

Neskowin CPAC  
Land Use Subcommittee Meeting Minutes  
April 4, 2009

*The Neskowin CPAC Land Use Subcommittee and others met with the developers of Hawk Creek to discuss their new application prior to the regularly scheduled CPAC meeting.*

Land Use Subcommittee Members in attendance: Doug MacCourt, Andreas Von Foerster and Charlie Ciecko

Other attendees included Jan Bayless, Don Mezzenga, Carol Bickford, S.L. Baumgarte, Captain of Station 84, Nestucca Rural Fire District and Kris K. Weiland, Chief of the Nestucca Rural Fire District

Doug (Land Use Subcommittee Co-Chair) explained that the Subcommittee would not make a decision or negotiate any issues concerning the new cluster subdivision proposal, but rather listen to the details of the proposal, ask questions and then make recommendations to the CPAC as a whole.

John (prospective Hawk Creek developer) explained proposed cluster subdivision submittal to Tillamook County. According to John, the prospective developers thought the differences between the original Planned Development concept and this concept would address the Neskowin Community's concerns, including:

- Larger lot sizes (6000 sq. ft. minimum);
- 25 lots in first phase with installation of utilities and infrastructure for at least 100 units
- Garage parking and on street parking

Questions:

How many potential lots at buildout under cluster subdivision proposal?

100 at buildout if they use the cluster subdivision rules; they would continue with developing the maximum density now but the market will not support it.

Access issues – Fire department may require no parking areas, pullouts, no passing. Emergency access road is not dedicated to the County so the Fire Department cannot rely on it for access. Access was a significant concern to the Fire District.

When can the CPAC get the new application?

Application submitted to the County March 13, 2009. John and Jeb said that they did not want to release the submittal to the CPAC until it is deemed complete by the County. The Subcommittee urged the developers to give the CPAC members access to the report at this time because of the short amount of time we have to analyze the materials. The developers refused the CPAC's request.

How does the cluster proposal address flooding?

Outside of the developed areas, the open space areas will act as storage. Areas that are impacted by flooding will be seasonally impacted and the water will go downstream.

Fire Hazard Issues:

According to the Fire District, the proposed development is within the Urban/Wetland Interface Area where fire danger is severe. Building materials relevant because clustered development creates a fire hazard. The Fire Officials discussed problems with cluster subdivision in other areas of the County and the limited ability of the Fire District to respond or deal with fires in cluster subdivision areas.

How will this proposal impact the quality of wetlands?

The developers stated that there was a wetlands delineation

Transportation impacts?

Basically same analysis as previous proposal. ODOT has not yet signed off on the proposal. Vegetation removal would still need to take place but the developers insisted that no damage to trees or roots would take place.

Utilities

Q: written commitment for providers?

A: No

Q: Size of line for service?

A: 8"; hydrants every 500 feet

- plan to run line throughout the entire
- will want more fire hydrants

Q (from Fire Chief): how will this be affect by the 100 and 500 year flood? One concern is that heavy rains and high tides will compound the current flooding conditions

A: No answer

Q: base was lifted 3-4 feet, any plans to remove gravel to enhance movement of water to ocean?

A: should be dredged, but salmon?

- adjacent owner had removed 40 cubic yards of material

Q: How will conservation easement be maintained?

A: HOA

- O&M plan in bylaws

Q: Intending to apply under cluster rules?

A: Yes

Q: Neskowin Community – need greater specificity with the Neskowin Community Plan

A: Have not done a side by side comparison

Q: Would the development result in smaller setbacks and higher building heights?

A: Development would be limited to square footage of 1500-2000 total

Q: Selling as lots?

A: Yes. Just land developing, selling lots w/CC&Rs.

Q: What construction and building standards, e.g. roof design? What is the “design” feel?

A: Quintessential beach feel, wood side, stone; same feel as original proposal but design requirements are not a part of the proposal to the County.

Q: Was a stormwater analysis performed?

A: Yes. It cost \$13-14K.

Q: Stormwater analysis – what went into it?

A: Too technical for this meeting; did not discuss details

Storm report – would be happy to share at a later date.

Q: Considerable amount of impervious surfaces

- concerns about surface water impacts
- will have SFA stormwater person by CPAC meetings

Other general comments – uncertain about plan for full buildout

Lack of meaningful difference between original proposal and cluster proposal raised concerns.

Q: Does stormwater, traffic, other analysis take full buildout into account?

A: “ It depends.”

- ODOT only one Phase I; will advise
- Traffic study does account for full buildout because same study used as previous submittal

The prospective developers noted in response to concern about the lack of meaningful difference between the cluster proposal and the Planned Development proposal that the Neskowin Community was opposed to any Planned Development. The Subcommittee clarified that the CPAC was opposed to the previous Planned Development proposal because of the extreme density and the lack of compliance with County criteria including public safety, environmental concerns, compliance with the Neskowin Community Plan, and other problems. The Subcommittee noted that it appeared the same buildout was being proposed, just in phases.