

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Newberg Public Safety Building - Newberg, Oregon
THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 1998 AT 7 P.M.

Approved at the September 10, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting

I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

Stephen Ashby
Myrna Miller

Steve Hannum
Warren Parrish

Matson Haug

Absent: Paula Fowler

Lon Wall

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, City Planner
Barbara Mingay, Planning Technician
David Beam, Economic Development Coordinator/Planning
Peggy Hall, Recording Secretary

II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Miller opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m. She announced the procedure of testimony. Citizens must fill out a public comment registration form to speak at the meeting.

III. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR (5 minute maximum per person)

None

Barton Brierley reviewed the Commission's request for additional information concerning historic preservation.

IV. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

A. Mary Post on Historic Preservation

Mary Post, President of Newberg Historic Preservation Society, said she was a member on the Planning Commission when the City adopted the historic preservation ordinance. Ms. Post reviewed the following:

1. Historic District. Impact on the community is financial as well as promoting community pride. Ms. Post mentioned Oregon City's policies on historic districts. They are involved in setting up the process and the Board. Residents are an integral part of a historic neighborhood - they get involved. They have seen added increase in property values. Increase in tourism dollars - museums, walking tours, etc. They also promote pride in ownership. Newberg's historic areas involve the downtown core area and the areas around George Fox University. Ms. Post discussed the City's involvement in the historic process.

2. Historic Review Board vs. Planning Commission. Ms. Post stated that she knows how the Planning Commission developed into the present historic preservation ordinance. The Commission listened to problems dealing with changes to historic structures, dealing with the City's existing ordinances. While on the Planning Commission, she voted to have the Planning Commission maintain its historic sites. Ms. Post said that she remembers she and fellow Commissioner Jack Kriz were the only Planning Commission members who voted against the Planning Commission being the Historic Review Board. The Historic Review Board would assist the property owners through the process. Oregon City adopted general guidelines, which included neighbors, residents of the City (volunteers), who have the expertise to review such properties (historians, landscape architects, restored homes, architects, etc.), and a person at large from the City. The Review Board helps with the designs of the outside architecture. Everything goes through the Review Board, except minuscule or specific issues. The work of the Review

Board is important to maintain the value of the historic district. Many of the decisions are common sense, the Board guides the applicant through the process. The Board members are professional. The purpose is to restore the historic character of the structure. The Oregon City Review Board holds forums and workshops to help those interested in restoring historic homes. Ms. Post said she would recommend that the Commission invite Mr. Dan Fowler from the Oregon City Historic Review Board to talk on how the Review Board has impacted the City of Oregon City.

Commissioner Parrish thanked Ms. Post for the presentation and inquired about the criteria used in designating a historic property. Ms. Post noted that the State has its own guidelines.

Mr. Brierley said that the Kent State campus is historic because of events that happened. There are other issues he said recent events could also serve as criteria for historic designation dealing with structures for properties that are of an architectural value.

Ms. Post said that if they are on the inventory, they still go through the Historic Review Board and have to meet certain criteria.

Discussion was held concerning historic homes having carports and garages. Ms. Post said she has a garage which was constructed similar to that of her home. Commissioner Parrish discussed the Development Code's language dealing with historic preservation/construction. Ms. Post said that when the historic inventory was originally developed, some properties were eliminated for various reasons due to hardship, etc. The Historic Review Board would assist with free consultations that would not be such a burden for the property owners to maintain their properties in accordance with the historic preservation requirements. Additional discussion was held concerning tax advantages. The City codes allow for non-payment of building permit fees for properties that are on the historic inventory. The Review Board helping the property owners would be a positive image for the City.

Commissioner Haug said he hoped that the Planning Commission would take a positive direction, agree to identify the economic advantages and pro-active interest and allow for neighborhood input. All would be a significant benefit to the general welfare of the City.

