

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Newberg Public Library
Newberg, Oregon

Thursday, 7:30 PM

June 20, 1991

Subject to P.C. Approval at 7/18/91 P.C. Meeting

I. OPEN MEETING

Present:

Jack Kriz
Rob Molzahn
Mary Post
Sandra Prewitt
Carol Ring
Steve Roberts
Wally Russell
Donald Thomas
Roger Veatch

Staff Present:

Dennis Egner, Planning Director
Mike Unger, Associate Planner
Barb Mingay, Recording Secretary

Citizens: 13

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Roberts-Post to approve the minutes of the May 16, 1991 Planning Commission.
Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Veatch revised the order of the agenda.

III. PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: Mike Raine/Jeff Twenge
REQUEST: Approval of a 24 lot residential subdivision on a 7.9 acre parcel
LOCATION: SE corner of Villa Rd. and Mountainview Dr.
TAX LOT: 3217-1801 and 3217-1804
FILE NO: S-3-91
CRITERIA: Newberg Subdivision Ordinance, Section 24 and Section 66

Commissioner Prewitt indicated she had visited the site. No other abstentions, objections to jurisdiction or ex-parte contact were indicated.

Chairman Veatch noted that a letter had been received from the applicant which requested a continuance of the hearing to the July 18, 1991 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion: Thomas-Roberts to continue the hearing to the July 18, 1991 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING: Continued

APPLICANT: Cypress Ventures, Inc.
REQUEST: Approval of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from LDR (Low Density Residential) to MDR (Medium Density Residential) and a Zone Change from R-1 Low Density Residential to R-2 PD Medium Density Residential and a 42 lot residential Planned Unit Development/Subdivision
LOCATION: North of Jaquith Park, East of North College
TAX LOT: 3218AD-7400, -7600, part of -7500
FILE NO: CPA-3-91/Z-3-91/PUD-1-91
CRITERIA: Newberg Ordinance 1967, Section 4; Newberg Zoning Ordinance, Section 458(7) and Section 600; and Newberg Subdivision Ordinance Section 24

Commissioner Prewitt indicated she visited the site. No other objections to jurisdiction, abstentions or ex-parte contact were indicated.

Staff Report: Planning Director Egner distributed a supplemental staff report, together with the supplemental report from the last meeting. He noted that last month the criteria for a comprehensive plan, zone change, planned unit development and subdivision modification were reviewed. He then reviewed a compilation of conditions derived from the staff report findings, as well as both supplements. He reviewed the supplemental staff report distributed at this meeting, discussing density, neighborhood compatibility, school concerns, Highway 219 access, street width, fencing, and interior setbacks. He noted that Wes Smith, Newberg School District representative had been contacted relating to school district comments. Mr. Smith commented that his concerns were of a warning nature at this point. A facilities study is expected to be completed in December, 1991 and, based on the facility study, a more serious position by the School District may be taken. He reviewed last month's discussion regarding street widths. He commented that during a meeting with Police, Fire and Engineering Department representatives, some public access concerns were noted; however, it was felt that the concerns could be alleviated by restricting parking in specific areas. This project is proposed as a PUD, and as such, is intended to provide some flexibility in development. The street system being proposed fits the development concept well. He reviewed a slide show of various streets in the area representing a variety of street widths and parking restrictions. Typical 34' wide streets found in Newberg were shown, as well as 24-30 foot street widths in the Portland Metropolitan area. He also reviewed slides presented by the

applicant showing street scenes in the Portland Hollywood District. He concluded the staff report with a review of a compilation of all conditions applicable to the project.

Proponent: John Reiman, 8632 SW Miller Ct., Tigard, project engineer, addressed the street width issue. He quoted material from Residential Streets, Second Addition by the American Society of Civil Engineers, et. al. regarding residential street designs. He noted that an access street is identified as a "place" or "lane", designed to conduct traffic between dwelling units and higher-order streets. He added that access streets usually carry no through traffic and provide a quiet, neighborhood accessway. He commented that average daily traffic (ADT) is the average number of vehicles traveling the route in a typical day and ADT is only one factor in determining street widths. ADT should not be the sole factor. He indicated that the proposed streets are local streets and it is the applicants desire to create a safe street system.

