

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Newberg Public Library**  
**Newberg, Oregon**

**Thursday, 7:30 PM**

**July 18, 1991**

Subject to P.C. Approval at 8/15/91 P.C. Meeting

**I. OPEN MEETING**

**Present:**

Jack Kriz  
Rob Molzahn  
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:** 5 Citizens, TCI representative, Graphic representative

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion:** Thomas-Roberts to approve the minutes of the June 20, 1991 Planning Commission with the notation that Sandy Prewitt was present. Motion carried unanimously.

**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

Chairman Veatch noted that a letter had been received from the applicant which requested a continuance of the hearing to the August 15, 1991 Planning Commission meeting. He asked for a Commission consensus relating to whether the hearing should be continued or opened for testimony at this meeting.

Commissioner Roberts commented that the application should be dismissed until such time as the applicant is prepared to present his case.

Planning Director Egner indicated that the applicant had discussed with staff a number of issues with staff in order to resolve conflicts prior to a public hearing. He commented that in one sense it would be unfair to the applicant to dismiss the application since scheduling difficulties have prevented conferencing with the applicant in a timely fashion. He recommended that the application be continued to the August Planning Commission meeting.

The Commissioners discussed the request for continuance and the need to proceed with applications in a timely fashion.

Commissioner Kriz requested a poll of the audience relating to interest in this hearing.

**Motion:** Kriz-Thomas to continue the hearing to the August 15, 1991 Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

An audience member requested that the applicants have it made clear to them that the hearing would commence in August.

Chairman Veatch revised the hearing order.

#### **IV. Public Hearing:**

**Request:** An amendment to the Newberg Zoning Ordinance to allow R.V. parks in the C-2 zone as a conditional use.  
**File No:** G-7-91  
**Criteria:** Section 800 of the Newberg Zoning Ordinance

Associate Planner Mike Unger reviewed the C-2 zoning designation and he identified the area on the Zoning Map. He reviewed the criteria to amend the Zoning Ordinance, the applicable LCDC Goal and Comprehensive Plan policies. He indicated that the intent of proposing RV parks within the C-2 zone as a conditional use was to allow the Planning Commission the opportunity to review each project for site compatibility.

Proponents/Opponents: None

Letters/Public Agencies: No comments

**Hearing Closed.**

**Staff Recommendation:** Associate Planner Unger requested that the Commission direct the Planning Staff to develop an ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance which would allow RV

Planning Commission Minutes

July 18, 1991

Page 3

parks in the C-2 district as a conditional use. He noted that design review would apply to RV parks.

Commissioner Kriz asked if there were any design guidelines for RV parks that the Commissioners could use as criteria for review.

Commissioner Roberts questioned whether the gateway to Newberg should be an RV park. He agreed that the C-2 zone was appropriate but felt that locating RV parks in the area adjoining Highway 99 was not a good idea. He noted that an RV park could also be appropriately placed in an industrial zone.

Commissioner Thomas asked what other zones would be more appropriate for the proposed use. Chairman Veatch indicated that possible zones for this use are the C-2, M-1 or M-2 zones. Planning Director Egner indicated that the C-2 zone is typically used for land extensive uses.

Commissioner Roberts noted that a commercial hotel and an RV park were similar in usage; however, the aesthetic impacts of each use were vastly different. Associate Planner Unger indicated that the Planning Commission would have control over the appearance of an RV park through a conditional use permit hearing.

Staff indicated that the Zoning Ordinance currently does not address RV parks. He added that in the recent past the Commission was asked whether a tourist court was the same as an RV park and the Commissioners concluded that the uses were different.

Chairman Veatch asked whether a Zoning Ordinance amendment would be the only method to locate an RV park outside of a C-2 zone. He added that consideration should be given to adding this use to other zones as well.

Planning Director Egner indicated that some industrially zoned sites could be appropriate for RV parks. He added that some of the areas along the riverfront could also be considered as good locations for this use, and that in the future, a waterfront development plan would be discussed by the Commissioners. He also noted that one of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan was to preserve industrial land.

Commissioner Roberts indicated that the Commission should be given the opportunity to choose which lands to protect. He noted that if industrial lands were included, specific sites could be excluded from development. Mr. Egner noted that once a use is designated within a zone through a Conditional Use Permit, only the Conditional Use Permit criteria need to be met for approval. Commissioner Molzan indicated that perhaps additional conditions could be placed on the Conditional Use Permit approval for RVs to restrict them from a major arterial.

Commissioner Roberts felt that the location along 99W was inappropriate. Chairman Veatch indicated that there were some areas along 99W that would be appropriate. Commissioner Thomas indicated that property costs nearer the center of town would be prohibitive.