Chair Miller suggested that planning staff place the matter on the agenda in order to expand the discussion. **Mr. David Beam** said that the downtown core area may also be interested in the process. Discussion was held concerning holding a public hearing. Ms. Post offered her assistance in promoting and encouraging historic preservation. Discussion was held on the procedure in developing the Review Board, the Planning Commission and the City Council's involvement. Commissioner Haug discussed citizen and public input and providing appropriate notice to let people know of the historic preservation process.

Discussion was held concerning the historic district language in the Development Code and how the Planning Commission could instigate action to be reviewed and considered by the City Council. Chair Miller said her perspective is that right now, it is one of the responsibilities given to the Planning Commission. That decision making was given to the Planning Commission by the City Council. The Commission can discuss the issues, listen to public opinion and entertain speakers. They would still be recommending proposals to the City Council. The Council can decide to have the Planning Commission retain responsibility or take it away and appoint a historic review board.

Commissioner Haug said he would like to raise the awareness of the contribution to the economic value to the downtown area in general. He suggested that David Beam ask the Downtown Redevelopment Committee to consider asking Dan Fowler to come and discuss historic preservation with the group.

Discussion was held concerning negative input in the past (generally from business owners) and emotionalism at City Council meetings concerning historic preservation and the inventory.

Commissioner Parrish agreed the City needs to preserve historic districts, historic resources, buildings and houses.

Discussion was held concerning having the issue rise out of the community, with leadership from the downtown commission. Further discussion was held concerning the City Council initiating the action. Commissioner Haug recommended that the Commission ask David Beam to initiate discussion and setup a meeting inviting Dan Fowler from Oregon City. The meeting would involve the City Council, and the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ashby noted that the idea should be palatable in order to keep it alive. Commissioner Haug said he saw a sense of viability, etc.

Commissioner Hannum said that unless someone stirs up the water and get players to take ownership to push through encouragement and momentum, nothing would happen.

Commissioner Parrish discussed page 8 of the Comprehensive Plan concerning encouragement of historic inventories and updates with new information, historic resources, museum and national historic site (Hoover-Minthorn House). Ms. Mingay said there is no city museum. Commissioner Parrish said the City could do more. Discussion was held concerning the willingness of the property owners to fulfil the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan language. Additional discussion was held concerning funding for required remodeling and the hampering of flexibility.

Mr. David Beam discussed the appointment of the Downtown Redevelopment Committee members by the City Council. He will bring up the issue of the historic district with the Downtown Redevelopment Committee.

Motion #1:	Haug/Ashby to ask the Economic Development/City Planner (David Beam) to discuss with the Downtown Redevelopment Committee at their next meeting, inviting Dan Fowler or a similar historic preservation presenter, to discuss and evaluate the value of the historic homes, downtown core area and historic buildings. Mr. Beam is to find some venue in getting the topic out for citizen discussion. To include all interested parties who have shown an interest, as well as the general public in order to be informed, aware and be able to participate in the process.
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #1:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
---------------------------	---

Mr. Beam indicated that Ms. Post offered assistance through the historical society.

Chair Miller said to include all people that either own historic property or are interested in historical properties. Mr. Beam said he would bring up the matter with the Downtown Redevelopment Commission at their next meeting.

Chair Miller said that a target date for the meeting would be October/November, but not to be scheduled during the holidays.

II. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS (#1)

1. APPLICANT: City of Newberg (*CONTINUED FROM 8/13/98 MEETING*)
REQUEST: Approval of an ordinance amending the Newberg Comprehensive Plan policies and Comprehensive Plan Map, and amending the Newberg Development Code and Zoning Map relating to residential needs.
LOCATION: City wide
FILE NO: GR-2-95
CRITERIA: NDC 10.20.030
RESOLUTION NO.: 97-80

Abstentions/ex-parte contact: None.

Objections: None.

Staff Report: Ms. Mingay presented the staff report addressing mobile home and manufactured home parks, parking and historic landmarks.

Item #1:

Commissioner Parrish discussed the development standards (matrix). Ms. Mingay said it was the consensus to adopt the matrix and at the end, staff will compile what was and was not selected. Staff recommendations are marked with an (*).

