

# CITIZEN TESTIMONY

**From:** Daniel Howlett <[danielhowlett@gmail.com](mailto:danielhowlett@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 6, 2023 2:53 PM  
**To:** Luke Shepard <[lukeshepard@corb.us](mailto:lukeshepard@corb.us)>  
**Cc:** Mary McGinnis <[marymcginniscitycouncil@gmail.com](mailto:marymcginniscitycouncil@gmail.com)>; Kristine Hayes <[kristineforrockaway@gmail.com](mailto:kristineforrockaway@gmail.com)>; [tmartine13719@gmail.com](mailto:tmartine13719@gmail.com); Penny Cheek <[pennycheek@live.com](mailto:pennycheek@live.com)>; [alesiafrankenrbcitycouncil@gmail.com](mailto:alesiafrankenrbcitycouncil@gmail.com); Charles McNeilly <[charlesforrockawaybeachmayor@gmail.com](mailto:charlesforrockawaybeachmayor@gmail.com)>; [umazee73@comcast.net](mailto:umazee73@comcast.net); [steph@goducks.com](mailto:steph@goducks.com); [olsonrl@centurylink.net](mailto:olsonrl@centurylink.net); Sandra Johnson <[s.l.johnson2021@gmail.com](mailto:s.l.johnson2021@gmail.com)>; [billh@billhassell.com](mailto:billh@billhassell.com); [klwodia@gmail.com](mailto:klwodia@gmail.com); [g\\_and\\_j@charter.net](mailto:g_and_j@charter.net)  
**Subject:** Rockaway Beach Anchor Street and Wayside Projected Costs

Hello City Manager Shepard,

Please add this public testimony to the April council meeting, along with the 3 attachments from the city transportation plan and city comprehensive plan.

I saw on the city website that the proposed Anchor Street project cost estimate is \$684,684. The proposed Wayside beach access project cost estimate is \$847,968. Together, \$1,532,652 for both projects is extremely expensive and based on the 2010 Transportation Plan, there are 13 other higher priority projects that the citizens want to see completed first. See attached priorities list page A-168 of the transportation plan.

Anchor Street currently is a gravel parking lot that already functions as a parking lot, and it goes unused for the majority of the year. In the 2010 transportation plan, no citizens voted to prioritize paving the city lot, back when the cost was \$165K. Now it's \$684,684. See attached 2010 cost estimate.

It would be reasonable to gather evidence first to substantiate the need for more parking downtown before moving forward. A parking study could be done with an inexpensive car counting

system. The planning process should be based on data, not speculation. Why spend \$685k to fulfill this unsupported need?

Within both proposals, the largest expenses are the public restrooms, \$330k for Anchor street and over \$420k for the Wayside. Why spend \$330k to build restrooms at Anchor Street when there are already public restrooms available inside City Hall, directly across the street? There are also public restrooms at the Wayside, 1 block away, a short 0.2 mile walk. Why spend \$440k plus to demolish the existing Wayside restrooms to build new ones? Why not instead remodel the public restrooms we already have at the Wayside at a fraction of the cost?

Unlike the Lake Lytle project, neither Anchor street nor the Wayside project have had any public input, no planning commission involvement, no public workshop, no online surveys, and no public discussion of alternatives or highest and best uses for these spaces, which is contrary to planning guidelines in the city comprehensive plan. See attached pages from the comp plan. Why is the council giving these projects special treatment?

The landslide election in November demonstrated that the voters want change, transparency, and accountability. I respectfully ask that the council please consider these reasonable steps:

1. Push pause on these projects and get the planning commission involved.
2. Implement a parking study to track parking counts this summer to quantify the need.
3. Get a cost estimate to remodel the existing Wayside restrooms for comparison.
4. Host a public workshop to get citizen input before moving forward.

## 5. Consider starting an urban renewal committee.

Please respond with your feedback, answers, or thoughts.

