

**MINUTES**  
**City of Newport Planning Commission**  
**Regular Session**  
**Newport City Hall Council Chambers**  
**May 9, 2022**

**Planning Commissioners Present:** Jim Patrick, Bob Berman, Braulio Escobar, Gary East, Jim Hanselman, and Bill Branigan.

**City Staff Present:** Community Development Director (CDD), Derrick Tokos; and Executive Assistant, Sherri Marineau.

**Public Members Present:** Nyla Jebousek (by video), Linsey McLane-Godwin, Allen Wells (by video), Peter Seaders, and Mark Watkins.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call.** Chair Patrick called the meeting to order in the City Hall Council Chambers at 7:01 p.m. On roll call, Commissioners Patrick, Branigan, Hanselman, Berman, Escobar, and East were present.

2. **Approval of Minutes.**

A. **Approval of the Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes of April 25, 2022.**

**MOTION** was made by Commissioner Berman, seconded by Commissioner Branigan to approve the Planning Commission Work Session meeting minutes of April 25, 2022 with minor correction. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

B. **Approval of the Planning Commission Regular Session Meeting Minutes of April 25, 2022.**

**MOTION** was made by Commissioner Berman, seconded by Commissioner Branigan to approve the Planning Commission Regular Session meeting minutes of April 25, 2022 as written. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

3. **Public Comment.** Nyla Jebousek addressed the Commission. She read the letter that she submitted to the Commission into the record. She added that the intersection on US 101 and 15th Street was misaligned. If San-Bay-O came out straight to the street instead of a center, it would be the same distance from 15th to San-Bay-O Circle. The section of 15th was called an alley instead of a street and was considered San-Bay-O's cross street. Jebousek it was an illegitimate thing to do felt for traffic counting. Patrick encouraged her to participate in the hearing process and reported that her testimony would be included in the hearing documents.

4. **Action Items.** None were heard.

5. **Public Hearings.** At 7:09 p.m. Chair Patrick opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. Chair Patrick acknowledged the statement of rights and relevance. He asked the Commissioners for declarations of conflicts of interest, ex parte contacts, bias, or site visits. None

were heard. Patrick called for objections to any member of the Planning Commission or the Commission as a whole hearing this matter; and none were heard.

**A. File 1-CUP-22.**

Tokos reviewed the staff report with the Commission.

Berman thought they wanted to see the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) condition be beefed up to take into consideration the cumulative effect of the tenants. He was also concerned about the overnight usage of yurts. He thought the permissible uses didn't allow residences on the first floor. Tokos noted that this was for the fly in village for Phase 2 and not so much the live/work option. This would be more for pilots or tourists for overnight lodging. Tokos thought there might be building codes that would come into play that could be an issue with yurts, and included the construction type. Berman was concerned about C-1 not allowing residences on ground floor. Patrick noted RV parks were allowed in C-1 and this might fall under those rules.

Escobar asked what was the expectation on the use of this area was when the lease was entered. Tokos explained the concept for the lease was for an industrial park with a flex type range of uses. They wanted to see uses that would benefit the airport in some way.

Berman asked if there should be some kind of environment mitigation to the system when the septic system was operational. Tokos explained there would be a decontamination on the tank.

Hanselman noted many uses could have hazardous materials involved with them that some users might not dispose of in an honorable method. He noted most of the hazardous materials were detrimental to septic systems and asked what kind of mitigation they would use to subvert them from going into the septic system and creeks. Tokos noted that if hazardous materials were a part of the uses for the flex spaces, there were building code provisions to take care of the infrastructure of the building to protect against this. If they observed anything going into the system that was interfering with the operation of the septic system, the city would engage to get the problem sorted out and addressed. The stormwater runoff wouldn't be such an issue as septic runoff.

East asked how many years it would take for the city to extend services to the airport. Tokos reported that it would be a long time because of the costs of infrastructure. This probably wouldn't be seen unless there were areas near the Airport where DEQ asked the city to step in to give them service.

Hanselman noted the rent collected would be split between city and the airport and asked what the split between the two would be. Tokos reported he hadn't looked at this because it wasn't a part of the approval standards. Berman pointed out this would be determined by the budget impact.

Escobar asked what the impact of having the TIA done immediately rather than having it be subject to as time went on and the use increased. Tokos said they could do it immediately but noted to do a proper TIA you needed to have a sense of what the use was.

Linsey McLane-Godwin with MSS Engineering addressed the Commission and gave a slide show presentation on their proposal for the applicant. She discussed what brought them to this point in the process. McLane-Godwin reviewed the criteria for the application approval. For Criteria #1 she said she understood that during the permitting process the use for the septic system was

declared to determine if the use could be accepted by the septic system. She believed there would be checks and balances with this. McLane-Godwin discussed the sanitary sewer service, water service, fire suppression, vehicular access, storm drainage, and power for the property. She covered the parking conceptual site plan as well.

