

NEWBERG PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

January 9, 2020

Newberg Public Safety Building
401 E Third Street

Chair Edwards called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Allyn Edwards
Kriss Wright
Jason Dale
Jeffrey Musall
John Wuitschick
Robert Ficker
Sharon Capri
Colin Bolek, Student Planner

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Keith Leonard, Associate Planner

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Approval of the December 12, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes

MOTION: PC Wuitschick/PC Wright moved to approve the December 12, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion carried (7 Yes/0 No).

NEW BUSINESS

1. Election of Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair

Community Development Director Rux explained the process for electing the Chair and Vice Chair.

MOTION: PC Edwards/PC Ficker moved to nominate PC Dale as Planning Commission Chair for 2020. Motion carried (7 Yes/0 No).

Chair Dale continued as the new Chair and asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

MOTION: PC Wright/PC Ficker moved to nominate PC Musall as Planning Commission Vice Chair for 2020. Motion carried (7 Yes/0 No).

Workshop

1. Workshop to gather input from the Planning Commission regarding suggested Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments suggested in the 2018 Yamhill County Transit Area Transit Development Plan.

Associate Planner Leonard presented the suggested Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments suggested in the 2018 Yamhill County Transit Development Plan. In February 2019, the Council directed staff to initiate these amendments. He discussed the Comprehensive Goals and Policies for transportation. Staff recommended deleting number 5 which was a previous policy and adding number 8 with a policy that was from the Transit Development Plan. It would state, "The City will facilitate transit services for its community members with special attention to the needs of members

who may be classified as transit dependent due to factors such as age, income, and/or disabilities.” He asked if the Commission was comfortable with these changes.

PC Capri thought the change only added more factors and made it more complete. AP Leonard responded it did provide more depth to the policy.

PC Edwards asked about the impact of Tri-Met’s fees on businesses. CDD Rux responded Tri-Met had its own service area that did not include Yamhill County. The policy was for Yamhill County and Tri-Met to work together to get people from Yamhill County to the Portland area. There was a new statewide transit tax. There had been no discussions about Tri-Met moving into Yamhill County.

PC Capri asked if there were plans to add a rail system. CDD Rux responded there had been discussions for decades about a commuter rail line that might run from Portland to McMinnville, but it had never moved forward.

PC Wright clarified the commuter bus only ran at peak times in the morning and night.

PC Wright asked about the dial a ride service. CDD Rux responded that was run by the transit district. He explained how there were plans for more transit coverage and a transit center in downtown in the future.

Student PC Bolek asked about the deletion of number 5. CDD Rux responded that was an old policy about establishing a transit district, which had already been done.

PC Capri asked where people could pick up transit maps. CDD Rux said most of them were online.

There was consensus to make the changes as staff recommended.

AP Leonard continued by saying that new Goal 13 stated they would utilize the Transit Development Plan as a guidance document and below were the recommended policies. He asked if they were comfortable with that goal.

PC Edwards thought there should be a transit hub across from City Hall in the capital improvement plan.

There was consensus to keep the goal language as staff recommended.

AP Leonard continued through the policies under Goal 13. Policy A stated the Transit Development Plan provided the policy and implementation direction for the City transit planning which included route development, financing, and physical improvements necessary to maintain and improve public transit services for the City, residents, businesses, and visitors.

Policy B stated transit improvements within the City should be guided by the findings and recommendations in the Transit Development Plan.

Policy C stated the City will seek to implement, through capital improvement projects and private development requirements, improvements that encourage increased transit use and are consistent with and supportive of the Transit Development Plan recommendations.

PC Musall asked how the City would implement the Plan. CDD Rux responded if the City was doing a capital improvement project, such as widening a roadway, and the Transit Plan called for a stop and pull out for a bus, they would work to incorporate that into the project. If a developer was building a project on a transit line, staff would work with them to get a transit sign out front and pedestrian walkways. They also wanted to put in more shelters and signs.

Policy D stated the City will support higher density and mixed use land use around transit stops and in transit corridors to make transit service more feasible and effective.

