

**MINUTES**  
**City of Newport Planning Commission**  
**Work Session**  
**Newport City Hall Council Chambers**  
**May 23, 2022**  
**6:00 p.m.**

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

**PC Citizens Advisory Committee Members Present:** Dustin Capri.

**PC Citizens Advisory Committee Members Absent:** Greg Sutton.

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

1. **Call to Order.** Chair Patrick called the Planning Commission work session to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. **New Business.**

A. **Review Results of Newport Housing Needs Projection Report.** Tokos reviewed a PowerPoint presentation of the Newport Housing Needs Projection Report with the Commission. He first reviewed the building permits issued between 2012 to 2021; the population growth; the factors that affected housing demand; and the aging population. Patrick noted that the projection from years before was behind what they estimated. Tokos confirmed this was just a guess and was to show that a large number of the population that was moving to Newport was the older population.

Tokos reviewed the population forecast by age. Capri asked if they came up with the numbers through the census. Tokos explained the census was part of it and they did intermediate surveys to form their projections and track over time.

Tokos reviewed household size; household income; the share of Latino households; commuting flows for 2019; median house sales price; and monthly asking rent costs for Newport. He noted this was the aggregate for all bedrooms. Tokos covered the cost burden; the cost burden by tenure; financially attainable housing; existing households by income level in Newport; and housing affordability by income levels.

Tokos reviewed the preliminary housing population forecast, Newport UGB. He noted they weren't bound by the projections but they had to meet the Portland State projections under State law. Tokos noted that they planned to have ECONorthwest provide a couple of alternate forecasts that they thought were more realistic. Berman pointed out that the forecast showed a rise but then it declined. He thought that at some point they should use the top of the rise to decide what housing they needed because they couldn't wait for the population to decrease. Berman noted that these numbers were off from the Transportation System Plan (TSP) discussion, which were almost 10 times as much. He questioned if it was the intent of the particular activity to maximize it on the TSP. He thought it was weird to use two such different numbers when they were both referencing Portland State. He felt it was a problem. If they were going to forecast they should all use the same forecast. Tokos noted this forecast was within the UGB. He noted with respect to the TSP he didn't think the population growth

estimates were particularly aggressive and thought this was a reasonable estimate. When you compound this with background traffic, the State minimized background growth on US 101 and US 20. The city had to reflect housing in their study but they didn't have to base their polices on assumptions that they were only going to have 248 new residents. Portland State philosophy in terms of what they were looking at were what the city's trends were in terms of growth, and what the life expectancy they had over time. They anticipated that the population growth would go down but didn't take the other things into account. Tokos explained they would reflect Portland State's numbers in the report and there would be a couple of alternative estimates provided to get a better picture of where the city was at. Branigan didn't think Portland State factored in aging residents who were buying homes as part time residences, and were not renting them out and lived in them part of the year. He asked how this factored into the growth rates. Tokos didn't have the answer but they would have a figure that showed the percentage of the housing that was second housing.

Berman reported he had a list of changes for the document and asked how they should be reviewed. Tokos requested Berman send an email of the changes to him because this was a running draft document.

Tokos reviewed the implication for housing needs. Patrick asked what they wanted for a wider range of for demographic trends. Tokos explained thought they would see more demand for detached housing and for rentals for multi-family. He thought they should look more at the percentages of different types of housing. Patrick noted more would be factored in because of accessory dwelling units. (ADU). Hanselman asked if ADUs would have a housing boom in the city. Tokos didn't think they would and reported there wasn't a huge number of new ADUs coming in over the years. Capri thought ADUs would fill the gaps for housing. Tokos noted the city was considering standard plans for ADUs to share. He thought taking out the costs for plan review fees could help make them be more affordable. Tokos pointed out there wasn't a demand for stock plans for ADUs in Newport at that time. Berman asked why the document didn't reference cottage clusters. Tokos reported they fell in with the single family attached, duplexes, triplexes, or quadplexes, depending on what they were building. Escobar asked if there was a conflict between the types of housing projected to constructed over the next 20 years, and the income of the people who lived in Newport. The incomes levels showed there was a certain percentage that could afford houses, and others that wouldn't be able to afford to rent or purchase housing in Newport. Tokos agreed that the big challenge they had was meeting the needs of those who had the income to find single family housing but weren't able to find anything because there wasn't anything on the market. They would continue to see subsidized housing coming in under the Housing Authority who managed projects to build rentals units that were managed by the Housing Authority or others at 60 percent median area income or less. Tokos noted there would always be a demand for higher income housing.

