

TILLAMOOK COUNTY
CITIZEN PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
NETARTS, OR
01/18/06 @ 6:00 pm

DRAFT WORKSHOP NOTES

Attendees: Bill Campbell
Lisa Phipps
Anna Towns
See Attached

Lisa Phipps began by explaining the purpose of CPAC's as being a function of Statewide Planning Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement: to provide citizens with an opportunity as part of a community, to interact with neighbors, talk about land use issues as a community, and to provide recommendations to the decision makers (the Planning Commission, the Department of Community Development, the Board of Commissioners). A focus group with the Planning Commission tailored a process called The Guidelines to Establishing Citizen Planning Advisories in Tillamook County, which was approved by the Board of Commissioners. She stated the hope that citizens would be interested in the process once it was explained, and so proposed the formation of a Steering Committee, pointing to the Oceanside Neighborhood Association as a prime example of community involvement.

Shannon Brosseau began the discussion by asking how this CPAC would tie in with the work that was done by a citizen group 15 years ago. The group fell apart because of insurance coverage issues, and, while it was dropped, a lot of work had already been done.

Bill Campbell fielded the answer to a portion of her question, specific to the land use processes: formation of a committee becomes an acknowledged and standing voice for the Netarts' community. He listed tools used in the due process of land use: public open meetings, fair and impartial hearing based upon criteria relevant in the County Comprehensive Plan, land use ordinances, community plans, policies in particular, and zoning provisions specific to Netarts codes. Recommendations for actions or courses of action would be based upon the criteria under review, public testimonies, pro and con on particular issues; the recommendation would be sent to the Planning Commission, then to the Board of Commissioners. The Committee's one voice would lend weight and credence to the recommendations on active, current planning applications. As an organization, the Committee would have standing to initiate change in its own community plan; a plan that is acknowledged cannot be changed without going through the same due process.

Mr. Campbell continued further, in the vein of initiating change, with an example of the articulation of "village" character; beginning with a series of meetings in the community, gathering and synthesizing ideas, articulating them in policy, then suggesting modifications to ordinances. The community's voice is what initiates these changes and sustains them. Where there have been a lot of changes through the years, the ordinances have not kept pace with those changes. Without a clear and consistent voice from the local communities being served, the decision makers are not getting recommendations from the citizenry. As far as insurance goes, as a standing body engaged in the land use process, this group would be covered by this county; if a lawsuit is brought against the advisory committee, it would be a lawsuit against the county.

Lisa Phipps added that prior committees were charged with single tasks, and this would theoretically be a sustainable organization dealing with constantly changing land use issues.

Joan Cutuly felt that the fact that these are recommendations to decision is a worrisome term, in that people could spend forever planning and then the decision makers decide to do something other than what was recommended. Lisa Phipps answered that not all recommendations would automatically be accepted; there are other issues to be considered that go beyond what this group could say – issues that could affect the entire county, or cost, for example. However, if actions are contrary to what this body recommends, the

Planning Commission would have to explain why they couldn't follow the recommendations; and, there will be times when this will happen.

Bernie Wolff wanted to know who could belong to which group, who would be making recommendations to who; in regards to the Netarts Community Club, this CPAC, and this Steering Committee. Lisa Phipps explained that everyone in the Netarts community could belong to the NCC and CPAC, or subsets of either, but the Steering Committee would help focus on the best way to get people involved.

Tim Carpenter asked what the recourse of the community is should this group develop its own personal agenda, or start working on issues all its own, and the community disagrees. Lisa Phipps answered that, more than likely, a public forum would be held before anything was developed. Tim Carpenter asked how to counter a group within the organization disliking one particular person and using their position within the organization to try to stifle that person. Lisa Phipps answered that there would be an executive board with a president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer and at-large members who would be like the steering committee of this body; they will set the agenda and be open to the public, which will be notified in one form or another. In other words, it will be community driven, thereby policing any personal agendas.

Bill Campbell added that, as a group, there are several essentials: ownership – jointly and individually, investment – personal time, sustainability – able to be handed on. All this to keep the community voice alive, heard, and listened to with regard. The community voice must be built and strengthened; and, in the land use arena, this is the vehicle to develop and sustain the community voice.

Lori Carpenter didn't understand how all the data collected in 1994 for the Community Plan would be used now. Lisa Phipps explained that since the framework had already been done, there are now parameters that can be worked with – with new faces, new history, new perspectives, new data, new statistics. Bill Campbell went on to add that updating a plan is regular and routine; he felt a Netarts CPAC can initiate a change – a dialogue with the Planning Commission, which then speaks to the Board of Commissioners.

Lisa Phipps began speaking of people's frustrations in the other communities. One area Bill Campbell feels can help is Plan Amendments and gave the Transportation Refinement Plan in Hebo as an example. He stated there is a transportation refinement plan approved by ODOT for Hwy 131 for bicycle and pedestrian safety from the Tillamook River Bridge to Netarts and Oceanside.

