

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**June 19, 2014 7:00 PM**  
**NEWBERG PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (401 EAST THIRD STREET)**

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chair Art Smith called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**II. ROLL CALL**

|                  |                                     |             |              |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Members Present: | Art Smith, Chair                    | Cathy Stuhr | Philip Smith |
|                  | Gary Bliss                          |             | Jason Dale   |
|                  | Luis Saavedra, Student Commissioner |             |              |

Members Absent: Matt Fortner and Allyn Edwards (both excused)

Staff Present: Steve Olson, Interim Planning & Building Director

**III. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chair Smith opened and closed public testimony as there was no one to testify.

**IV. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING:**

1. APPLICANT: Brown/Nielsen  
REQUEST: Subdivision/variance for Shellie Park (21 lots)  
LOCATION: 735 N. College Street  
TAX LOT: 3218DB-2300, -2600, -700  
FILE NO.: SUB3-14-005/VAR-14-002  
CRITERIA: 15.235.060 and 15.215.040
- ORDER NO.: 2014-16

Steve Olson, Interim Planning & Building Director, received an email from Lee Leighton confirming in writing they were extending the time period of the 120 day rule by 31 days. This was a continuation of the public hearing to discuss the findings further. A final decision would be made in July. There were no changes or additions to the staff report. He suggested modifying the findings one by one.

The Commission went through the findings and conditions and made edits and additions to the language. The following discussion was on the main points and changes.

There was discussion regarding how to state that an additional future street plan was not required for this proposal. It was suggested that the only way to have a street plan was by requiring the purchase and change of already developed properties. It would also encumber future actions should one of the surrounding properties want to develop. There was clarification that the proposed plan was the future street plan because there were no other viable options. The modification to the first two sentences of the first finding was as follows: The proposed plan was the future street plan for the area. The subdivision was surrounded by developed property.

There was discussion regarding whether or not to require a curbside sidewalk. There was consensus to allow curbside sidewalks on the future development of the two tax lots to the south. There were underdeveloped properties south of the site fronting Illinois. Currently City Code allowed for a shared driveway on these types of lots, so the development pattern was reasonable because it would not create additional access points. Additional access points would not be needed if flag lots were created. The Development Code allowed up to three lots to share a driveway.

It needed to be added to the conditions that the sewer for Lots 20 and 21 were not shown on the documents. The applicant shall come up with a plan for utilities to serve Lot 21. The utility plan would include storm water.

The Planning Commission found that the engineering department comments were relevant. There was discussion regarding the subdivision design and that it would have additional, not better, connectivity if it extended to College Street. Because College Street was a minor arterial the access spacing standards in the Development Code required a new street to be at least 300 feet from Mission Drive, however an extension of Rentfro Way would only be 230 feet from Mission Drive. In addition, a Rentfro extension would only be slightly offset from Ella Court on the east side of College. The spacing standards in the Code required the street to either align with the other one or be offset by 100 feet. The other connections would cause negative impacts and would be a taking because all of the surrounding properties were already developed. Requiring a street plan that extended to Illinois would create a negative impact for already developed properties.

Regarding sidewalks, the sidewalk to the west was not practical because of the angle and visibility. The applicant proposed public walkways to bring the subdivision as close to standards as reasonable. The walkway to Clifford Court should not be built because it was narrow, long, and angled. The Planning Commission found that the comments from ODOT were applicable.

There was further discussion regarding the long cul-de-sac street language. It was feasible to subdivide the property without creating a future street plan that would result in negative impacts to currently developed property along Illinois. The Commission wanted the tax lot numbers inserted instead of saying they were adjacent skinny parcels. Language was suggested to say "subdividing the existing R-1 zone site without a variance to cul-de-sac standards would require a. an access to College which would not happen due to ODOT requirements and the offset and b. an access to Illinois through the developed lots which had a negative impact. The only way to provide access and connectivity was through a long cul-de-sac." They also wanted to remove language about this being an infill project. This R-1 property differed from most other R-1 properties in the City in that it had access from only one City street and was surrounded by developed properties. Granting of the variance would not be detrimental and had no negative impact on neighboring properties. The Commission wanted to add a sentence saying this variance avoided producing a traffic plan that would be injurious to neighboring properties.

For the conditions, the Commission wanted to add storm water and sewer for Lot 21. There was discussion regarding how the storm water system would be maintained.

Mr. Steve Olson said staff would finalize the changes and the Planning Commission would make the decision at the next meeting.

## **V. ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

1. Update on Council items: Mr. Steve Olson reviewed what had happened at the last Council meeting including discussion on increasing the hotel tax and fire and police contract negotiations. There was a new City Manager and the budget had been passed.
2. Other reports, letters or correspondence: None.
3. Next Planning Commission meeting: July 10, 2014

## **VI. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

None.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.

Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this 8 day of January, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Minutes Recorder

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Chair