Policy E stated in lower density areas, the City will support park and ride/rideshare facilities, demand responsive and flexible transit services, and other facilities and services that are appropriate where it is less feasible to serve the area with fixed route transit.

PC Capri asked if this policy meant they would have a parking lot. CDD Rux said they could have a park and ride parking lot or flexible transit routes, such as dial a ride.

The Commission was good with all of these policies.

AP Leonard continued with new Goal 14 which was to coordinate with Yamhill County Transit Area. He reviewed the policies under this goal.

Policy A stated the City will invite transit service providers to participate in long-range and comprehensive land use planning projects in order to optimally coordinate land use and transit service.

Policy B stated the City will invite transit service providers to participate in the review of land use applications that may have implications for transit service or impacts to transit facilities.

Policy C stated in planning for and implementing capital projects, the City will coordinate with Yamhill County Transit Area, Oregon Department of Transportation, and other road authorities if applicable to preserve or improve existing and planned transit stop amenities and connections.

Policy D stated the City will work with Yamhill County Transit Area to site and implement needed transit stops and park and ride lots within the City in support of the district-wide public transit system, with an emphasis on sites that are safe and convenient for riders.

Policy E stated the City will participate in Yamhill County Transit Area's efforts to promote and implement rideshare and other transportation demand management programs for reducing motor vehicle travel demand on state highways.

PC Capri asked if there were any plans for a park and ride by Second Street. CDD Rux responded they did not know where the locations would be for those yet. Second Street was identified to be a mixed use residential street and transit did go up and down that street.

The Commission was good with this goal and policies.

AP Leonard continued with new Goal 15 which was to implement transit-supportive improvements.

Policy A stated the City will prioritize the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle network gaps and substandard facilities along and adjacent to transit corridors in its long-range transportation planning and capital improvement programming.

Chair Dale asked if they already did that with new development, such as putting in new sidewalks. CDD Rux explained it was not a big change as there were already obligations for new development, such as putting in sidewalks. What was missing were shelters and signs. It would depend on the frequency of the service for where those shelters and signs should go. This policy furthered the obligations that the state and city already had.

Policy B stated the City will support improvements such as pedestrian and bicycle connections, shelters, easements for shelters and/or landing pads, and lighting to complement transit service and encourage increased transit use. Transit stop improvements shall be coordinated with the transit service provider.

CDD Rux commented that they already had requirements for bike lanes, but this would integrate the whole multi-modal system together and connect them to transit, such as adding bike shelters.

PC Edwards suggested adding verbiage to Policy B regarding handicap regulations. CDD Rux said they could add verbiage about ADA accessibility.

Chair Dale asked who paid for the shelters and signs. CDD Rux responded the transit agency would install them. The City would make sure the public sidewalk was in place.

PC Wright asked about ODOT and the road diet for 99W. CDD Rux clarified the road diet would remove one travel lane on First Street and one travel lane on Hancock. He explained what the proposed lane changes would be in the areas coming in and going out of that road diet.

PC Wright asked if the Special Transportation Area applied to the Riverfront Master Plan area. CDD Rux said no, it would only apply to the downtown. It was a special designation in the downtown that gave them alternative mobility standards.

Policy C stated the City will work to improve safety for transit riders through the local planning and development review process, helping to ensure safe locations of transit stops and safe connections to transit stops, including roadway crossings.

Policy D stated the City will prioritize improvements to the City's pedestrian environment that increase safe and attractive access to transit, including lighting, landscaping, public art, marked and protected crossings, and curb ramps.

PC Wuitschick asked if the City would make this a priority. CDD Rux commented they had a lot of priorities and there was always a balancing of the priorities. Transit might not always be the top priority.

PC Wright asked if studies were taken into consideration to know what improvements should be done. CDD Rux responded they took all of the master plans into consideration when they created the capital improvement projects. They also had to look at the funding and possible grants. If they were doing a capital project and the Transit Plan identified it was on a transit route and there should be a transit stop, then putting in a shelter would be incorporated into the project. This would help the City be proactive and responsive to transit.

Policy E stated the City will establish and implement development requirements that provide preferential parking for ridesharing and allow parking areas to be used for park and ride.

