# A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission

7:30 PM, Thursday

Council Chambers

December 19, 1985

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Roger Veatch.

## Members Present:

John Englebrecht

John Lyda

Bryce Fendall

Eldon McIntosh

Kathy Kelso Jack Kriz Ken Overton Arthur Roberts

Roger Veatch

### Staff Present:

Clay Moorhead, Planning Director Barb Mingay, Recording Secretary Rick Faus, City Attorney

### Citizens Present:

#### 5 Citizens

<u>Motion</u>: Englebrecht-Kelso to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting for November with amendment of page 2, paragraph 6, line 2, striking "and drainage". Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Veatch indicated that Agenda Item 5, Public Hearing B, will not be reviewed as the applicants have withdrawn their request.

## Public Hearing A:

Applicant:

David Abbott

Request:

Removal of a planned unit development overlay on a twenty acre site currently zoned as 10 acres of R-1 (Low Density

acre site currently zoned as 10 acres of R-1 (Low Dens Residential) and 10 acres of R-2 (Medium Density

Residential) zones.

This will change the zoning from an R-1/R-2 PUD to just the standard R-1 and R-2 zones.

Location:

North of Mountainview Drive, East of Zimri Drive.

Tax Lot:

3209-2600

File No:

PUD-1-85 (REMOVAL)

Commissioner Roberts indicated he owns property adjacent to the site, which is currently under contract sale. He feels this will not have any bearing on his decision. No objections to jurisdiction, no abstentions and no exparte contact were indicated.

<u>Staff Report</u>: Planning Director Moorhead identified the site on a map and highlighted sections of the staff report which he then entered into the record.

Planning Commission December 19, 1985 Page 2

<u>Proponent</u>: David Abbott, Rt. 2, Box 266, Newberg, indicated the history of the original request for a solar PUD on the site. He commented that currently solar developments are not a saleable commodity. Due to his current involvement with a hotel/restaurant project in the area he needs additional capital investment. He would like the solar PUD requirement removed from the site to allow it to become a more saleable property.

Opponent: Bill Coffield, Rt. 2, Box 41, indicated he was an abutting property owner, and stated he felt that the original project proposal was a very positive one. He expressed concern about the impact of a less restrictive project on his property. He requested that staff explain the subdivision process and what restrictions could be placed by staff. Planning Director Moorhead indicated the process for partitioning and subdividing property. Mr. Coffield questioned how the site would be served by city services. Staff identified that city services would be required to be installed up to the property line of the project. Mr. Coffield commented that he felt removal of the solar PUD could potentially impact his property value.

Opponent: Phil Smith, Rt. 2, Box 40A, owner of adjacent property, commented he liked the original project, but understood how Mr. Abbott could be considered a victim of the current economy. He was concerned about the potential impact of the R-2 zoning designation on a portion of the property. He felt that this designation which allows mobile homes, would adversely impact his property. He indicated that an R-1 designation on the entire property would be more appropriate.

No adverse comments have been received from public agencies and no letters had been received.

Proponent Rebuttal: David Abbott commented that his original flag annexation is now more contiguous with the city limits since the property directly to the south has been annexed to the City. He would not be adverse to de-annexation if that were possible. He also commented that due to the slope of the site, it was not readily adaptable to installation of mobile homes.

Opponent Rebuttal: Bill Coffield commented that the R-2 zoning designation was a serious concern of the abutting property owners. He would like to see additional use restrictions placed on the R-2 portion of the site. Director Moorhead clarified the designation of the site on the Comprehensive Plan and its current zoning designation. City Attorney Faus identified that rezoning could occur on the site but the applicant would be required to apply and a new hearing process would be required.

<u>Staff Recommendation</u>: Planning Staff recommended that the request for removal of the solar PUD zoning overlay on the site be approved.

Hearing Closed.

City Attorney Faus responded to a question regarding de-annexation by indicating that there is a newly approved process which could be enacted at applicant's request through a hearing process before the City Council.

Planning Commission December 19, 1985 Page 3

Benefits of de-annexing the site were discussed and comments were made as to the positive benefits of keeping the property in the City. Additional comments were made regarding the buffering effect of the R-2 zone between industrial and low density residential zones. A brief discussion occurred regarding the possible placement of a mobile home subdivision on the site. Staff identified the history of mobile home siting throughout the various zones in the City.

David Abbott was asked if he were interested in de-annexation. He commented that he would take the matter under advisement but would like the Planning Commission to make a recommendation at this meeting regarding the requested removal of the solar PUD requirements.

Motion: Englebrecht-Overton to recommend to City Council approval of the requested removal of a planned unit overlay on a twenty acre site currently zoned as 10 acres of R-1 (Low Density Residential) and 10 acres of R-2 (Medium Density Residential) zones, based on Staff Report Findings 1-9.

Vote on Motion: Aye: Englebrecht, Fendall, Kelso, Lyda, McIntosh, Overton, Veatch; Nay: Kriz; Abstain: Roberts. Motion carried: 7-1, 1 Abstention.

Planning Director Moorhead identified that this matter would be scheduled as a public hearing before the City Council at their January 5 1986 meeting.

Round table discussion: Historic Preservation Ordinance

Motion: Kriz-Fendall to have a special Planning Commission meeting January 9, 1986 to discuss the historic preservation ordinance. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Business: Staff responded to a question regarding the status of the sign ordinance by indicating that the Chamber of Commerce was currently doing a survey on the subject and that further information would be available in the future.

New Business: Staff indicated that the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting would be held at the Newberg Public Library meeting room.

Motion: Englebrecht-Roberts to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.