Cheers,

Daniel Howlett  
132 N Grayling St

Recommendation	Total tally from comment form and wall map	
	Most Important	Implement First
1. Extend Necarney Street	11.5	10.5
2. Improve and Extend Miller Street	17.5	17.5
3. Improve Beach Access	4	5
4. Construct Recreational Trails around Lakes	7	5
5. Improve Priority Highway Crossings	12	15
6. Install Signal for Emergency Vehicles	4	4
7. Improve Parking (general)	-	5
7a. Improve Section Line Street Lot	0	0
7b. Add signage for Manhattan Beach	1	0
7c. Extend Parking Pod in Downtown Core	3	0
7 d. Pave City Parking Lot	0	0
7e. Revise Zoning Ordinance with Minimum and Maximum Parking	1	0
7f. Create Nature Preserver Parking Lot	0	0
8. Pedestrian Connectivity (general)	-	1
8a. Continuous Sidewalks on East Side of US 101 between N 6 <sup>th</sup> and S 7 <sup>th</sup>	5	5
8b. Sidewalks on East Side of US 101 between S 6 <sup>th</sup> and Washington	2	4
8c. Connect Lake Lytle Trail with Sidewalk at N 6 <sup>th</sup> .	0	0
8d. Pedestrian Connections near Nature Preserve	0	0
9. Create Bus Pull-out Areas	0	0
10. Improve Critical Railroad Crossings	7	3
11. Add Right Turn Lake to US 101 at Beach Street	5	4

organization to construct a parking lot off of US 101 at the south end of the preserve property for visitors to park while enjoying the trail into the preserve. As described in the section below (sidewalks), this recommendation complements another recommendation to extend the sidewalk on the east side of US 101 to the south, connecting to this parking lot location. This would connect the nature preserve land and parking area with downtown Rockaway Beach.

Planning level cost estimates for the parking recommendations are included in Table 5 below.

**TABLE 5  
Improved Parking Cost Estimates**

Recommendation	Estimated Cost (2010\$) (rounded to the nearest \$1,000)
7a. Section Line Street	\$111,000
7b. Manhattan Beach Signage	\$5,000
7c. Parking in the Downtown Core	\$609,000
7d. Pave City Parking Lot	\$165,000
7e. Zoning Ordinances	N/A
7f. Nature Preserve Parking Lot	\$101,000

## Pedestrian Connectivity

Continuous sidewalks are recommended in the following locations to address existing pedestrian deficiencies within Rockaway Beach:

### 8a. Priority 1 – Continuous Sidewalks east of US 101

Continuous and improved sidewalks on the east side of the highway are recommended within the STA, from N 6<sup>th</sup> to S 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues to provide a continuous pedestrian route through the downtown core. At priority crossing areas (see Recommendation #5) striped crosswalks across US 101 are recommended with connections to the improved Miller Street north-south connection for a pedestrian route on the west side of the highway. Adequate space for sidewalks on the west side of US 101 in this section does not exist.

annual rate of 1.02% The numbers are based on forecasts done by the state Office of Economic Analysis for Counties. They are, at best, estimates and may not have any basis in terms of actual trends. The City of Rockaway Beach should review these numbers every five years, and if there is a considerable discrepancy, initiate a process with the county to potentially reallocate. Since the number of vacation homes is disproportionate to the number of homes occupied by permanent residents and since tourism is the only industry of Rockaway Beach, it is vital that higher numbers be factored into public facility planning, utilizing the best available information. Employment is expected to grow from 342 jobs to 419 jobs, an increase of 77 jobs at an average annual rate of 1.02%.

- Rockaway Beach has about 162 buildable acres within the UGB. More than 96% of the land available in the Rockaway Beach UGB is zoned for residential uses.
- Rockaway Beach will need about 160 new dwelling units to accommodate planned population growth between 2007 and 2027. The forecast shows that an average of eight new dwelling units will be needed annually. Rockaway Beach will need about 24 gross buildable residential acres to accommodate new housing for residents between 2007 and 2027. This forecast does review both a low and a high scenario for the demand for second homes for recreational and investment purposes. The Buildable Lands Inventory indicates that the City has a surplus of approximately 57 residential acres.
- Rockaway Beach will need about 12 gross buildable acres of commercial land to meet planned employment needs. The Buildable Lands Inventory indicates that the City has a shortfall of approximately five commercial acres. Therefore, some land that is currently designated for residential use will need to be re-designated for commercial land.