Commissioner Parrish asked if these standards will be retroactive. Ms. Mingay said there will not be retroactive changes.

Commissioner Haug addressed the language in 5(A) concerning allowance for no more than 4 feet and concerns about aesthetics dealing with shielding and the impact of livability. Ms. Mingay said the language is from a recommendation within the residential needs guidelines.

Public Testimony: None.

Public Agency reports: None.

Letters: None.

Staff Recommendation: Ms. Mingay said it was staff's recommendation to approve the changes.

Hearing Closed.

Commission Deliberation:

Discussion was held concerning styles and ages of homes that are allowed in manufactured home parks which are not allowed in other residential areas. Discussion was held concerning manufactured homes being allowed in city areas once they have a foundation.

Commissioner Ashby inquired about arborvitae used as fencing and security. Why mandating a masonry wall versus chain link which is more affordable? Mr. Brierley said that there are issues with quality. Ms. Mingay addressed longevity and aging of fencing.

Commissioner Hannum discussed shared driveways and moving houses on the lots. Secondly, if they have a shared driveway, keeping in mind lot spacing, then there would be two shared living walls and the impact and affect on livability. Mr. Brierley said the units are set up in a special way (doors are on one side, it is natural to have carports being on the right or left side)

Ms. Mingay said that the section deals with design standards for adding and enhancing the appearance of the community. Not necessarily intended for a costs saving benefit as much as they are to improve aesthetics.

Commissioner Haug said he was concerned about livability and impacts of manufactured housing development. The development lots are maximized and yard space is limited. Requiring a certain amount of joint driveway is a positive benefit.

Commissioner Hannum addressed the comment about putting the manufactured home on the lot, he saw typically a canopy or carport so they are going to be butting the carports up against each other. Discussion was held concerning what the consequences are in redesigning the exterior aesthetics and how it involves and could possibly affect livability.

Chair Miller said that in most of the manufactured homes being developed, the owners dictate the criteria that all of the owners/properties have to meet. If the City would say shared driveways, they could designate to the owners that there are certain criteria in addressing modifications. Discussion was held

concerning "curb-cuts" which are actually bumpers with openings where the sidewalks go up to the steps (which include the walk-ways).

Commissioners Ashby and Miller discussed conflicts that arise due to additional cars utilizing the shared driveways and the safety hazards involving children.

Commissioner Parrish also expressed concerns involving conflict.

Chair Miller said she presently resides in a mobile home that has a shared driveway. Difficulties arise in the use of shared driveways.

Commissioner Haug said that he has a home on the coast and he shared problems he has had dealing with easements and driveways. Commissioner Haug said there are benefits in sharing a common driveway rather than constructing another separate driveway.

Commissioner Parrish expressed concerns about resolving issues with the mobile home owners and working out issues with them and the park manager.

Motion #2:	Haug/Hannum to delete option 4 as recommended by staff.
-------------------	--

Amended Motion #2:	Haug/Ashby to add the language at the end of the sentence: "shall be recommended".
---------------------------	---

Discussion was held concerning "encouraging" and by deleting the entire paragraph, it would leave open the option.

Commissioner Hannum said that he is not convinced that the shared driveway is that advantageous. The carport is a semi-private space.

Commissioner Parrish asked staff why there should be a shared driveway. Ms. Mingay said that the language added is presented by the changes recommended as a result of information obtained through the residential needs analysis preference survey.

Vote on Motion #2 as amended:	5 No/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]. Motion failed.
--------------------------------------	---

Vote on Original Motion #2:	5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]. Motion carried.
------------------------------------	---

Chair Miller called for a break at 8:50 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:55 p.m.

Item #5 (perimeter fencing):

Commissioner Haug expressed concerns in using appropriate fencing, height standards, and other existing standards using masonry walls and arborvitae. Discussion was held concerning maximum height of 4 feet being changed to a maximum of 6 feet masonry wall.

Commissioner Parrish discussed health and safety issues (brush fires, damage), relating to separation of adjacent parcels. In the event of fires, such areas would have a perimeter wall constructed. Agreed with Commissioner Haug's statements concerning extending the height requirements.

