



**NEWBERG AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
AD HOC COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, January 29, 2009**

**7 p.m. to 9 p.m.**

**Newberg City Hall**

**Permit Center Conference Room**

**414 E. First Street, Newberg, OR**

**I. OPEN MEETING:** Chair Philip Smith opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL:**

Present: Philip Smith Joel Perez (arrived 7:05)  
Denise Bacon Charlie Harris  
Bob Ficker Rick Rogers  
Kevin Winbush (arrived 7:07)

Absent: Mike Gougler (excused) Dennis Russell (excused)  
Mike Willcuts (excused)

Staff Present: David Beam, Economic Development Coordinator/Planner  
Barton Brierley, Planning Director  
Dawn Karen Bevill, Recording Secretary

Others Present Julie Codiga Ian McLeod

Since the committee was awaiting a quorum, Chair Smith began the meeting by stating he had made a presentation to the Newberg City Club regarding the work finished thus far by the Ad Hoc Committee. He also made essentially the same report to City Council. Both meetings took place on January 20, 2009.

Chair Smith asked for comments regarding the draft letter he had presented to the committee on January 15, 2009. The letter is intended for local business owners regarding employee housing assistance programs they may already have in place. It was written by Chair Smith and Ian McLeod. He mentioned that there may be confidentiality issues involved.

Denise Bacon believes this letter will help inform the committee as to what, if any, programs are in the area. She doesn't see a confidentiality problem as long as the businesses are reporting on programs only, not employee information.

Chair Smith suggested adding a sentence to the letter stating the request is for general housing program information only.

Charlie Harris suggested moving the text regarding what is being requested of the employer at the beginning of the letter instead of at the end.

Rick Rogers stated that when it comes time to the proposed housing fair, a few housing non-profits should be included. Also, Mr. Rogers attended the Newberg City Club meeting and complimented Chair Smith on the presentation he gave. In addition, he thought the questions asked by the group were very good.

Chair Smith encouraged Ian McLeod to rewrite the letter with the added feedback.

**(Quorum achieved at this point.)**

### **III. MEETING MINUTES:**

**MOTION #1: Rogers/Harris** moved to approve the minutes from the January 15, 2009 meeting. Motion passed by voice vote.

Chair Smith stated that a letter was received from Mr. Leonard Rydell, which voiced critical comments concerning the need to increase density in Newberg.

Denise Bacon understood the letter to mean Mr. Rydell is referring to density in general, not necessarily in terms of affordable housing.

Chair Smith agreed and added that an increase in density would likely help contribute to affordable housing. Mr. Rydell thinks density is important for a number of reasons.

Rick Rogers stated that Mr. Rydell raises some interesting questions regarding street standards, driveway access, etc. Mr. Rogers believes one topic that needs to be looked at is building height. Modifications to current standards could allow for greater density. Chair Smith agreed.

Chair Smith stated that the committee is now reaching the stage where decision points need to be made after months of discussion. According to the draft plan language in the meeting packet, there are 37 different items that need to be decided upon. Many have already been agreed on, but there are key decision points that will help the process move ahead.

David Beam identified some decisions points to be addressed.

### **IV. PROPOSED DESIGN STANDARDS:**

David Beam gave a quick summary of what was discussed at the last meeting regarding the proposed design standards. He specifically talked about the presentation of existing local examples presented by Barton Brierley and how they might fare under the proposed point system.

Barton Brierley explained that staff drafted the original proposal. A subcommittee then was chosen to look at those proposals who in turn, gave staff feedback. The revised proposed standards are presented on pages 11-15. At the previous meeting, Mr. Brierley had brought in pictures of existing developments to illustrate how these proposals would work. He applied the proposed standards to five developments; making the conclusion that four out of five met all the design standards. There are still some standards that need refinement, such as the proposed natural feature and tree preservation/replacement plan standard. This might be challenging in keeping affordable housing, as efficient land use while keeping natural land features might conflict at times (P.13, A-9.) No points have been assigned thus far for this standard.

Charlie Harris is unsure about standard #9 (P.15) regarding the height of new dwellings. If a developer wants to build a two-story home next to a single story home, the set back would need to be relatively large. This may dissuade developers from doing this and also will be points they cannot utilize.

Barton Brierley replied there are enough points that can be earned in other ways to make up for the loss of those points.

Chair Smith stated the general principle to remember under the design points is the developer acquires points in many different ways. This is only one of 11 building design elements offered.

Charlie Harris agreed, but building a house in an already established development would be more cost efficient for affordable housing because the area is already serviced for development.

Barton Brierley gave the example of the River Point development, which is located on South River Street. This was an infill development where many neighbor complained about the two-story homes being built next to the existing surrounding single story homes. For that development, frosted windows on the second story were required when facing existing homes.