McLane-Godwin covered the Criteria #2 requirements and how the applicant had met them. They felt the uses they were proposing were aligned to the airport use and permitted uses that would have minimal impact. McLane-Godwin reviewed Criteria #3 sharing how they met the requirements and what their proposed uses were to make it more attractive the airport users. She then reviewed Criteria #4 noting the buildings would be consistent with the overall development character of the area McLane-Godwin reviewed Criteria #5 on how they didn't create safety hazards for airport uses. She then concluded that the criteria had been met and asked Allen Wells to speak. Wells noted they had a good sense of the market in Newport and thought the uses outlined in the proposal were what the market was looking for.

Escobar asked if Phase 2 and 3 would happen after funds were available, and what the timeline for all three phases was. Watkins explained that given the amount of money and complexity of the project, all three phases wouldn't be built at the same time. The developers would look at what would work and what wouldn't. Then Phases 2 and 3 would be tailored to what worked. He thought they could be built out within the first 5 years because of the demand. They needed to tailor to what was in most demand. Costs and rents would come into play on the considerations for projects.

Branigan asked if the bid demand for the proposal was based on a survey or from people asking for uses. He also wanted to know what were they looking at for mixed uses that the public wanted. Wells reported he had a community property management company and had a good sense of what people were looking for. He felt these kinds of projects would work at the airport. There wasn't much space to lease in Newport, and once it went up for lease, it would immediately be snatched up. Wells explained they tried to identify all the uses they could think of for this proposal. Branigan noted the east end of Aquarium Village was storage and asked if they were looking to do this. Wells noted the project was more indicative to the Newport Business Plaza East. Branigan asked if the fly in village concept was more of just an idea. Applicant, Mark Watkins addressed the Commission and explained that there was an entire way of life for fly in villages. This was similar to RV groups and where they wanted to camp. Watkins wanted to make the airport similar to a destination for people to fly to Newport and take a car to visit the Newport area. He wanted to have five yurts for pilots to fly in and stay at to visit Newport. Watkins thought this would enhance the tourist attraction to Newport. Branigan asked if the FAA would put in a taxiway for this. Watkins said they wouldn't. This area was outside the tarmac area and would be a walking facility.

Escobar noted he was having trouble understanding the concept and questioned why it was not a fly in camp area. Watkins noted this was just a portion of the area and not a part of the flex units. It would be a different phase than Phase 1 and it would be away from the industrial site.

East asked if all the conditions were approved, would the camping be a part of Phase 1, 2 or 3. Watkins wanted to do it in Phase 1, but noted it would be away from the Phase 1 area.

Escobar asked for clarification on the concerns about waste water. Peter Seaders with MSS Engineering explained the grinder pump for all three phases would pump the effluent up the hill. It worked with a holding tank for the grinder pump and kept all the contaminates from going into the drain fields. There would be no runoff to the system because the storm drain system would be

independent. It would be in accordance with the DEQ regulations for what got into the streams. This was what all other jurisdictions used for water quality treatment. There was also storm water detention systems so there wouldn't be damage to the system as well.

Hanselman was glad they addressed his concerns but didn't think it was very convincing because of his extensive experience in this field. He reported that they couldn't have pavement without runoff. The runoff would go into the containment ponds and that was what he was most concerned with. Hanselman was familiar with a grind and pump station in another state that he campaigned against since he was young. It took many years to get pump and grind systems for several lakes. The systems allowed the lakes to recover over years. He knew the systems could work but it took a lot of effort to get them to. Hanselman thought the onsite septic system would need to be extensively protected.

No opponents were heard.

Chair Patrick closed the hearing at 8:23 p.m.

East liked the idea of the fly in campground. As long as all the requirements were met he was for the project. East noted that they should be flexible for traffic control and the types of businesses that came in. He thought they should move forward with approving it.

Berman thought it was a great concept and thought it was needed. He liked the yurt addition. If the industrial warehouse worked out, his concerns would be for the TIA and having the big picture taken into account. Berman supported the request.

Branigan noted the consideration was for a conditional use permit and going through the staff report and McLane-Godwin's PowerPoint slide, it appeared that they met the criteria to meet the conditional use permit. There was a demand for light industrial and this was needed help for the airport. Branigan was in favor of this and had no concerns.

Hanselman wished they knew more about the tenants. He placed his trust in the applicant to select good tenants when doing so. Hanselman noted that this would increase the tax base. He had hesitations but thought in large measure they needed to move this forward. Hanselman could support it but was concerned about traffic. He thought he would go along with this project.

Escobar thought the applicant met the criteria. He had concerns with the TIA but noted the analysis would come later as traffic increased. There was a need for this and he thought it would be an economically successful project. Escobar wouldn't have a problem approving it.


Patrick noted everything met the criteria. He thought it was odd to be prewriting conditions but understood the reason behind it. Patrick liked the concept and the fly in village. He thought the parking was more than what they needed but it might be because of truck parking for the warehouse. Patrick wanted to see that it get connected to the airport. He was all in favor.

**MOTION** was made by Commissioner Escobar, seconded by Commissioner Berman to approve File 1-CUP-22 with the 14 conditions. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

**6. New Business.** None were heard.

7. **Unfinished Business.** None were heard.
8. **Director Comments.** None were heard.
9. **Adjournment.** Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sherri Marineau". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Sherri Marineau  
Executive Assistant