Proponent: Ed Dobbs, partner in development, discussed the density within the development. He indicated that it was their proposal to tie in with the adjoining properties in a compatible manner. He indicated the variety of lot sizes was intended to serve the market demand. He indicated that a market analysis in the Portland area listed about 15 similar projects in various stages of development, and 14 fall within the same lot sizes as those proposed. Finally, he noted that revisions suggested by the staff to the rear yard setbacks abutting the surrounding neighborhoods was a concession that would enhance the neighborhood, making it more fire safe while also reducing possible noise impacts.

Questions to Proponent: None

Opponent: Roger Currier, 504 Pinehurst, indicated that the fence issue has not yet been completely clarified. He felt the fence along the Pinehurst side of the project should be required. He requested that single story stick built homes, rather than modular or mobile homes, be built on the site. He commented that he would rather the present zoning be retained. R-1 density would allow 32 units to be developed with larger lots. He approved the setback proposed along the Pinehurst side of the development.

Public Agencies/Letters: None other than those noted in the Supplemental Staff Report.

Proponent Rebuttal:

Ed Dobbs identified that the 20 ft. rear yard setback being requested would reduce the impact on the Pinehurst side. He noted that existing landscaping, together with possible new additional landscaping, could be installed rather than a fence. He agreed to work with the neighbors to keep everyone happy.

Staff Recommendation: Planning Director Egner recommended approval of the requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zone Change and Subdivision/PUD subject to the findings

within the Staff Report and supplemental staff reports, together with the conditions identified in the compilation of findings.

Hearing Closed.

Commissioner Discussion:

Commissioner Roberts asked whether 6 ft. was sufficient between buildings for fire protection purposes. Planning Director Egner identified that 6 ft. was the minimum setback within residential areas.

Commissioner Roberts indicated that the request is for a Planned Development overlay. He questioned whether the PD application should include footprints for building placement on each lot, building construction types, etc. Planning Director Egner responded that the PD process can be implemented at various levels. It allows the Planning Commission and Council to attach conditions to the Zone Change rather than conditions to the Subdivision. He noted that City Staff had recommended a PD overlay in order to better control the proposed development through the implementation of specific conditions. The PD overlay also allows a variance from strict subdivision standards.

Commissioner Roberts suggested street width photos relating to Portland's Hollywood District were not relevant to the application. He indicated that the 24 ft. wide streets were a serious mistake. He commented that older developments similar to the Hollywood District did not have to contend with automobiles the size of those today. In most of the cases, the streets connect at more than one end so the 24 ft. wide section has more than one outlet - typically to a major street. He felt that a street variance to allow narrower 20-28 foot streets was a poor idea. He added that the ALF facility will attract extra visitors with no place to park. He expressed concern about granting a variance in this area before the street width issue is discussed for the City as a whole.

Commissioner Prewitt expressed a concern about the accessways into Jaquith Park. She noted that having a park facility adjacent to the site with inadequate parking on the Jaquith side of College may cause additional parking problems within the development. She asked Staff to identify the proposed breakdown and location of senior housing within the development.

Ed Dobbs noted that the project would be divided with approximately half elderly and half general public housing. He noted that the streets were all dead-end with no outlet and were intended to be pedestrian friendly. He noted that the speed issue was a very important concern. He noted that a narrow street would only create a slowing down effect on the traffic. He noted that the Hollywood area was designed to create slower traffic patterns.

Commissioner Prewitt asked what limitations would occur for Fire Department access if the street area was used by non-residential users for access to Jaquith Park. Planning Director Egner noted that on the Fire Department concerns relating to parking restrictions and turning width radius would be addressed on the final plat. He noted that there has been a nation-wide emphasis toward more traditional developments such as the one proposed.

