



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

May 26, 2005

7 p.m. Special Meeting

Newberg Public Safety Building

401 E. Third Street

TO BE APPROVED AT THE JULY 14, 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

I. ROLL CALL:

Present: Chair Smith Nick Tri Maston Haug Louis Larson

Absent: Daniel Foster Devorah Overbay

Staff Present: Barton Brierley, Planning and Building Director
Elaine Taylor, Associate Planner
Kathleen Bochart, Recording Secretary

II. OPENING:

Chair Smith opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of the December 4, 2003 minutes.

MOTION: Tri/Haug to approve the May 12, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes 3
Yes/0 No Motion Carried

2. Appoint a Vice Chair.

MOTION: Tri/Larson to appoint Matston Haug as Vice Chair 3 Yes/0 No Motion Carried

IV. COMMUNICATION FROM THE FLOOR

None.

V. WORKSHOPS

1. Industrial Zoning Workshop

Ms. Elaine Taylor, Associate Planner presented staff report. The purposes are to make more efficient use of existing industrial land base, to reduce potential for land use conflict, and to update outdated language and uses. The proposal uses simplified use categories so it is easier to use. She outlined the differences between the current code and the proposed revisions. The current code is outdated. It lists specific uses. The proposed code is modernized. It lists characteristics and is easier to address compatibility issues. It is more performance-oriented: it can set specific development standards for each zone to address off-site impacts.

Mr. Haug asked if the proposal had quantitative data on terms like “few customers come to site.” He would like to define these terms.

Mr. Martin Keller 1102 N. Springbrook #152: I have an auto detailing service. Where would you classify that as? Currently we are in a light industrial zone.

Mr. Brierley said that in the new codes it would be vehicle repair (M-2).

Mr. Haug said that once the new code is finished he would like to see a list of businesses and which category they fall into. He said he was concerned about the compatibility of industrial uses with surrounding uses. He thinks the public needs to be involved in these important decisions.

Mr. Larson said he liked the idea of having some discretion for a business like Milgard Windows, which has a retail showroom, but is primarily an industrial use.

Mr. Haug said he was worried it was a step back into ambiguity.

Chair Smith said heavy manufacturers would have to meet standards. He questioned why truck stops were allowed: they are very customer oriented.

Mr. Haug said that we may need to change the zoning of some properties to meet these new classifications.

Mr. Haug said he would want to have a conditional use permit before any use is allowed in M-4. The public should be involved, because these uses could have major impacts on the community. Going through the public review process can enhance the final product. This is not possible if the process is strictly administrative. The M-4 should not be allowed to be subdivided into small lots with commercial uses. The community needs a chance to voice concerns.

Mr. Keller said a large hospital, like Pepperdine University, should be allowed in M-4. Vehicle repair ought to be allowed in M-3.

Mr. Larson asked if any other cities had this same type of zoning. Have we looked at Wilsonville, Tualatin, and Tigard?

Ms. Taylor said that the code presented was closely modeled after Portland’s zoning code.

Mr. Larson said Portland is known as being anti-business.

Mr. Haug said what is missing in this discussion is how to protect residential neighborhoods. There needs to be more definition in the rules. There needs to be buffers between industrial and residential uses.

Dylan Roberts, 804 Crestview Dr. said that in Beaverton they have Intel sites which produce lots of noise and light pollution, they are considered M-4, I believe that there should be at least a M-3 zone around an M-4 zone.

Mr. Smith commented that this is just a workshop. Now that we have heard the proposed code, staff can go back and work on another draft and then take it to the City Council.

Ron Halstead 2301 Jodi Court. Asked where his cabinet shop business with 2 employees and a 10,000 sq ft building would be under.

Mr. Brierley said that it would light industrial and would be under either M-1 or M-2.

Chair Smith called for a 5 minute break at 8:35p.m.

2. Development Review Processes Workshop

Mr. Brierley presented the staff report. He indicated that this was a result of a Planning Commission request to look at areas in the code where there might be increased citizen involvement. The City Council asked the Planning Commission for recommendations. He outlined the various development processes (Type I- Type IV). He outlined other options that are not currently in use, such as a hearings officer, development review board, or request for hearing. Zone changes require Type III process with Planning Commission recommendation and City Council hearing. Exceptions are the institutional zone near GFU, and Springbrook Oaks Specific Plan modifications. Subdivisions generally follow a Type II process. There are exceptions, such as subdivisions within a stream corridor that that require a Type III. For Type II subdivisions, any neighbor, during the public comment period, can request that a hearing be held on the subdivision. Code adjustment are Type I: Variances are Type II. Type II applications take 4-6 weeks and have about \$400 extra cost. Type III's take 6-8 weeks and have about \$1200 extra cost.

Mr. Larson said he felt it was important for the public to be involved in review of subdivisions. There have been several subdivisions in the Crater Lane area, and none of them have had hearings. Subdivisions should all have hearings. The notices that are sent out are unintelligible. Ideally, neighbors would get together to discuss the development. He thinks it would be a good idea for a group of people to look at subdivision designs and then comment on the looks and possibly make changes. That way they "buy in" to the design. It also puts pressure on the development department to watch the design.

Mr. Haug proposed that all subdivisions over 8-lots require hearings, and that we increase the notice area an extra 100 feet.

Mr. Larson said all subdivisions should be Type IIIs.

Mr. Haug proposed that specific plans can't have administrative zone changes. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Larson would like the idea of a design review committee to look at commercial buildings and apartment buildings.

Mr. Haug said that it would have to be a group of qualified people, who are appointed by the city council. It should include at least one staff member. A member of the design review committee also could be a Planning Commissioner.

Mr. Tri said that it would be a good idea to have someone from City Council on the design review committee.

Mr. Haug said that a few years back a point system was put together for multi-family units. It was based on

a lot of visuals. One could be developed for subdivisions. Points could be given for having porches, installing landscaping, or preserving trees.

Mr. Smith said that he agrees with a lot of what is being said. He believes that points should be given for keeping historical landmarks.

Mr. Haug said that there will be flexibility in the point system. If something doesn't work then there will be options given to raise your points up.

Mr. Smith said that this is where the citizen review board might be a problem. Many people may think that the city is trying to "run" their property and that it is a road block between a citizen and the use of his property. Other than that, he believes this is a good idea.

Mr. Haug said that he believes this should be for residential land only.

Mr. Larson said infill development should add value to the community.

Mr. Smith is concerned about the citizen review board and multi-family homes. Mr. Smith asked if there was any land set aside for multi-family houses.

Mr. Brierley said that there is very little land available right now. There have been few if any multi-family developments in the past few years.

Mr. Haug said livability will decrease with density. He asked when the land north of the northern arterial would be developed?

Mr. Brierley said that a plan will be created in the next year.

Mr. Brierley said that it appears the Planning Commission has identified several possible actions, some where there are some choices to be made. He understands that the Planning Commission would like staff to prepare a specific draft including the options discussed and bring that back to the Planning Commission for a hearing.

Chair Smith asked that staff prepare the draft.

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Mr Brierley said the City Council has finally adopted the Transportation System Plan. Planning Commission's next meeting is June 9th. You will be having a hearing on a subdivision. The City Council would like to look at specific language on parking in planter strips.

VIII. ADJOURN:

Adjourned at 10:55

Approved by the Planning Commission this 14th day of July, 2005.

AYES:

6

NO:

0

ABSENT:

1

(List Name)

Haug

ABSTAIN:

0

(List Name)

DUBOIS

Planning Recording Secretary

DAN B. KING, JR

Print Name

14 JULY 05

Date