Tokos reviewed the forecast of new housing. He noted the last Housing Needs Assessment came up with a need for about 850 dwelling units over the planning period which equvalated to about 45 every year.

Tokos reviewed new dwelling units; the implications of housing needs; how housing needs often differed by group; the housing needs for people experiencing homelessness; ability to pay for housing by race and ethnicity; cost burden by race and ethnicity; and the housing need by race and ethnicity. Patrick asked if they were picking up the housing that was being sold outright in the counts. Tokos thought this was counted in one of the sections.

Tokos reviewed the people's ability to pay for housing who were aged 64 years and older; and housing needs for people 65 years or older. Berman asked if they were counting special housing such as nursing

homes and assisted living homes. Tokos confirmed they were and they would also pick up drug alcohol treatment facilities and group homes. The transitional housing for the parole office would be picked up as well.

Gary East joined the meeting at 6:39 pm.

Tokos reviewed the persons with disabilities next. Berman asked if 40 percent of the residents had disabilities. Patrick pointed out that it said nearly a quarter of the population. He noted they weren't picking up the people who were retired in advanced age who got older and needed better healthcare, which forced them to move to the valley. Tokos noted as long as employment was strong in Newport you wouldn't see a drop in population in Newport.

### **3. Unfinished Business.**

- A. File No. 1-CP-17, Transportation System Plan Part I and II – Final Review.** Tokos suggested the Commission spend a few minutes on this discussion before they had to start the regular session meeting that night. Then, they could come back to the discussion after that meeting. He noted they would have a little time now and before the first public hearing on June 13th. The plan was to have the TSP code work passed along to Angelo Planning for quality control review and to double check the administrative rule obligations on what they needed to meet for public facilities planning in the Comprehensive Plan. If Angelo Planning had any changes he would highlight these so the Commission had a chance to take a look at them and then be able to give Tokos their edits, such as typos, through an email. If there were substantive changes the Commission should note it at this meeting.

Tokos reviewed the code changes since the last meeting starting with Chapter 14.01, purpose, applicability, and definitions. Branigan asked if under the "compliance required" they should add the word "demolished" to the list. Tokos noted this chapter didn't reference demolition of structures. Branigan thought that a demo to rebuild something was more than a reconstruction. A discussion ensued regarding what constituted a demolition versus reconstruction.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.01.020, definitions. Berman asked why the Community Development Director was defined but the City Engineer or City Manager wasn't. Tokos reported that the Community Development Director made the decisions and why they were included. Berman asked what sale or transfer was. Tokos explained this pertained to short-term rentals. Berman noted when referencing that "a license" was valid they should talk about which license this entailed. Tokos would note this and try to pick it up in the changes they did with the short-term rental ordinance amendments. Berman asked if there would be an effort to update the illustrations for the yards. He would volunteer to do this if needed. Tokos thought Berman could work on this.

The meeting was temporarily adjourned at 6:59 p.m. for the start of the regular session meeting and then reconvened at 7:05 p.m.

Tokos continued his review of the changes starting with Chapter 14.03, zoning districts. Berman noted that 14.03.030 referenced the zoning maps and thought the city's GIS technician could produce a full resolution city limits map for them. Tokos noted the new GIS technician was working to clean up the minor discrepancies on the GIS maps and Tokos would work with the technician on this.

Tokos reviewed Chapters 14.03.050 and 14.03.110 next. Berman thought 14.03.110 was a duplicate of 14.03.090. Tokos noted these were two different zoning areas and could possibly be consolidated.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.14.010, parking and loading requirements; and Chapter 14.14.060, compact spaces next. Berman asked if anyone got a ticket for parking a large truck in compact parking spaces. Tokos explained this section was for private properties and they would only be ticketed on public property.