The Commissioners asked where RV parks could be located in the county.

Planning Director Egner indicated that some agricultural zones allowed some subsidiary use such as RV parks. He added that he understood RV parks were allowed in the commercially designated zones in the county but those areas are limited. He noted that there could be options to create a destination type of RV park in the county relating to tourist type uses.

Commissioners Russell and Thomas indicated that many transient RV parks are located outside of urban areas. Planning Director Egner indicated that there are several RV parks in the County which are in the vicinity of commercial areas.

Commissioner Thomas commented that the Commission should not make a decision until an application is presented for an RV park. Chairman Veatch indicated that the mechanics of going through all the red tape of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment on the chance that the Commission would approve an RV park would be prohibitive. He felt that the Commission should approve some direction as to where an RV park could be located, and he added that the CUP process is an appropriate avenue to review each application. He added that ignoring the issue was inappropriate.

Commissioner Russell felt that an RV park could be very attractive under the controls the Commission could place on the site through a CUP. Commissioners Thomas, Ring and Kriz agreed.

Commissioner Kriz felt the use was appropriate to C-2 uses and Commissioner Molzahn concurred. Commissioner Thomas felt that the use should be considered in the industrial areas as well. Chairman Veatch indicated that parcels in the industrial zones could have a zone change request to C-2 to allow the use.

Planning Director Egner indicated that a CUP decision is final at the Planning Commission level but a Zone Change/Comprehensive Plan Amendment is final at the City Council level. He stated that a CUP indicates the use is allowed within the designated zone unless there is some apparent problem. He commented that the Commission may find it difficult to deny an RV park in an industrial area if they did not like it.

Commissioner Kriz felt there should be more zone options. Planning Director Egner indicated that there is a CUP process to allow certain uses such as garbage dumps, jails, etc. in any zone through a CUP. He indicated that RV parks could be listed in that section. Commissioner Kriz expressed concern that specific review criteria should be listed.

**Motion:** Kriz-Thomas to direct staff to construct language to place RV parks within section 432 of the Zoning Ordinance and develop criteria for approval.

**Vote on Motion:** Voice vote on the motion carried unanimously.

#### **V. Rural Growth Policy Study - G-12-91**

Planning Director Egner reviewed the packet information and noted that the Council had directed the Planning Commission to review the issues. He indicated that County Planning Director Mike Brandt was not able to attend the meeting to discuss the issues. He added that there have recently been numerous discussions at the State level relating to exceptions land rules. He noted that Newberg is completely surrounded by exceptions lands and he pointed them out on a map. He commented that LCDC rejected a rule recently presented relating to this issue, but they requested that amendments to the rule be presented. They expressed concern about parcelization of land around the urban growth boundaries in areas like Newberg. He indicated this was also discussed by the legislature and there is interest in developing urban reserve areas--areas into which the urban growth boundary would be expanded in the future. Long range public facilities planning for up to 50 years in the future would occur in these areas. He noted that there have been inconsistencies between facilities planning and development of urban growth boundaries. The House and the Senate have both approved the concept but have never passed a bill. Such a law would have directed LCDC to create this rule. He noted that a roundtable workshop was held last week which indicated that urban reserve areas should be put into place. The County Planning Directors will meet next Friday to discuss this issue and develop a rule to present to LCDC. He added that land divisions of less than 10 acres would probably not be allowed in these areas.

Mr. Egner discussed a DLCD study of growth patterns in Portland, Brookings, Medford and Bend. He stated that high percentages of rural development has occurred in these areas. He then discussed Newberg's rural development. He noted that 32% of the development in the Newberg area has occurred outside the City limits. He noted that numerous 2 1/2 acre sites were developed. He presented a graph which indicated that Newberg is experiencing the same kind of pattern as discovered in the DLCD studies of Bend, Medford and Brookings. On a statewide level, LCDC is considering this pattern to be a problem, since if this trend continues, it will be very difficult to expand in the UGB in the long term.

He indicated that the Newberg Urban Area Management Commission was the agency which reviewed City/County concerns. Issues relating to revisions to the NUAMC agreement have been discussed but no firm commitments have occurred to date. He noted that the City currently does not have jurisdiction to oppose County actions outside the urban growth boundary. He indicated that he would like to continue review of "urban reserve areas" and to come to some agreement with the County on these areas.

Chairman Veatch asked when this rule would become effective. Planning Director Egner indicated that a new rule could be in place as early as September. He indicated that a rule may limit rural development to 1 dwelling unit permitted per common lot ownership. He noted that details relating to criteria are yet to be resolved; however, Newberg should move forward into developing urban reserve areas. He felt that the County would also be interested in this development. He indicated that the Commissioners could discuss what potential urban reserve areas could include as well as exception areas that could be served with public utilities.

