

NEWBERG PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
May 11, 2017, 7:00 PM
PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (401 E. THIRD STREET)

Chair PC Jason Dale called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jason Dale, Chair
Allyn Edwards
Cathy Stuhr
Gary Bliss
Ron Wolfe
Patricia Watson

Members Absent: Miranda Piros, Student, excused
Philip Smith, excused

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Steve Olson, Senior Planner
Brad Allen, Assistant Planner
Bobbie Morgan, Office Assistant II

Also Present: Mayor Bob Andrews, Ex-Officio

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Approval of the April 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes

MOTION: PC Stuhr/PC Watson moved to approve the April 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes. The motion carried (6 Yes/ 0 No).

NEW BUSINESS:

Storm Water Master Plan: Consider a resolution initiating a Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to incorporate the 2014 Storm Water Master Plan into the Newberg Comprehensive Plan. Resolution 2017-327. File No. CPTA-17-002.

Community Development Director Doug Rux presented the staff report. The Storm Water Master Plan had been updated and adopted in 2014. Storm sewer and storm water plans had to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, such as what was recently done with the Water Master Plan. This was a request to initiate a Comprehensive Plan text amendment, which would likely come back to the Commission in August. Staff recommended adopting the resolution to begin the process. There were no funds budgeted for any consultants to make changes to the document.

MOTION: PC Bliss/PC Wolfe moved to approve Resolution 2017-327. The motion carried (6 Yes / 0 No).

Marijuana-related uses: Consider a resolution initiating a Development Code Amendment to the zoning use table for the Airport Overlay and Bypass Interchange Overlay. Resolution 2017-328. File No. DCA-17-001.

CDD Rux delivered the staff report. The Commission had worked on marijuana regulations previously and as staff went through the process of implementing the regulations, some fixes had been identified that needed to be made. The areas identified were the Airport Overlay and the Bypass Interchange Overlay. The purpose of the Airport Overlay was to protect services for the airport. The purpose of the Bypass Overlay Zone was to protect the capacity of future interchanges that would be there. The types of activities in this zone were industrial. The resolution would initiate a Development Code amendment and this issue would be brought back to the Commission in August.

MOTION: PC Wolfe/PC Watson moved to approve Resolution 2017-328. The motion carried (6 Yes / 0 No).

Annexation/housing policies: Consider a resolution initiating a Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to R-3/annexation policies. Resolution 2017-329. File No. CPTA-17-003

Senior Planner Steve Olson presented the staff report. The Planning Commission had given direction on revising the R-3 annexation policies and this resolution would start the process. Some of the questions to discuss were: should the LDR Comprehensive Plan designation allow a mix of zones, should the designation allow a mix of densities, should the location policies for high density or multi-family be revised to emphasize flexibility and should they state that they were lower priority than the goal of dispersing R-3 throughout the community, how should the words “large” and “some” be defined in the Comprehensive Plan mixed policy, should the size be based on gross acreage or buildable acreage, and should the timing change from requiring R-3 designation at annexation to requiring R-3 at the Urban Growth Boundary amendment. Staff recommended approval of the resolution.

Chair Dale asked that staff provide the consequences for each of the options.

MOTION: PC Stuhr/PC Wolfe moved to approve Resolution 2017-329. The motion carried (6 Yes / 0 No).

WORKSHOP: Residential parking standards & Accessory Dwelling Units

CDD Rux introduced the agenda item. The Commission had discussed these standards, and staff was bringing them back for additional discussion before proceeding with the approval process.

Assistant Planner Brad Allen gave the staff report. There were concerns about the off street parking standards and whether they were sufficient when it came to out of the ordinary developments. The Commission discussed previously whether or not to count garages as part of the minimum off street parking requirement and whether or not to consider this standard for cul-de-sacs only or if it should be applied broadly. They also discussed if the parking requirement should be reduced in the R-2 zone to encourage affordable housing, using car courts as an option, or requiring extra parking per unit on cul-de-sacs, having a mechanism to review the driveway locations when an application came in for a subdivision, and how accessory dwelling units (ADUs) would affect the parking. Currently single family homes had to have two off street parking spaces, and ADUs had to have one off street parking space. He asked if the Commission wanted to focus on standards for cul-de-sacs only where on street parking might be an issue or if it needed to be broader.