Charlie Harris stated to the extent that the City can give points in areas that are not counter productive to affordable housing, that is a preferable way to go.

Chair Smith asked if the subdivision design element (P13) A-9 should be included.

Julie Codiga stated the subcommittee discussed preserving trees on a lot before. Site design can sometimes preserve existing trees, but other times they cannot. In this case, strategic tree planting can be done.

Chair Smith felt that a point could be rewarded for preserving existing trees or providing a replacement plan for trees, depending on how it affects the proposed development.

Julie Codiga agreed it's good to give developers a choice to make it cost effective.

Rick Rogers asked if developers need a landscaping plan.

Barton Brierley replied a street tree plan is required for a typical subdivision, but not for all trees on the site.

## **V. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SOLUTIONS:**

David Beam reviewed the proposed actions (P. 25.)

#1 Promote the expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new business that focuses on existing local business clusters with good employee incomes;

#2 Increase in the industrial and commercial land supply with additional properties in both size and types;

#3 Develop industrial and commercial lands to a “shovel-ready” status. Today’s business has changed, making the decision to relocate extremely fast;

#4 Promote the development of workforce skills, such as skills in welding, machinery, etc.;

#5: Create an expedited annexation process for employment-creating development.

Denise Bacon asked if that decision (expedited annexation) would need a vote from the public. David Beam replied, yes.

Charlie Harris suggested dropping #5 and replace it with promoting employer assisted housing.

Chair Smith is strongly in favor of #2. The Planning Commission and City Council have taken steps toward that action, but the State is currently reviewing the proposed expansion. #3 is just telling David Beam, as the Economic Development Coordinator, to just get the industrial land ready for development. Charlie Harris stated there’s a large cost to doing that and he would rather see such investment money go to affordable housing instead of industrial infrastructure.

David Beam replied the infrastructure/investment funds for affordable housing and industrial infrastructure often come from two different sources. There may also be funding outside the City available for these efforts. The City is currently working on a South Industrial Master Plan. Rick Rogers asked if a housing component could be included in that plan.

Barton Brierley replied the area was chosen because there is no housing there. Problems can arise between residential and industrial neighbors.

Chair Smith stated affordable housing needs to be addressed from many different directions. A better linked bus system in town would be helpful in transporting workers to and from the industrial park, since housing would unlikely be right next door. Affordable housing and new industrial jobs can work together in this way.

Rick Rogers wants to be sure that connection is solidly made. Chair Smith agreed.

Denise Bacon stated a new company coming into Newberg brings in employees and Newberg needs to have the housing for them.

Rick Rogers asked if the school system owns land on Wilsonville Rd. and if so, it would certainly make sense to have housing in that area. Annexing R-3 land in the City is difficult because neighbors don't want it.

Chair Smith believes #5 should not be included. The voters decided to require annexation and this would be asking them to overrule their decision. Ideally, he would like to have expedited annexations for job development too, but expedited annexations for R-4 should be done first, demonstrating that this step it can be done successfully.

David Beam referred to page 18, stating that R-4 land could be annexed under Action item B-5.

Chair Smith asked everyone to think more about this issue. He would like to see the committee unanimous on their decisions before presenting it to the City Council.

David Beam suggested placing #5 under the City Comprehensive Plan policies. (pp. 5 – 7)

Charlie Harris would like to see the promotion of public transit in the City in order to connect transit and affordable housing.

David Beam stated the basis structure of the City is already created and the possibility of redeveloping the core of the City to higher density is limited.

David Beam reviewed the suggested strategies from the committee: the following policies to be added include: employer assisted housing, tying jobs with housing, and promote public transit for employees to the workplace.

## **VI. REVIEW OF DRAFT ACTION PLAN STRATEGIES:**

David Beam stated that the draft strategies in the meeting packet (pp. 5 – 25) are the heart of the action plan. It would be good if decisions on these strategies were made prior to the public open house. He then referred to Action #1 on page 5 referring to the need for policies/goals to encourage affordable housing.

David Beam referred to a handout map that Barton Brierley prepared. The map illustrates the properties that the committee members identified at a previous meeting that should be considered for zoning/rezoning to high or medium density residential.

Chair Smith recalled during the earlier discussion of these parcels that not many opportunities were found. Even if all of the identified parcels were changed, it still would not solve the affordable housing problem.

David Beam referred to the bottom of page 10, A1 #7 regarding reduced minimum lot sizes. Barton Brierley brought up the suggestion made by Charlie Harris in a previous meeting. Charlie feels that lot sizes for all the residential zones should be reduced as a general standard throughout the City, not just as flexible development standard.

Chair Smith believes developers Mike Willcuts and Mike Gougler, as well as Leonard Rydell would be in favor of smaller lot sizes across the board as a general standard. Numbers 1 – 6 would still be under the Flexible Development Standards. However, the view by the general public on this type of change needs to be heard as well.