Commissioner Roberts expressed concern that the urban reserve area should not be implemented in a specific location based only on a need for service to those areas. He questioned whether capital development should occur in areas that are not developed and use concentrated. He added that there should be other criteria than the need to extend services.

Planning Director Egner indicated that Mike Brandt would be at the next meeting and additional information relating to urban reserve areas will be brought to the Commission. He noted that the County Planning Director Association is well organized and very able to represent the county and rural land interests. Concern has been expressed about how the rule would impact unincorporated communities. The area of disagreement between city and county planning directors is what to do until a rule is in place and how best to define urban reserve areas.

Chairman Veatch directed staff to bring additional information to the August meeting.

Commissioner Roberts asked if a draft urban reserve area could be presented by the August meeting.

Planning Director Egner indicated that a sketchy presentation could be made. He indicated that there would be a need for direct notification to all affected property owners relating to placement of an urban reserve area on their property. If a general policy addressing general areas was presented however, it may not need specific notification.

Chairman Veatch indicated that property owners should be notified.

A brief discussion relating to meeting schedules occurred. Commissioner Russell stated he would be on vacation August 15.

**Motion:** Russell-Roberts to reschedule the August 15, 1991 Planning Commission meeting to August 22. Motion carried.

## **VI. Old Business:**



**A. Discussion relating to Street Width Standards, File G-1-91**

Planning Director Egner presented graphics relating to goals of the development code and neighborhood quality. He noted that elements of neighborhood quality covered items such as park/school access, work/shopping access, streetscape, architectural compatibility, security/safety and pedestrian orientation.

He noted that reducing the street width is not intended to reduce the quality of the neighborhood. The standard width is a 60 foot right-of-way with a 34 foot paved street - the proposed alternative is a 50 foot right-of-way with a 28 foot paved street. He reviewed restrictions which would include limited parking at street intersection areas. He reviewed proposed private street standards based on various types of streets. He discussed block length and public accessway standards. He indicated the proposed reductions in the City block length requirements. He noted that the Fire Department liked the reduced block length when used in conjunction with a narrower street width. He reviewed pedestrian accessway requirements.

Staff was asked when the street width determinations would be made on a project. Planning Director Egner indicated that the street widths would need to be determined at the beginning of a project.

The Commissioners discussed reducing the block length to 200, 400, or 600 ft. It was noted that this would generally create a grid-like pattern.

The Commissioners generally discussed the concept of neighborhoods and pedestrian access. The subdivisions along N. College were identified as examples of neighborhoods which were not connected to each other by accessways. An 800 foot street length, together with a pedestrian access every 400 ft. was discussed.

Planning Director Egner presented Section 46 of the Subdivision Ordinance as it currently exists. This section relates to public accessways and block length. The proposed change would set some specific standards that are easier to apply.

Chairman Veatch indicated that there are areas in which it would be inappropriate to have public accessways through residential neighborhoods. He indicated that the issue of policing and maintenance of the public accessways was of very great concern.

Commissioner Roberts indicated that the accessways could be closed after the fact by police action. He added that if accessways are not required now, they will be gone forever. Chairman Veatch expressed concern that there was a great amount of risk in allowing these pedestrian accessways.

Chairman Veatch indicated that pedestrian access through cul-de-sacs is not necessary with the exception of those areas adjoining public and private areas.

The Commission discussed fuel conservation measures relating to vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns.

Planning Director Egner discussed national trends relating to neo-traditional planning. He indicated that this method of planning was a pattern of land uses, transportation and mixed uses and how they work together. He indicated that the designs include both grid patterns and cul-de-sacs with pedestrian-oriented development emphasized. The need for boulevards which direct people to activity centers is part of this kind of planning. He added that additional material and videotapes could be presented to the Planning Commission .

Commissioner Russell indicated that there is not a lot of undeveloped land available to establish a grid pattern. Planning Director Egner indicated that there is a lot of vacant land in the UGB on the north side of Newberg which could have these designs put into place. Commissioner Kriz indicated that connectivity was needed in future street planning. Chairman Veatch indicated that lifestyles today have changed the style of neighborhoods. Commissioner Roberts indicated that some kind of grid system should be established. Planning Director Egner suggested that pedestrian access issues be deleted from this discussion and that the Planning Commission focus on street width standards at the hearing.

The Commission noted that the maximum block length should be 600 feet.

Planning Director Egner was asked about excluding cul-de-sac length limits from the packet. He noted that the standards were designed to serve only five lots, which would generally allow a maximum of 500 foot street lengths.