Commissioner Ashby expressed concerns over psychological barriers with people that live in manufactured home parks and the rest of the community, such as restricting open-ness to the public. Discuss options concerning landscaping alternatives. He did not think the cost would be that much of a concern.

Chair Miller stated that brick walls are also sound buffers. Further comments were made addressing restricting

Motion #3:	Haug/Parrish to change the language: "A masonry wall, not less than 4 feet, no more than 6 feet in height, shall be built around the perimeter of the park..."
-------------------	---

Commissioner Haug discussed issues dealing with abutting walls and appropriate landscaping requirements.

Commissioner Parrish said he disagreed with Commissioner Haug's statements. He would like to see that it remain around the whole perimeter. Mr. Brierley reviewed item (B) concerning landscaping areas.

Commissioner Ashby said he had no objections.

Commissioner Hannum said it provides a means of preventing people from wandering within the community.

Vote on Motion #3:	5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]. Motion carried.
---------------------------	---

Ms. Mingay said that staff will renumber the paragraphs accordingly.

Item #2 - Parking:

Ms. Mingay addressed parking changes and staff's recommendations. Ms. Mingay said she originally opposed any changes to reduce the number of parking spaces. Ms. Mingay then said she agreed with the consultant's approved changes. Ms. Mingay also addressed residential uses (6).

Commissioner Hannum asked for a sense of the distribution of the studios, one bedrooms, two bedrooms, etc. Mr. Brierley noted that some complexes generally offer 1-2-3 bedrooms to catch the eyes of the market. Further discussion was held concerning a mix of dwelling units and the additional parking requirements.

Commissioner Ashby expressed concerns about reducing parking and addressed allowed and increasing densities. Ms. Mingay said that with aesthetic improvements and by reducing the number of parking spaces, it would allow for more green space.

Chair Miller discussed row houses, curb-cuts and a reduction of blacktop/parking lots.

Commissioner Haug said he feels we need more off-street parking, high quality design, maximum number of parking spaces and landscaping. Discussion was held concerning requirements for garage setbacks. Suggest that we keep the requirements as high as we can for livability and aesthetics.

Motion #4:	Hannum/Haug to strike the words: "1 for each dwelling unit with one bedroom" and keeping the remaining changes.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #4:	(5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]. The motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	--

Motion #5:	Haug/Parrish to leave the language as is and not accept the changes (removing the italicized additions).
-------------------	---

Commissioner Haug clarified his concerns in addressing off street parking and unacceptable designs.

Commissioner Hannum questioned some row houses (neo-traditional) which minimize garages, ways of dealing with design and handling alternatives.

Ms. Mingay discussed design standards that meet the criteria (for anything greater than duplexes). Discussion was held concerning the controlling document that would allow these changes with landscaping options.

Commissioner Haug said that some houses around George Fox University (GFU) have been converted to fraternity houses which involve numerous cars and parking problems. Without adding the changes, it will correct itself.

Chair Miller said tri-plexes and row houses have not been addressed. Discussion was held concerning attached/detached units and addressing 3 and 4 family dwelling units as well.

Commissioner Haug addressed landscaping issues in allowing for central parking and the driveways would be filled with cars, and take away the livability of the area. He said it would not be as aesthetically pleasing as what it would be left alone. If allowed, it would open up clutter in the streets.

Discussion was held concerning clarification in allowing more units to have front driveways.

Chair Miller talked about the northwest Portland area having 4-5 plexes with fronts with entrances and garages (greater use of infill in the area, trees and it is pleasing to the eye, not otherwise providing on-street parking).

Commissioner Haug said that there are too many cars between the property and the streets.

Ms. Mingay said the point system has two different areas to meet standards. The parking issue would be one of the items considered that would be covered under the point system. The front is a setback of 15 feet. Discussion was held concerning landscaping issues.

Commissioner Haug suggested a compromise: 3-4 family dwelling units, provide for garages (and not just parking spots) - avoid cluttering.