CDD Rux added that if the Commission wanted to have the driveway locations included in subdivision applications, it could be added to the current land division regulation update process. An action and implementation plan had been drafted for the UGB expansion project and there were some provisions about efficiency measures which included ADUs. The document stated if ADUs were allowed as an outright permitted use in all residential zones, SDCs would not be charged and off-street parking was not required. This might be a future policy issue.

PC Edwards asked if the Code specified the number of residents allowed in ADUs. SP Olson responded the Building Code regulated the number of people, which did not set a hard limit. There was a definition of family which allowed an unlimited number of related people and a maximum of 5 unrelated people. That was the limit for rentals. PC Edwards thought it would be a parking issue when all 5 people had vehicles.

PC Stuhr said to inhabit the ADU, would the 5 apply to the people in the house and ADU? SP Olson replied it was separated, they could have 5 people in the house and 5 in the ADU. The Code allowed up to 1,000 square feet or half the size of the main unit. One possibility was only allowing smaller ADUs which would inherently limit the parking or a two track system, to allow it as a Type 2 design review in R-2 and as a conditional use permit in R-1. They could create a simplified process for smaller applications to be a Type 1 review if everything was objective and anything larger would be a conditional use and go to the Planning Commission.

PC Edwards was concerned about potential college student housing and potentially each one having their own vehicle. He thought the Commission should make a recommendation to LCDC to fix the rule for parking. It had to be a number of spaces associated with the eligible drivers in the ADU.

PC Bliss asked what the required width was for a single driveway. SP Olson responded for a one car driveway it was a minimum of 12 feet, and for two cars it was a minimum of 20 feet.

PC Stuhr said in the Code, sometimes it said dwelling and other times it said dwelling unit. She thought that needed to be cleared up. She asked if there was a difference between the definitions for multi-family dwellings and multiple single family dwellings on a single lot. AP Allen explained the parking regulations for multi-family dwellings and multiple single family dwellings on a single lot as well as single or two family dwellings. CDD Rux stated the definition of dwelling was a building or portion of a building which was occupied in whole or in part as a home, residence, or sleeping place either permanently or temporarily by one or more families but excluded hotels, motels, and tourist courts. A dwelling unit was a single unit of one or more habitable rooms providing complete independent facilities for occupants including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation.

PC Edwards made reference to the Wynyoski project. The way that cul-de-sac was designed, there was a need to off-set the driveways to allow more off street parking. He did not see that issue being addressed as part of the on street parking credits. AP Allen said there was no standard or requirement for on street parking. There was a credit for multi-family housing, but not for single family. PC Edwards would like that to be included. Where parking was limited, there should be a requirement that the builder designate a parking area to accommodate up to one space per dwelling unit.

Chair Dale said staff was asking for direction on whether or not to count the garage as parking and if it should only be in cul-de-sacs that they were not counted.

PC Bliss thought to not count garages was too limiting. A lot of townhouses and single family homes were being built with only a single car garage. These garages usually did not fit a car because they were full of storage. A townhouse with a single garage still counted as a single family living unit and the Code called for two off street spaces and he thought it should stay that way. He asked if townhomes or projects with certain styles of homes, lot widths and depths, and one car garages, could be conditional use. CDD Rux responded that parking drove the design and there was a townhouse concept that pushed garages back to create two surface spaces outside of the garage. This design would not work for rowhouses. One townhouse could have a garage on one side, and the next townhouse could have a garage on the other side to create space between driveways to have some off street parking. This would affect the design of these dwelling units which could affect cost and affordability.

PC Bliss added the storm drainage master plan was trying to minimize run off and in order to do so, the streets were to be narrowed. As the streets were narrowed, more on street parking was eliminated. If a development was townhomes, could forming a Homeowners Association be required as a means to regulate parking. CDD Rux did not think the City could require that. SP Olson said if a cul-de-sac did not have enough on street parking, it could be put on private property where it was controlled by an HOA. There could also be a parking court as part of the public right-of-way that did not require an HOA. CDD Rux said the problem with that was Public Works would have to maintain it, there would be difficult dimensions for the parking stalls and back out areas, and it would take a lot away from the developer that would otherwise be developed.