Commissioner Ring noted that some of her neighbors had received CAP notices relating to this issue and she abstained from discussing the issue with them until she could clarify her legal ability to do so. She was advised that the streets issue was public information and she was encouraged to advise interested parties to contact the Planning Office.

Chairman Veatch asked what staff required for development of the next presentation on this issue. Planning Director Egner suggested that the Commissioners delete public access issues; however, street width standards themselves should be continued.

**Motion:** Russell-Thomas to recommend that staff revise the draft street width standards ordinance, to include Table 2 with a revision to *Private access to local - Min. Easement Width - 25' to 20'*, Table 3 and block length standards.



**Discussion on Motion:** The Commissioners discussed how various subdivisions would have looked under the proposed new standards.

**Vote on Motion:** Aye--Molzahn, Ring, Roberts, Russell, Thomas, Veatch; Nay--Kriz. Motion carried (6-1).

**B. Discussion relating to the proposed Development Code, File G-1-91**

Planning Director Egner indicated that the Planning staff has been attempting to develop an introduction to the proposed Development Code and to provide information to the Commissioners; however, work loads and scheduling has prohibited progress on this project. This issue was continued for future discussion.

**C. Council Update**

1. CPA-3-91 Cypress Ventures - Planning Director Egner noted that the City Council approved this project with the condition that the project be limited to 43 units, limitations be placed on building heights on north side of the site, and on-street RV parking be limited to 48 hours.
2. Transportation Plan - Planning Director Egner indicated that the Engineering Dept. is discussing a future project relating to a transportation plan for the City. Discussion will include many of the same issues as the those identified within the NE transportation plan. Part of this project is related to an LCDC administrative rule which mandates that cities do transportation plans.

**D. Building Permits/Planning Permits**

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

**VII. New Business**

**A. County Referral**

Staff intends to send a similar but more strongly worded letter as that sent on the Dayton Avenue zone change. He noted that the timeline for referral is July 26 and the Council will be briefed on August 5. The Planning Commission can make a recommendation to the City Council as to what kind of action should be taken.

**Motion:** Roberts-Kriz to advise the City Council to oppose the zone change.

**Vote on Motion:** Aye--Kriz, Roberts; Nay--Molzahn, Ring, Russell, Thomas; Abstain--Veatch. Motion failed.

Commissioner Veatch expressed concern that the motion will not give the City Council any direction. A consensus of Commissioners felt that the vote on the motion would give the Council a fair representation of the Planning Commission position.

Commissioners discussed the development of this area and its future urbanization. Chairman Veatch indicated that it should be the City's responsibility to expand urban services to those areas where they are interested in expanding the UGB.

Water resources, well access and fragmentation of parcels was discussed. Considerable debate ensued as to the benefits and detractions of rural development. Commissioners Kriz and Roberts expressed concern about parcelization and future service extensions. Planning Director Egner indicated that the long term interests of the community should be considered by the Commission.

Commissioner Russell indicated he was acquainted with the individuals involved in this request and he felt that they should be able to profit from some of the benefits of being long time landowners in the community. Chairman Veatch noted that without some kind of consideration for the old time land owner profiting from development of the property, one large development company will come in and purchase the land for land banking and future profit.

Commissioner Molzahn indicated that this request appeared to be merely an extension of existing small acreage parcels to the east.

The issue of 2 1/2 acre versus 10 acre parcels in the County as well as value of lots and desirability of parcels, together with adjacency to the City was further discussed. Chairman Veatch indicated that a compromise to developing to rural densities in the UGB is shadow platting to prevent obstructions for future development.

The issue of extending City services to areas adjacent to the UGB was then discussed. Staff was asked what the population would have to be to fill in the expanded UGB area up to Bell Rd. Planning Director Egner indicated it would require a population of approximately 40,000 or so.

Commissioner Roberts indicated that the City should consider purchasing property for park use in the northern area of the community.

Planning Director Egner indicated that the Planning Commission concerns would be forwarded to the City Council.

**OTHER NEW BUSINESS:**

Commissioner Kriz requested an update about landscaping at Mike Gunn's new office on Hancock. Planning Director Egner noted that a letter indicating a final date for installation of landscaping would be sent to Mr. Gunn. He added that the occupancy permit has been used as a tool to require completion of design review requirements; however, the Building Department feels there is no basis for withholding the occupancy permit since the building is complete. Planning Director Egner indicated that incomplete landscaping would be considered a violation of the Zoning Ordinance. He indicated that a copy of the letter would be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

The Halbrook Subdivision landscaping was then discussed. Planning Director Egner indicated that the Engineering Department is reviewing the plat now.

**VII. Adjourn**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.