Commissioner Prewitt commented that the School District is having capacity problems and she cautioned the applicants to be aware of this difficulty. Mr. Dobbs noted that a number of interested elderly citizens have expressed a desire for the proposed sites and the occupants will likely be primarily elderly.

Commissioner Thomas asked about the location of fire hydrants. Planning Director Egner responded that the final construction approval plans include detail such as placement of fire hydrants, water lines, etc. and this review is a preliminary plat.

Mr. Reiman indicated that the typical standard was a 500 ft. lane length from the fire hydrant to furthest building.

Commissioner Post indicated that parking on both sides of the narrow proposed street may be a possible problem. She felt that intermittent no parking areas should be placed within the narrow street sections.

Commissioner Thomas expressed concern relating the street widths proposed. He felt some of the street widths could be increased to 28' by reducing the abutting lots by 4 ft. and there would not be a very great impact on the project.

Commissioner Russell asked the developer what difference it would make to increase specific streets.

Mr. Dobbs commented that reconfiguration could occur; however, he indicated that people drive slower on narrower streets. It was the intent of the project to have homes sites with longer driveways which could accommodate 2-3 cars. He expressed concern relating to the need for wider streets for safety. He felt there would not be that much parking problem on the street as most elderly couples have only one vehicle. The sites have a one car garage with on site parking for 2-3 vehicles.

Planning Director Egner noted that Condition G identifies a 5 ft. setback on interior yards. He noted that this condition is modified by Condition Y. which requires a 20 ft. interior yard setback for those properties abutting the north boundary of the project.

Mr. Dobbs reviewed a publication which identifies that narrower streets produces slower traffic, not less safe conditions.

Commissioner Post indicated that the proposed street width would be satisfactory if parking were only allowed along one side.

Commissioner Ring expressed concern about the proposed density and narrow streets.

Commissioner Molzahn concurred that parking on one side of the narrow street sections was a possible solution to the street width concern.

Commissioner Kriz expressed approval for the application as presented.

Commissioner Russell noted that the street widths proposed appear to be an effective way to create safe streets.

Commissioner Veatch added that a neighborhood with 24 ft. wide streets is much safer than a wider street. He cited Haworth street as an example. He noted that a tight knit residential neighborhood is well served by a 24 ft. wide street, and that a shorter street stub to the park access might prevent excessive non-area use of street parking.

Commissioner Molzahn indicated that senior citizens were the most likely to be interested in this area.

Motion: Russell-Roberts to recommend that the City Council approve a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from LDR to MDR and a Zone Change from R-1 Low Density Residential to R-2 PD Medium Density Residential and to approve a 43 lot residential Planned Unit Development/Subdivision subject to Staff Report findings and Conditions A-BB.

Vote on Motion: Aye: Kriz, Molzahn, Post, Roberts, Russell, Thomas, Veatch; Nay: Ring. Motion carried (8-1).

Planning Director Egner noted that the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zone Change would be scheduled for the July 1 Council meeting. He noted that the Planned Unit Development/Subdivision was final at this point subject to the zone change approval at council. He added that there is a 30 day appeal process following notice of approval.

A 5 minute recess was called after which the meeting was reconvened.

V. OLD BUSINESS:

A. Council Update

Planning Director Egner noted that the Council approved the Cogut and Fisher Comprehensive Plan Amendment/Zone Changes.

He noted that at the last Council meeting, new planning fees were approved and will become effective July 1. They include an increase of 50-100% across the board. New fees will be collected for design review and final plat approvals. He stated that the new fees were based on 50% of the actual cost of the land use actions. Newberg currently ranks 9th in fees, and after the increase it still ranks 9th. He noted that only McMinnville had a lower average fee.

B. Building Permits/Planning Permits

He reviewed the monthly permit information sheets from the Building and Planning Departments.

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

A. S-1-90, Prospect Park Subdivision Extension for Final Plat Approval

Planning Director Egner identified that Engineering is holding the final plat pending installation of improvements. Chairman Veatch added that the project appeared to be moving forward and an extension of approval would allow the applicants time to complete their application.