Tokos covered Chapter 14.14.070, bicycle parking. Berman questioned if the parking spaces requirement chart was correct for the 1 to 4 spaces, and 5 to 25 spaces numbers. Tokos would clarify this. Berman asked if bicycle spaces needed to be signed. Tokos would take a look into this. He noted that under "E" it said it needed to be clearly marked.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.14.090, parking lot minimum standards table. Berman requested the images be high resolution. Tokos then covered the driveway standards.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.19, landscaping and screening for parking lots requirements. Berman noted that there was no mention of the Tree Plan to make sure they are planting the correct plants. Tokos would add this. Berman pointed out that under 14.19.060 it listed that the values should be based on year 2000 dollars and adjusted on July 1 of each year for inflation. He suggested putting in the 2021 numbers instead.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.33 adjustments, variances and transportation mitigation, starting with Chapter 14.33.070, transportation mitigation procedures. He acknowledged the memorandum the City Engineer submitted to the Commission. Tokos noted that 24 feet wasn't a city standard, the existing standards are much wider. He reported that the 20 feet of clearance was in the Fire Code and was why the Fire Chief wanted larger streets. Tokos noted that there would probably be testimony from the Fire Chief and City Engineer at the public hearings. The City Engineer wanted his memo included on the record. He understood there was a lot of work on the yield street items and that it had been vetted out with the committee. Tokos emphasized that they weren't doing anything they hadn't done before. The yield street standards were in line with what Portland adopted in terms of their yield street dimensions, and were aligned with recommendations they would see from other organizations that had yield and street recommendations. He reported they had vetted this with what they had on the ground to see what they were working with. They used examples of streets in Newport to know they could make it work. Escobar questioned if they looked at the Wilder Development streets widths. A discussion ensued regarding street widths and if the response time for fire trucks was considered. Patrick asked how the Fire Chief felt about roundabouts. Tokos noted he was clear about not wanting traffic calming measures that produced wear and tear on their vehicles.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.33.070, process for determining street cross-sections in constrained conditions; then Chapter 14.44.050 transit improvements. He noted with these standards would have required the hospital to do bus shelters when it was built. Tokos reported that the hospital had plans to build a shelter later because they received the budget to install it.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.44.060 street pathways accessways and trails; Chapter 14.45 traffic impact analysis; the fee in lieu option; Chapter 14.46, vehicle access and circulation; Chapter 14.47, pedestrian access; and Chapter 14.48, land divisions. He noted that he would talk to Angelo Consultants about delayed sidewalk construction and a better way to do this. Berman asked if there was a construction cost index they used. Tokos reported they used the Engineer's News Record for a construction cost index. They also used this as a modifier for the city's System Development fees. Berman suggested saying 15 percent plus for the increase. Patrick asked if the city had done sidewalks after the fact. Tokos reported they did this in the small subdivision on Avery Street and 71st Street.

They also did this on the Lincoln Lane where they were building one section of sidewalks at a time as new houses were built. Patrick asked why the city didn't do rolled curbs. Tokos didn't have the information but would get back to the Commission on this.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.49, property line adjustments; Chapter 14.50, tsunami hazards overlay; Chapter 14.52, procedural requirements; and Chapter 14.52.140, expiration and extension of decision. Berman asked if A2 was missing the word "not" between "has" and "been." Tokos would add this.

Tokos reviewed Chapter 14.53, enforcement; Chapter 14.54, penalty; and Chapter 14.57, fees next. He noted the goals and policy changes were to pick up some typos.

Berman asked how the list of the future summary of requested changes would be handled. He wanted to know if this list would be a part of the presentation during the hearing. Tokos confirmed it would be part of it. The public hearings gave people the opportunity to raise issues. Tokos noted they had the opportunity to have two public hearings. The first hearing would be on June 13th, and they could have a special alternate second hearing date in June if needed. He would have some dates available if the Commission wanted to do this. Berman asked if they weren't merging the document at that time because of the time and cost of the consultants. Tokos confirmed this was correct. They only had the budget to do one more revision. Berman noted that they needed to make it clear during the public hearing that these were things that were going to be put into the document.

4. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau,  
Executive Assistant