

**MINUTES**  
**City of Newport Planning Commission**  
**Work Session**  
**Newport City Hall Council Chambers**  
**June 13, 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. **Draft South Beach Comprehensive Plan Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning Ordinance Amendments for the South Beach Commercial/Industrial Corridor (File 1-CP-22/2-Z-22).**

Tokos reviewed the Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan map changes. Escobar asked if the property next to the South Beach State Park was designated public, did it mean that it wouldn't be developed. Tokos explained it wouldn't be developed for housing. This was part of the State Park but wasn't in the city limits. It was under the County designation which was consistent with the public designation they had.

Tokos reviewed the zone change recommendations, and the expanded zone change map. He explained the zone changes would create a large block of commercial zones. Berman asked if any of the changes would make the current buildings nonconforming. Tokos explained that the bulk retail was permitted in the C-1 zone and should be okay. There might be some industrial uses at the Aquarium Village that would be nonconforming when it was changed. Tokos thought the expanded zone made more sense. Patrick liked the expanded and felt it would acknowledge what the properties really were. Hanselman asked what the area behind the Toyota dealership was going to be used for. Tokos explained they were dividing the lot into two pieces. The north half would be most likely developed and the south not being done so much. The north half would possibility be a medical office with residential over it, but this could change.

Branigan like the expanded map because it gave more flexibility on what they could put there. He wanted to see more in the I-1 category than in the commercial. Tokos noted the reason for the recommendation to have the I-1 go to C-1 in that area was that there was a risk with flexibility of having incompatible uses be established that would conflict with some of the commercial uses. They were looking to establish more retail service type uses in the area, and the C-1 was more conducive for getting more commercial uses. Escobar asked if any existing businesses would be adversely affected. Tokos confirmed the existing businesses would be nonconforming and grandfathered in under their current condition. Arrow Heating and Columbia Distributing would be moving out and will relocate. This property would then be redeveloped at some point. Hoovers would stay, but they might be

renovating, which was permitted in the C-1 zone. Berman asked if the city did any outreach for the abandoned properties. Tokos confirmed they did and had been carefully looked at. This was in the RFP and it would need to be done under a willing seller arrangement. They weren't looking to condemn through eminent domain. Tokos asked if there was a general agreement to go with the expanded package. The Commission was in general agreement for this.

Tokos reviewed the code changes. He pointed out the changes in NMC Section 14.03.070 for self-service storage use. Berman asked if the added foot note 6 should be under 4, 5 & 7 for vehicle repair. Patrick noted that it said "sales" which would take out Newport Toyota and a couple of repair stores. Tokos asked if the Commission wanted it to say something general like "sales and repair." Patrick thought they should take out storage, salvage and wrecking. Tokos would clean up the language to clarify the language to add "recycling" of machinery.

Tokos reviewed the 15 foot setbacks from US 101, and changing 50 feet to 15 feet from US 101 for buildings that were 5,000 square feet and above. Escobar asked if the 15 foot setback would prohibit parking within the 15 foot area. Tokos explained they were looking to add a 15 foot landscaping requirement for new development. A discussion ensued regarding the need for 50 foot setbacks for I-1 zones, and why there wasn't a need currently to force a 50 foot setback along US 101. This didn't change anything that was on the ground currently and they could continue to operate as they were. The landscaping requirements was for a buffer for new development. The Commission was in general agreement with the setbacks.

Tokos reviewed the landscaping requirements and noted the changes to the project values. Berman asked if anything tied to inflation should be tied to the code. He asked if it should just say it was adjusted by City Council resolution. Tokos explained that resolutions by the Council were for fees. This wasn't a fee and was a monetary value to establish a series of thresholds for when someone doing redevelopment had to provide some landscaping if it wasn't already there. Patrick pointed out that they needed a base, and the city would adjust this every year. Tokos confirmed they would have a chart that they needed to maintain and keep up to date each year. He noted that they discussed how the code numbers wouldn't be adjusted but the values would be based on the latest CPI-U.

Branigan asked if they defined what constituted landscaping. Tokos confirmed they did not define it in this context. It was defined somewhat in the Transportation System Plan. This was more about providing separation from the travel lanes. Branigan asked if artificial grass or flowers worked. Tokos confirmed they had some flexibility on this and there was a little guidance.

Tokos noted that if the Commission was comfortable with the package of revisions, they could initiate the Comprehensive Plan Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning Ordinance amendments by motion at that evening's regular session meeting.

- B. Results of Housing Capacity Analysis Draft Buildable Lands Inventory.** Tokos reviewed the Newport Housing Capacity Analysis slideshow and discussed the interactive map done by ECONorthwest that allowed comments to be made on it. He encouraged the Commission to view the map and make comments within the next week.

Berman asked if all the acres were included in the parcels for everything that was buildable. Tokos thought it should be the sum total. Berman asked if the property near his property on 68th Street was buildable. Tokos explained they truncated properties that extended past the vegetation line because they were getting weird results on properties that weren't buildable lands. They asked to truncate anything that was west of the vegetation line to help with this. Berman noted that there was a property

with a pump station on it that wasn't city owned. Tokos noted the city didn't control the entire piece of land and thought this was a discrepancy between the tax lot layer and a more current aerial image. The tax lot hadn't picked up that the city had purchased the land to put a pump station on it yet because the updates to the tax lot map data was only done annually. Berman asked how this land was counted in the buildable lands when it was to never be developed. Tokos noted the constraints layer showed that the buildable acres on this property was zero. A discussion ensued regarding how constrained properties were shown on the maps.

Tokos reported they would be reaching out to developers on the constructability assessment. He reviewed the areas they would look at the constructability. After they did the buildable lands piece they would move to the constructability piece.

Branigan asked how the planned destination overlay was counted. Tokos explained this was the old Wolf Tree Resort property. This was discounted because it could only be a full package resort that included a waste treatment plant or nothing at all. They couldn't rely on housing there.

Tokos encouraged the Commission to put their comments in the interactive map. He noted it would be further refined over the next few weeks.

**3. Unfinished Business.**

**A. Updated Planning Commission Work Program.** No discussion was heard.

**4. Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau,  
Executive Assistant