The Commission was good with this goal and policy.

AP Leonard continued with the proposed changes to the Development Code regulations.

1. The first change was regarding a pre-application meeting. AP Leonard said the Transit Authority would be added to the list of agencies to be contacted to make comments on applications. CDD Rux commented that the City did not have a required pre-application conference provision for land use applications. He had been moving towards that, but they were not there yet. He suggested revisiting the idea in the future, but he did not want to make it mandatory now.
2. The second was the application review. Currently they mailed out notices to governmental agencies and staff recommended leaving the code as it was for this one.
3. The third change was regarding hearing notices. Staff recommended leaving the code as it was for this one as well.

CDD Rux commented that if a development was going in on a transit street, they would add the transit agency onto the distribution list for hearing notices. This would be standard operating procedure.

4. The fourth was regarding access between the site and the street. Staff recommended leaving the code as it was for this one.
5. The fifth was regarding the access to the transit stop and supportive improvements, which staff recommended leaving the code as it was.
6. The sixth was regarding off-site access to transit stops. AP Leonard suggested adding a third point under 15.505.020(O) dealing with pedestrian and bicycle access ways.

CDD Rux commented that instead of specifying the "Planning Commission" in the text, because some applications came to them and some did not, that it state "The approval authority."

7. The seventh was regarding transit-related uses/facilities in parking areas which staff recommended leaving as it was.
8. The eighth was regarding carpool/vanpool parking which staff recommended leaving the code as it was.
9. The ninth was regarding maximum parking requirements. AP Leonard said some zoning districts were left out of this one, C-1 and C-2. They would add under letter A language similar to number 3 regarding the number of parking spaces. A letter F would need to be added to 15.440.010 to include provisions for C-2.

PC Edwards asked if this took into consideration the parking requirements for residential. CDD Rux responded ADUs did not require parking anymore which had recently been passed by the state legislature.

CDD Rux clarified there was a minimum number of parking spaces required, and letter E would be instituting a maximum number of parking spaces. The maximum would be based on one of three variables.

Chair Dale asked what impact that would have on applications. CDD Rux responded they would have to meet the minimum number, but there would also be a cap on the maximum number. This would support transit by encouraging people to use transit to get where they were going and to get back home. It was nudging towards using alternative modes of transportation.

10. The tenth was regarding reduced parking requirements which staff recommended leaving the code as it was.

11. The eleventh was regarding parking area landscaping which staff recommended leaving the code as it was.

CDD Rux said the proposal in the Transit Plan would reduce the amount of landscaping within a parking lot, and he thought the current regulations did a good job of providing landscaping on the interior and on the perimeter of lots. Instead of making a wholesale change that he did not know what it would look like, he recommended leaving the code as it was.

12. The twelfth was regarding the minimum bicycle parking requirements. AP Leonard stated this addressed short and long term bicycle parking. They would be striking out "Transit Transfer Stations" which were not in the Code and replacing that with "Transit Centers and park and ride lots". The minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for those would be 4 spaces or 1 per 10 vehicle spaces, whichever was greater. It would increase the number of spaces required. They also defined short and long term bicycle parking.

PC Edwards asked about motorcycles spaces. CDD Rux responded they would be parking in the parking lot like a car.

13. The last was regarding maximum building setbacks. This pertained to East Portland Road or Highway 99W as well as C-1 and C-2 zoning districts. It would bring up the buildings and add flexibility for the pedestrian amenities so if there was a transit stop there could be a change of the maximum setbacks.

CDD Rux added Portland Road was 99W, but they would write Portland Road and in parenthesis Highway 99W.

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

CDD Rux announced a new City Manager had been hired and would begin work in February. He discussed the anticipated schedule of Planning Commission agenda items.

PC Capri had question about an email on the Governance 101 class in Salem, CDD Rux responded.

CDD Rux added that it was PC Wuitschick's last day as a Planning Commissioner.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2020.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Dale adjourned the meeting at 8:19 pm.

Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this February 13, 2020.



Jason Dale, Planning Commission Chair



Bobbie Morgan, Office Assistant II