessory use and that it was not clear that the Planning Commission was aware of this fact in 1988 when the nonconforming use was allowed to be reestablished. Staff indicated that at this meeting the Commission could either allow the use to continue or could set the matter for a public hearing in July to take public testimony. Mrs. June Redmond presented and read a letter to the Commission referring to a petition submitted in November 1989 calling for the revocation of Mr. Colegrove's permit and the permit of Mr. Pat Eldridge to park their vehicles on their property on Hassett St., and expressing complaints for early hour operation, noise, vibrations and the odor of exhaust fumes and asked that the Commission stop the use.

Mr. Colegrove responded that there were not two trucks on the property. The second truck belonged to the neighbor who owned property next door and was kept on that property. He felt that he was being singled out and would not have bought the property if the use was not allowed and that is why he went to the Planning Commission in 1988. After discussion by the Commission and more testimony from Mr. Colegrove and Mrs. Redmond, it was decided that the matter should be brought to public hearing at the July 3 meeting.

**MESSAGES AND PAPERS FROM THE MAYOR**


Mayor Hummel presented a Memorandum to the Commission discussing Citizen Involvement and the Commissions role as the CCI. The Mayor also spoke to this issue. Chairman Breuer stated that to his knowledge it was not recommended that the Planning Commission be the CCI in cities of over 2,500 population and that the CAC could be any group that forms to provide input to the Commission or Council. It was agreed that the ORS and other literature be reviewed for clarification and that we should work to establish more citizen involvement. It was agreed that Chairman Breuer and the Planning Director would meet to initiate a committee for the hillside development standards.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

**BROOKINGS PLANNING COMMISSION**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Earl Breuer, Chairman