Discussion was held concerning "required front yards". Mr. Brierley said that the parking space cannot be within the 15 feet setback area. Single family and duplexes are excepted from this requirement. With 3-4 family tri-plex or duplex, it would not allow parking in the driveway. Ms. Mingay said that in residential areas, the restriction is 15 feet setback. The parking area is not to be used as a driveway. Ms. Mingay provided the following alternatives:

Parking areas for residential uses shall not be located in a required front yard, except those required in conjunction with attached and detached single family or two family dwellings; and 3-4 family dwelling units with garages.

Commissioner Hannum provided additional changes. Further discussion was held concerning

alternatives, RV parking in front, etc. Commissioner Hannum also addressed his neighbor's existing RV parking.

Ms. Mingay said that you cannot park in 3-4 unit structure driveways. It would be illegal to park in front of a garage if this language is not adopted.

Amendment Motion #5:	Miller/Ashby to have staff clarify the language amendments and come up with a resolution for the changes addressed by the Commission.
-----------------------------	--

Mr. Brierley stated that staff will bring back changes.

Vote on Amendment #5:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
------------------------------	--

Motion #6:	Haug/Ashby to table the discussion to the next meeting (September 10, 1998).
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #6:	The motion carried. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
---------------------------	---

Motion #7:	Haug/Hannum to table remaining issues.
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #7:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
---------------------------	---

Ms. Mingay presented residential needs handout and process. Ms. Mingay requested that the remaining items be continued to the next meeting.

Commissioner Haug expressed concerns in not receiving the population growth calculations and not being able to address other issues. Discussion was held concerning urban reserve areas and the capacity and the request for staff presentations to better understand the status of the City's growth.

Chair Miller suggested that the Commission also review the appropriate mapping.

Commissioner Parrish asked about the status of the NUAMC agreement. Mr. Brierley said that negotiations are still on-going and will be focused on the urban reserve area.

PUBLIC HEARINGS (#2)

2. **APPLICANT:** City of Newberg (*CONTINUED FROM 4/23/98 MEETING*)
 REQUEST: Approval of an ordinance amending the Newberg Comprehensive Plan and Newberg Development Code relating to street standards, as required for compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule.
 LOCATION: City wide
 FILE NO: GR-4-95 **RESOLUTION NO.:** 97-83
 CRITERIA: NDC 10.20.030

Motion #8:	Parrish/Haug to continue the hearing on the transportation meeting to the 24th of September, 1998.
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #8:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
---------------------------	--

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

- A. Update on Council items
- B. Other reports, letters, or correspondence
- C. Next Planning Commission Meeting, September 10, 1998

Mr. Brierley discussed Commissioner Ashby's excused absence due to classes at George Fox University. The Commission's second meeting in September and October could be held on Wednesday nights rather than Thursday nights.

Motion #9:	Haug/Hannum to have the second meeting of the Commission to be held on the 4 th Wednesday of the month through December.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #9:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
---------------------------	--

Mr. Brierley reviewed the City Council meeting and the candidates for the positions of Mayor and City Council for the upcoming election. Discussion was held concerning eliminating some issues on the Commission's calendar (now to all be legislative issues).

VII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Parrish asked staff how to approach City Council on the issues of cul-de-sacs and private streets. Mr. Brierley said it was scheduled for a discussion at the second meeting in September for the City Council.

Commissioner Haug suggested planned joint meetings with the City Council in January, 1999.

Motion #10:	Haug/Ashby to have staff initiate a joint meeting with the City Council at the 4 th Thursday in January and the 4 th Thursday in June, 1999.
--------------------	---

Vote on Motion #10:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
----------------------------	--

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Motion #11:	Haug/Hannum to adjourn at 10:40 p.m.
--------------------	---

Vote on Motion #11:	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent [Fowler/Wall]).
----------------------------	--

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this 10th day of September, 1998.

AYES: 5

NO:

ABSTAIN:
(list names)

ABSENT: (Ashby/Miller)

ATTEST:



Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature

Peggy R. Hall
Print Name

September 10, 1998
Date