Julie Codiga sees this working for a new subdivision, but wouldn't work for infill properties. Existing surrounding neighbor would probably not like the higher density.

Rick Rogers believes the only way to redevelop properties with higher densities is by reducing lot size. He can't see anything significant occurring in the City core without that happening.

Bob Ficker stated the hotel opening in August will create 165 new jobs. Having the housing for those employees hasn't been addressed as of yet.

Denise Bacon replied there should be enough people unemployed in Newberg who will be taking those jobs.

Bob Ficker asked where the employees will live if they have minimum wage jobs.

As far as annexations, he doesn't believe there should be a voting process involved at all. Qualified City Staff should be able to make that decision. Having shovel-ready land doesn't help with the housing problem.

Charlie Harris asked if the Austins had a response in regards to housing/Allison question.

Barton Brierley explained the Austins stated there would be single-family and multi-family apartments throughout the development.

Bob Ficker stated it's not the Austins responsibility to provide housing.

Rick Rogers replied it is the City's job as part of attracting the business.

Chair Smith stated the City needs to create to a plan that makes sense. He then asked should the smaller lot standards be a general policy? All in attendance agreed it should be done.

David Beam replied it could be listed as a general action item. The Planning Commission should look at all the residential minimum lot sizes and look for ways to reduce them. The recommendation should be without a specific number attached to it.

Joel Perez asked why neighbors are not happy with smaller lot sizes.

Chair Smith replied some believe it hurts their property value in some way.

Bob Ficker explained that an appraiser looks to see if a particular property conforms to those of the general neighborhood.

Julie Codiga stated that coming up with standards for medium and high residential areas for greater density is good. However, there still isn't enough of these types of zoned lands. Therefore, these properties will be expensive for the developer to buy.

Chair Smith stated if this is adopted policy across the board; it increases the possibility of higher density everywhere. It gives the landowners in the City more choice to increase density on their own property.

Charlie Harris stated narrower street widths would certainly increase density. The current street widths are 32 feet. Mr. Harris did some research and found 28 foot widths allows enough access room for emergency vehicles.

Chair Smith said the Planning Commission has heard on numerous occasions that the Newberg street widths are too wide. He then clarified Mr. Harris was referring to page 11, #iv2 under Street and Sidewalk Standards.

Also, Charlie Harris had done some research on deed restrictions. The Title Companies and Lawyers he heard from all had no problem with deed restrictions.

David Beam referred to page 16 (d) and asked how long they should be kept affordable. The less time the restriction the more you have to replenish the affordable housing stock.

Charlie Harris' experience in affordable housing is 15 years goes by very quickly. Twenty years is a typical figure. Twenty-five years is a reasonable time. The committee was in agreement

David Beam referred to page 19 concerning modifying the driveway standard to allow more than two lots per driveway.

Chair Smith asked Barton the history on how Newberg chose two lots per driveway.

Barton Brierley explained some points: One point is private streets in the community. The Planning Commission and City Council have said they don't want private streets because of gates which separate communities. The other point concerned the maintenance of private streets. When its time to pave, the private property owners the feel that their street is no longer private and City should do the work. The private owners don't want to pay for the work. Also, inappropriate parking on a private street can technically be taken care of by Police, but they are reluctant to do so. Private streets can create much animosity in certain neighborhoods.



**VII. DISCUSSION OF OPEN HOUSE – February 24<sup>th</sup> or 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009:**

David Beam asked the committee which date would work out for the Open House. February 24, 2009 was decided upon.

Charlie Harris asked if the committee should have a meeting beforehand in order to organize the workshop. The committee decided to meet on February 19, 2009 to help prepare for the Open House.

Chair Smith stated the project background should be clearly presented at the Open House.

Barton Brierley explained the general purpose of the Open House is to show the public where we are today, list the strategies, and have the public come and give us their comments and ideas.

David Beam stated comment sheets would be available for the public.

Rick Rogers expressed some concern on what the Ad Hoc Committee's role should be in terms of politics. *Mr. Rogers asked staff to prepare an answer on how much affordable housing would be generated based on the strategies discussed and implemented by this committee.* *RB*

Chair Smith replied this committee has some persuading to do with the community. It's important to be open for communications from the public. It's a democracy and protesters should be heard at City Council.

**VIII. OTHER BUSINESS: None.**

**IX. ADJOURN:** Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 9:06.

Approved by the Ad Hoc Committee this 19<sup>th</sup> day of February 2009.

AYES: 7

NO: 0

ABSTAIN: 0  
(list names)

ABSENT: 3

Gaugler  
Russell  
Willcuts

*Dawn Karen Beville*  
Ad Hoc Committee Recording Secretary

*Philip T Smith* 2/19/09  
Ad Hoc Committee Chair Date