

Peg Reagan, Gold Beach.

I'd like to request that item 6D be moved from the consent calendar to the regular agenda. As a former Co-county Commissioner, I know that when there is such a request, whatever the topic, the item is generally moved as requested.

But in the event you won't move it, there are a few points I'd like to make.

— You changed the regular public comment process at the 8-17 public hearing and did not accept the usual forms of speaker information for those who wished to provide public comment. Did you not want an easy record of all in opposition? Of those giving public comment that day, 20 were opposed, 2 were ambiguous and only 1 was in favor.

— Then right before the first speaker, you cut everyone's time from the usual 3 minutes to 2 minutes. Did you really not want to hear what we had to say?

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

(2)

- You had heard Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon members of the public - though staff denied it - that all written public comments were not included in the record. Well, my written comment didn't make it into the record so I'm bringing another copy today.
- You'll recall the Floras Lake issue - the exchange of county land with the State. That issue was considered for years before you took action. Public comment was accepted for years. But on this issue, which has significantly ^{more} impact on a greater number of Curry County residents and is infinitely more complex, you can't even give it enough time and public notice for us to know what's really going on.
- The so-called "findings" in your revised opinion are nothing more than a county "wish-list." Just because you say something doesn't make it so. Where is the evidence to back them up?

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon

- Nothing in the record suggests the claim that the City of Port Orford "acknowledges that the county's code changes are not subject" to the Joint Growth Management Plan. The only letter from the City in the record dated 8.15.22 expresses the city's "concerns" and asks for more time. It expresses its desire to be more involved than the county allowed.
- And there is no evidence that STPs are "paramount" to increasing tourism. In fact, the only evidence of how the tourism industry feels about STPs states that the author of the letter "understands the problems that are likely to be made worse by the changes" proposed.
- This pattern of not telling the truth is not new to the revised language. Staff told the City of Port Orford that the County was doing all this because DCD urged the county to increase density. I have both the manuscript of her statements and a recording, if you want to hear it. I left

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon

a message asking her to provide a copy of the letter or email or whatever she might have where DLCD made that request. She left a message for me that she didn't know how to answer that - I have that message on my phone if you want to hear it. However, DLCD said they did not ask the county to increase density; I have a copy of that email, if you want it.

- All this talk of contractors needing more density, more urbanization and yet the planning department is just dealt with a request for a variance not to have to pave a road and build sidewalks within the UGB in order to - and in getting the counties' language here - to "allow the applicant to maintain a rural character in their development."

- I also have a letter from the Nerita Beach-Ophir Water Board encouraging you to give them more time "to understand how the changes ... will affect the district" and hoping you would provide that

information to them before finalizing your decision.

- all along we've seen a pattern of lies and misrepresentation, a strategy of hiding the county's intent and scope of your actions until it is too late for the public to understand and address them.

give packet to JJ

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon



Curry County Community Development

94235 MOORE STREET, SUITE 113

GOLD BEACH, OREGON 97444

Phone (541) 247-3304

NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR YOUR RESPONSE TO A SPECIFIC LAND USE PROPOSAL BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

August 10, 2022

I. LAND USE ACTION

Application AD-2216

Type of Land Use Action: A request for a variance to the minimum roadway paved surface width and sidewalk improvements within the City of Gold Beach urban growth boundary set forth in Section 4.050 of the Curry County Zoning ordinance (CCZO). The request will be the subject of an Administrative Decision under the authority granted by Section 2.060 (1), and in accordance with the procedural requirements of Sections 2.100, 2.110, 8.010 of the CCZO.

Nature of Use Which Could be Authorized: A variance to the minimum roadway paved surface width and sidewalk improvements would **allow the applicant to maintain a rural character in their development** whilst avoiding unnecessary hardship.

II. APPLICANT AND SUBJECT PROPERTY

Applicant: John R. Lander

Property Owner: Deborah A. Lander

Assessor Map: 3614-21; Tax Lot 2102 9.70-acres

Situs Address: 95789 Saunders Creek Rd, Gold Beach, OR 97444

Location: The juncture of Saunders Creek Rd and Jerry's Flat Rd is approximately 3 miles east of Hwy 101. The property is 1/3-mile up Saunders Creek Rd.

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon

III. APPLICABLE CRITERIA

The following criteria of the Curry County Zoning Ordinance (CCZO) will be addressed reviewing this application:

Section 8.010 Authorization to Grant or Deny a Variance
Section 8.020 Application for Granting a Variance
Section 8.030 Standards for Granting a Variance

①
I think really a problem
for all of us who prepared for 3 min

Peg Reagan, Gold Beach.

First of all, we need - and the Board needs - a
longer process for all this and we need maps for
each attachment.

If the staff report is correct, the public notice
went out AFTER the planning commission workshop
on May 15 and public meeting on June 16. It's no
wonder no public comments were received if the
notice was published on June 24 & June 29.

That notice was in advance of the planning
commission's public meeting & hearing of July 21
but the notice was "false advertising" if you will.
For example, item 2b "Regulating Short-term
Rentals" - Webster's Dictionary defines regulating
as "to govern or direct according to rule" -
sounds like a good thing to anyone who has
experience with them. ^{but} allowing them to proliferate
throughout residential zones is a different matter
entirely and the notice does not reflect that
that is what the county is considering. There is
also no notice of the Recreation Center w/ high
intensity use.

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon

We need to consider each of these attachments separately, as in separate meetings for each.

Attachment B - separate issue

esp #4 BCL pre-empting any permit review or appeal process and #5 (d) the Board can't ever reject anything but only return it ad nauseum for new findings?

Attachment D - separate issue

allowing STRs: ADUs in a zone of "low density residential development" - STRs are neither residential nor low density

Attachment E - separate issue

STRs are not "~~Residential~~ Residential Uses" if you are going to allow them, it should be under "other uses."

Attachment F - separate issue

same concern as E but different zone (R-1)

Attachment G - separate issue (R-2)

Completely changes zone from single-family dwelling to STRs, 4-plexes, urban recreation high density. For example, how are you allowing a four-plex, but not expanding the lot size you needed

RECEIVED
SEP 7 2022
Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon

for a single-family dwelling to accommodate 4 times the ~~sewer~~?

Attachment H - separate issue (P-3)

This is the one zone where the existing ordinance says that "housing of a higher density is appropriate" within a UGP. Again, it should be decided separately and may be one 4-plex could be allowed but not STRs.

Attachment I - separate issue Rural Commercial

There have been suggestions that STRs should be confined to commercial zones because they are not residential uses but a new commercial establishment is "limited to allowing the requirements of the rural area in which it is located" and that is not free of STRs.

Attachment J - separate issue Light Commercial (C-1)

STRs do not "cater to the needs of nearby residential areas."

Attachments K & L - Adus - separate issues

Attachment M - High Intensity Recreation Urban Use - completely new issue - should be separate

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon

4

Attachment N - STFS - separate issue
8 pages of new language!

Attachment O - property line adjustment
7 pages of new language

Staff report says county surveyor, planning department, & assessor's office expressed concerns with existing language but we need something directly from them that this new language solves the problem. Again, it should be a separate issue.

hand you copy as we heard there have been problems getting the public comments to decision-makers

RECEIVED

SEP 7 2022

Board of Commissioners
Curry County, Oregon