Motion: Molzahn - Post to grant a 1 year extension for completion of the Prospect Park Subdivision. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Street Width Standards, File G-1-91

Planning Director Egner reviewed the memo relating to street width standards, including excerpts from Planning Magazine, an Oregonian newspaper article and the street classification map. He noted that few communities have addressed the issue of reduced street sizes. He noted that if it was the communities desire to have narrower streets, then the street standards currently existing should be modified. He commented that a hearing on the subject could be scheduled for the August Planning Commission meeting with Council action in September. He presented an overhead identifying current street standards and proposed reduced street standards. He noted that the market and the national trend appear to lean toward narrower street standards.

Commissioner Thomas felt 28' streets would be livable. He felt 24' streets would not be adequate.

Commissioner Post indicated that narrow streets do not adequately allow room for cars backing out of driveways or for fire and garbage trucks in the area.

Planning Director Egner reviewed some proposed private street width standards developed by the Planning Department for consideration.

Commissioner Prewitt indicated that Parklane was an example of a narrow street development which was inadequate. Staff indicated that Parklane was only a half-street and further development of the site to the south would complete the other half-street width.

Commissioner Thomas indicated that a length limitation should be placed on the private drive extensions.

Chairman Veatch noted that the County limits private roads over 400 ft. long are required to have turnouts.

Planning Director Egner noted that infill development is reviewed for future impact on surrounding land development.

Commissioner Roberts noted that vehicle size and/or height restrictions should be placed on certain public streets due to vision and clearance problems.

Commissioner Roberts indicated that a vision clearance from intersections and/or a no-parking zone at intersections should be discussed. He felt this should also be a street use standard. Planning Director Egner felt that should be included.

Commissioner Ring questioned the definitions on the map for arterials and collectors.

Planning Director Egner noted that the street classification map has not been updated to the most recent street classification. He encouraged the Commission to read the Exhibits in the street memorandum.

Commissioner Kriz requested discussion on off-street parking as opposed to on-street parking. He felt that 2-3 on site parking spots be provided per lot could be a development alternative.

Commissioner Roberts suggested that several alternative standards could be identified within the proposed ordinance.

C. County Referrals/Rural Development Study

Planning Director Egner noted that several development requests within the County have been forwarded to City Council for direction. He added that City Council supported opposition of a subdivision off Dayton Avenue and a zone change off Kincaid. They also

directed staff to study a growth policy for rural development. No policy currently exists related to areas outside UGB. Council directed the Planning Staff to investigate the issues. He noted that Staff would continue researching the issue.

Commissioner Thomas asked whether the County referrals should be reviewed by the Newberg Planning Commission. Planning Director Egner noted that typically the referrals are received within 5-10 days of the County hearing. Roger noted that the area of concern is typically outside the UGB but within Newberg's area of influence. Chairman Veatch indicated that the Council had suggested the Planning Commission review the area between Newberg-Dundee. He felt that a broader Area of Influence around Newberg should be reviewed with a possible open public meeting to discuss the issues. Chairman Veatch noted he has contacted Mike Brandt, Y.C. Planning Director and has invited him to the July 18 Planning Commission meeting to get his input on the issue.

Planning Director Egner indicated that he was unsure how the County determines which applications it refers to the City of Newberg. He noted that the subdivision hearing will be held in August. The zone change was approved; however, we are in the process of appealing the decision to the Board of Commissioners. He reviewed the City's argument relating to Statewide Planning Goal 3 and 4 and exceptions lands. He noted that the question was "what was urban development?" He noted that the Newberg Urban Area Management Agreement addresses policies relating to lands within the UGB; however, there are no policies relating to land outside the UGB but within Newberg's area of influence.

Commissioner Roberts suggested that Newberg's area of influence be defined on a map.

D. Training Workshop

Planning Director Egner distributed a memo relating to a future training workshop. He requested that the Planning Commissioners indicate whether they can attend or not and return the response to the Planning Department as soon as possible.

Commissioner Thomas noted that it would be helpful to receive the staff report material earlier than 5 days prior to the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.