CDD Rux said typically R-1 detached single family homes had a double car garage and this issue might not apply. In R-2 there was a mixture of housing types and garages and might need to be looked at, especially on cul-de-sacs. In R-3, there were apartments which did not have the issue they were trying to solve.

PC Wolfe said there was a problem of on street parking and congestion around the City. He thought it would be helpful to create driveways that allowed for more on street parking. CDD Rux said that got into the requirement of the developer showing the preliminary plans for where the driveways would be located to get a certain number of on street spaces.

PC Stuhr said for areas where parking was constrained, they could require either the two off street spaces or adding another on street parking space.

Chair Dale said if people chose not to use the garage as a place to park, that should be an enforcement issue if they were parking in the wrong place. He thought the restrictions should be for R-2 cul-de-sacs only. Regarding ADUs on cul-de-sacs, if they fit in with the regulations and restrictions he did not see a reason to limit them.

PC Stuhr thought ADUs should be prohibited on R-2 cul-de-sacs.

Chair Dale did not think they should change how the garage should be counted. They should be counted as a space as they were now. If a developer could not meet the parking requirements, there could be an option for a car court. This type of change might add to the cost of the developer. SP Olson said there could be an extra space in the garage for storage, like a one and a half car deep garage.

CDD Rux gave the definition of single car and two car garage. The definition for single car garage could be changed to be larger dimensions to allow for storage.

PC Watson asked if they could only allow parking of smaller vehicles in a car court. CDD Rux said they could regulate the size of the stalls, but some larger vehicles would probably still try to park there.

PC Stuhr suggested talking to developers to get ideas for possible changes.

Chair Dale suggested that there could be credits if developers built 1.5 car garages.

PC Stuhr liked the idea of reviewing driveway locations on subdivision applications for R-2 cul-de-sacs. She was not in favor of waiving the collection of SDCs for ADUs.

PC Edwards thought the parking requirements for ADUs should be a minimum of two parking spaces per ADU. PC Stuhr liked the idea of having smaller ADUs as a Type 1 decision and larger ADUs as a Type 2 or 3 decision. If it was a smaller ADU, it could require one parking space and if it was a larger ADU, it could require two.

PC Edwards suggested it could be based on bedrooms, a two bedroom ADU would require 1.5 parking spaces. Another idea was if it was an in-law suite, it could require one parking space or if it was designed for multi-purpose such as for students or families, then it could require two parking spaces.

PC Bliss added the square footage would be a better way to gage the use of the space.

CDD Rux commented that the Affordable Housing Commission was also looking into ADUs as well.

Mayor Andrews added that the Commission might want to be more specific about what they would allow for ADUs and their purpose.

PC Watson said a lot of cities required ADUs to be owner occupied. If they were to be rented, they could be under different regulations for parking. If it was owner occupied, it could be one parking space, and if it was a rental it could be two parking spaces. The larger the ADU, the more people could occupy it and there would be more cars. She thought the larger the ADU, more parking should be required.

PC Wolfe said the City of Wilsonville stipulated that no more than 25% of lots on the block could have ADUs. Chair Dale thought that idea should be researched as well.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

CDD Rux gave updates on Council approval of the Transportation Utility Fee, updated Transportation SDC methodology, and partition outside of the City limits but within the Urban Growth Boundary. The Dutchman Ridge subdivision was going to Council on May 15 and the Water Master Plan was going to Council on June 5. The land division regulations would be brought back to the Commission on July 13. He would be giving a presentation to the Council on the buildable lands inventory on June 5 and to the Commission on June 8. There would be a Commission hearing on the Veritas North Valley Friends Church annexation on June 8.

The next Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for June 8, 2017.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

PC Stuhr said on 2nd Street between Highway 219 and Brutscher, the planter strips and bioswales were full of weeds. CDD Rux would pass that on to Public Works.

PC Wolfe said he would recuse himself from the Veritas hearing on June 8 due to his involvement through his employer.

Chair Jason Dale adjourned the meeting at 8:31 p.m.

Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this June 8, 2017.



Jason Dale, Planning Commission Chair



Bobbie Morgan, Office Assistant II