

# EAST BETHEL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

December 23, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Sharon Johnson, Glenn Terry, Gerald Tiah, and Brian Downie.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kory Jorgensen and Kristina Pagnac

ALSO PRESENT: Kendra Lindahl, Community Development Director  
Brian Mundle, City Council Liaison

## 1.0 Call to Order

Chair Johnson called the Planning Commission regular meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

## 2.0 Adopt Agenda

**Commissioner Downie moved and Commissioner Terry seconded to adopt the agenda as presented.** Johnson asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Johnson asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

## 3.0 Swear In Planning Commissioner Gerald Tiah

Gerald Tiah read the Oath of Office.

## 4.0 Updates

Council Liaison Mundle updated the Commission on recent Council actions. He stated that Council passed the final budget for 2026. All of the Planning Commission items from the last meeting were passed by Council. Council extended the contract for the City Administrator, Matt Look one year. He noted that the Council has discussed updating the City newsletter process. He reviewed that the Fire Station breakfast is coming up.

The next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2026.

## 5.0 Approve November 25, 2025, meeting minutes

**Commissioner Downie moved and Commissioner Johnson seconded to adopt the November 25, 2025, regular meeting minutes as written.** Johnson asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Johnson asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

## 6.0 Public Hearing – Consider a PUD Concept Plan Review for “Cedarwood Estates,” a manufactured home park expansion located at 18164 Highway 65 NE

Lindahl reviewed the staff’s report stating that the PUD concept is to establish new standards to bring the existing park into compliance and allow for expansion of the park to add 33 new homes on the north. The area proposed to be part of the PUD includes five parcels. A Concept Plan Review allows the public, the Planning Commission, and the City Council to provide feedback on development plans.

Lindahl stated that the existing park was permitted by the Village of East Bethel in 1969. The City adopted Chapter 38 regulating manufactured home parks in 1987 and made the manufactured home park a legal non-conformity. Legal, nonconformities are allowed to continue but may not expand, and if homes are replaced with new homes, they can only do so in compliance with ordinance requirements. Removal of an existing home eliminates the legal, nonconforming protections. As a result, it is very difficult for homes to be replaced without variances. The applicant is proposing the PUD in order to establish new standards for the park. If approved, these would apply to the 33 new homes and the 178 existing sites, most of which are occupied.

Lindahl noted that the current concept also shows a single pad size for a 76-foot by 16-foot manufactured home. This is a standard budget home size; however, the current park has multiple doublewide homes today, and there is no mention of these in the narrative or expansion area. This is concerning as the narrative implies this expansion is due to the inability to replace or upgrade current homes as much as it is to supply new ones in the park expansion. Replacing older homes with modern homes benefits the residents, the park owner, and the City, but increases the quality, safety, and value of the homes. The application should provide additional information about how this would be accomplished.

Lindahl added that the concept plan only shows the areas slated for expansion in areas where open space and a small playground exist today. The applicant does not indicate how or where open space will be enhanced or protected. As discussed earlier, the manufactured home park would be required to provide at least 15% open space for recreation, and the northwestern expansion area is removing what appears to be the only park or green space for the manufactured home park.

Lindahl stated that she did not include draft resolutions in the staff report since there is so much that goes into this item. She noted that the Commission can recommend approval or denial, but they are mainly looking for feedback to provide for Council.

Tiah asked about the need for variance requests on this property.

Lindahl explained that they are requesting a PUD in order not need a variance every time it's needed.

Downie asked if the concept plan moves forward, if certain items in that plan will still be able to be amended, or if they will no longer be able to be negotiated.

Lindahl stated that there is a lot of missing information in this plan. The applicant could come back with more information and a new concept plan, or they could move forward with a formal application and risk denial related to the lack of details.

Johnson opened the public hearing at 7:35 pm.

Craig Hardy, attorney on behalf of the applicant, thanked Lindahl for her assistance. He noted that the objective for the process is to receive feedback from the Commission on the project moving forward. He provided history on the property and its ownership. He stated what they hope to achieve with this project. He added that they don't know all of the details right now, but would love any input on this matter. He reviewed the benefits that the PUD would bring to the City and the community if approved.

Arty Anderson stated that he thinks they should separate these issues. He stated that the PUD for expansion is fine, but the nonconforming needs to have a better plan.

Johnson closed the public hearing at 7:48 pm.

Downie asked how the City would benefit from this PUD. He stated that he has not seen the City ask for more affordable housing.

Hardy stated that they are more than willing to revise the plan to find a solution for the placement of the housing. He stated that this provides value to the City by providing more affordable housing and creating new standards for a long-term park such as this.

Johnson stated that she would really like to preserve the recreational space. She asked what the timeline for the builds would be.

Hardy stated that they anticipate that the land use process with the City will be quite long. He stated that this will most likely last until the summer. He noted that after approval, they should be able to move forward pretty quickly.

Johnson asked if the emergency vehicle access would be addressed in the plan.

Hardy explained that it can be added in the next plan, but the plan currently does not address it.

Johnson noted that she would be in favor of going to the state standards for the setbacks.

Downie asked if the client had considered a 30 ft setback between the homes.

Hardy stated that they have considered it, but the 30 ft could only apply to extended home sites and not the existing homes. He added that this will affect the benefits of affordable housing, but they can look into it.

Downie asked for further details on the flexibility mentioned in the plan. He asked if there would be any way to enforce no street parking.

Hardy explained the standards they have set for the driveway length. He also noted that they could include the enforcement of no street parking in the standards of the PUD. He stated that this issue should be able to be fleshed out between the City and his client.

Downie raised his issues relating to the possible limited access for emergency vehicles.

Hardy stated that the street expansions should meet code requirements. He added that this might not apply to the frontage road.

Downie added that he thinks there is a lot of uncertainty in the plans, and he would like the undefined and other unknowns to be filled in to give the plan more definition.

Tiah stated that he would like more information added to the plan. He asked what exactly they are looking for in terms of flexibility from the City.

Hardy stated that the more flexibility is related to the setback standards.

Terry asked if the PUD has to be considered for the whole property or if it can be considered for the expansion only. He shared his various concerns about this expansion. He noted that he does not see many benefits to anyone other than the property owner. He also stated his concerns about removing the park and replacing it with 30 homes.

Lindahl stated that she does not believe that the PUD can be considered for only the expansion. She stated that the standards can be adjusted to address the expansion and the existing property separately.

Johnson asked what kind of precedent this would set for the other park in the City.

Lindahl explained that it won't, since this is a unique negotiated zoning for this specific property.

Hardy explained that this will benefit the City by providing a connection to municipal services for expanded sites. He also noted that the affordability of these houses is a significant benefit to the City.

Terry stated that he would like to see a plan that shows an improvement of quality of life. He would like to see proof that this will make life better for those who live there.

Downie encouraged him not take the park space lightly and to come back with further plans for the issues addressed tonight.

Johnson noted that the Commission does not have a full yes or no answer, but will be willing to continue to work with some added revisions from the property owner.

Downie discussed his concerns with the fire safety aspects of the home designs.

Lindahl noted that the Fire Department raised no concerns for this project.

Downie noted that he would like to advise the property owner to address the concerns raised at the meeting before they move forward with a suggestion.

Lindhahl stated that she thinks they have given enough feedback that the property owner can take to adjust the plans.

#### **7.0 Staff Updates**

Lindhahl stated that there will be a meeting in January, and they have two public hearings for that meeting.

#### **8.0 Adjournment**

**Commissioner Terry moved and Commissioner Downie seconded to adjourn at 8:53 pm.** Johnson asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Johnson asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Submitted by:

Sylvia Rokosz

*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*