Loten Hooley shared his concerns, stating there is already a public process through the Planning Commission when changes come through. He asked for a show of hands of people who had gone through a conditional use process and a variance process; several hands were raised for each. He went on to describe the "public disembowelment" he felt he had received from Oceanside a couple of years ago when he was trying to do a condo project in the middle of Oceanside. Three times as many people had been for it, the minority report, written by the president of the Oceanside Neighborhood Association, was a four or five page document; the majority report being one paragraph. He feels that, given the choice, he would rather deal with the county instead of a citizens' group as it was a painful experience. There are already public hearings on all types of issues that can be done in-house (the Planning Commission). Originally the Oceanside Neighbor Association's quorum was 25 – 30 people, it's down to 10-11 people and getting smaller, so there could be 7 or 8 people running the show. Addressing the "village" character, he went on to state that the essence of Oceanside was the old 30 x 60 tent lots with little houses, little roads, public walkways down to the beach. What came out of the ONA was that new lots have to be at least 175', which is massive compared to 30 x 60. What came out of the "village character" was not the "village"; zoning now makes that very hard; he cautioned everyone about going through with the CPAC process.

A woman stated she was part of a community planning group in Clackamas County and found that neighborhood associations are valuable for having a voice in the community but didn't know how to keep the same small group from "running the show"; she did agree with a lot Loten Hooley had to say.

Bill Campbell addressed Loten Hooley's experience as his having gone through a process, not due process, and didn't get treated fairly. He reiterated that a part of due process is a fair and impartial hearing based upon criteria that is addressed by everyone as the standard. Loten Hooley then added that keeping to the

criteria is the chair's responsibility, but if the chair doesn't have the backbone to keep things on task it becomes a vendetta against the person, which in turn doesn't help the community.

Lisa Phipps felt that the CPAC will help citizens become educated about going through the process and giving testimony; the Planning Commission has the responsibility for the same education process, stepping up to take control of the meetings so they can move forward to a conclusion based on the criteria.

Shannon Brosseau wanted to know if there was a failure in the process with regard to the Oceanside group and the Anchor Tavern, and how can Netarts keep something like that from happening. Bill Campbell answered that the Anchor Tavern is a situation that failed on multiple levels: the advisory committee level, within the department, and with the developer. He had told the Planning Commission that there was enough blame to go around a couple of times. Shannon Brosseau reaffirmed the need to be really aware of what's going on if the group is formed. Bill Campbell once more reiterated the need for due process.

Dave Kratovil agreed with everyone about the need to be fair, about greater participation, and about not using these meetings as a means to grind a personal axe. He went on to ask how to get started. Dale Ouverson didn't understand about the committee having the say-so in, for example, conditional use permits: do people go to the committee for permission, or to the Planning Commission.

Lisa Phipps agreed to use flow charts for the next meeting and then explained the current process that leads to decision making; she used the Oceanside group as a model. But a current resident stated he still didn't understand why, if he wants to build a shed or garage and he goes through the planning and gets permits, why should he then have to go get approval from a committee. Lisa Phipps stated that permits for allowed uses may be granted without hearings. Bill Campbell explained that many things were not subject to land use application and formal review.

Loten Hooley felt that things like conditional use should not have to go back to the whole group, if there are already guidelines about making application for conditional use issues. He feels this committee will rehash everything already been gone through, instead of just the 250' property owners who would be affected. There would be added time, cost, possible litigation, and an added level of bureaucracy. Joan Cutuly countered that, although there was a public process regarding the Centex subdivision, some of it was personal. She felt that there is a need for compassion for a variety of viewpoints rather than just getting what one wants by going through the process; it would be a neighborly thing.

Tim Carpenter asked for clarification about the permit application process in regards to land use issues; Lisa Phipps and Bill Campbell obliged.

Lisa Phipps asked for a show of hands from people interested in being on the Steering Committee; five people raised their hands. Members of the Planning Commission were in attendance so she asked them to state to the community the value they see this Steering Committee providing. Bruce Lovelin stated that he has sat through hearings and sometimes wondered if they were getting a representative voice. When the Centex project came before them, he was uninspired by the amount of testimony and didn't feel they had a complete review of the process. He thinks that if the Committee is a visionary type, and not regulatory, it will be of value. Kurt Heckerth stated that this advisory committee is a good thing because it can interact with the community and also be an advocate, thereby having the opportunity to make well-informed decisions. Kurt Mizze stated that it's frustrating to not be able to make decisions he knows the community would embrace more strongly because he doesn't have policy to back up the decisions, so he's looking forward to the input from the Committee.

Loten Hooley asked for a show of hands to indicate whether this should go forward or not; 49 individuals supported going forward and 3 supported ending the process at this point. Lisa Phipps stated she would make plans for the next meeting and mail notices to everyone who attended, post it on the county's website, and put a notice in the newspaper.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40p.m.
amt/01/23/06