Rockaway Beach considered the data and analysis found in the *Urbanization Report* to support amendments to the 2007 comprehensive plan amendment package.

Specific policies that pertain to the land use planning process are as follows:

### **Citizen Involvement**

1. Citizens shall be given the opportunity to be involved in all phases of the comprehensive planning process, the citizen Involvement Program emphasizes the following points:

- A. All planning decisions shall be made in open, well publicized meetings;

- B. Minutes shall be kept of all planning commission meetings, and shall be made available to citizens.
- C. During the development or amendment of the plan or supporting ordinances, the planning commission (the City's committee for citizen involvement or CCI) shall take a lead roll in the preparation of documents;
- D. Planning commission members shall be chosen in an open, well-publicized manner;
- E. Through public meetings, the press and other means of communication, townspeople shall be informed of the workings of the city government and the planning process;
- F. All planning information and policies shall be written in a manner that is understandable to the general public;
- G. Citizen involvement in Rockaway Beach shall receive adequate technical assistance and financial support from the city government through the budget process;
- H. The city shall take into account public input during the planning process and respond to those who participate, and
- I. The planning commission shall serve as the permanent citizen's involvement committee.

### **Coordination**

- 2. Local governments and special purpose districts, state and federal agencies and jurisdictions shall be given the opportunity to participate in the City's planning process, and to coordinate their plans with the City.

### **The Planning Process**

- 3. The Oregon Supreme Court case Baker v. the City of Milwaukie, 1975, established the comprehensive plan as a city's controlling land use document. When the plan and zoning ordinance disagree on an area or subject, it is, according to the decision, the plan that takes precedence over the ordinance. All conflicts between the two must be resolved early in the planning process for either document to be of value.
- 4. The planning process is a continuous one, consisting of the following phases:
  - A. Identification of problems and issues;
  - B. Development of information and data;
  - C. Development of alternative policies and recommendations;
  - D. Adoption of the plan by the city council;
  - E. Development, adoption and application of implementing ordinances and other measures. Review of proposed land use actions; and



- F. Periodic review and evaluation of all planning documents, including the citizen involvement program.
5. At a minimum, a major review of the comprehensive plan will be undertaken at an interval as required by the Land Conservation and Development Commission's periodic review requirement pursuant to ORS 197.640 – 197.649. The city may undertake other amendments to the comprehensive plan, as necessary, to address issues of community concern. [Planning Process Policy 5, amended by Ord. 277, Aug. 29, 1990.]
  6. Amendments to the text of the comprehensive plan shall be made only where findings have been adopted that the following criteria are met:
    - A. The amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan's goals and policies; and
    - B. The amendment is necessary to meet a land use need.
  7. Amendments to the comprehensive plan map shall be made only where findings have been adopted that the following criteria are met:
    - A. The amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan's goals and policies;
    - B. The amendment is necessary to meet a land use need;
    - C. The land is physically suitable for the uses to be permitted in terms of slope, geologic stability, flood hazard and other relevant considerations;
    - D. The area can be served by the appropriate level of public facilities and adjacent streets can accommodate the traffic generated by uses permitted;
    - E. The amendment is compatible with the land use development pattern in the vicinity of the request. [Planning Process Policy 7, amended by Ord. 277, Aug. 29, 1990.]
  8. An exception to the requirements of the applicable state-wide planning goal shall be adopted as an amendment to the comprehensive plan where the City is proposing a plan amendment, which does not conform to the requirements of the goal. The exception shall be supported by the following:
    - A. Reasons justify why the state policy embodied in the applicable goals should not apply;
    - B. Areas which do not require a new exception cannot reasonably accommodate the use;
    - C. The long-term environmental, economic, social, and energy consequences resulting from the use at the proposed site with measures designed to reduce adverse impacts are not significantly more adverse