

MINUTES
City of Newport Planning Commission
Work Session
Newport City Hall Council Chambers by Video Conference
October 11, 2021
6:00 p.m.

Planning Commissioners Present by Video Conference: Bob Berman, Lee Hardy, Braulio Escobar, Jim Hanselman, Gary East, and Bill Branigan.

Planning Commissioners Absent: Jim Patrick (*excused*).

PC Citizens Advisory Committee Members Present by Video Conference: Dustin Capri and Greg Sutton.

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

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

2. **New Business.**

A. **Draft RFP for Newport Housing Capacity Analysis and Production Strategy Project.** Tokos reviewed Task #1 of the draft RFP for the project kick-off. Berman asked if they wanted to include the previous work that had been done on the housing needs analysis. Tokos reported it was included under background documents. Berman thought they should include it with the starting points to know what had been done before. Tokos noted that early in the project they would go through what the prior one called for and what they implemented from the recommendations. Branigan asked if grant funding would cover the costs of the consultants. Tokos reported that the project would cost \$105,000 and the city would contribute around \$26,250. This would be strictly for consulting fees. There would be additional costs to the city for notices and things of that nature. Berman asked if the city's contribution would span over two fiscal years or be in the current budget. Tokos explained it was already programmed in the current budget. If anything additional came up that they wanted to add, they would do a supplement in the next fiscal year. This amount would be relatively small.

Tokos reviewed Task #2 for education, outreach and engagement. He noted they would be reaching out to those in the community that were Spanish language dominant in the entire process to get them engaged. This would be done through Centro de Ayuda and others. Escobar asked who the others were. Tokos thought they could spend some time with Councilor Botello to figure out which groups they could reach out to, such as schools and religious institutions. Escobar suggested reaching out to restaurants and stores to get the message out.

Hanselman asked which properties the consultants would be looking at. Tokos reported they would look at all properties in the city as part of the Housing Needs Assessment and Buildable Lands Inventory. This would look at all vacant or partially vacant properties, and included properties in the Urban Growth Boundary.

Tokos reviewed Task #3 for the housing needs projection. This looked at socioeconomic and demographic trends to figure out what they were likely going to need over the next 20 years. They would need to try to quantify the number of people facing homelessness in the community. Hardy asked if they would be looking at the cause for homelessness. Tokos thought this would be more of the production strategy side of it and they would need to be careful on how they framed what they could reasonably do on that end. This projection was more about the quantifying side for what the population of homeless was now, and what they projected it to be in the planning period.

Capri asked when they would take into account for the underutilized properties in Newport. Tokos reported this would be reviewed under the housing needs piece and the constructability assessment. This would help to find

out which properties would be good candidates for housing, and which areas should be looked at to get the best bang for the buck for housing development.

Branigan asked if they would they look at the ability to have duplexes and fourplexes rather than single family units when they looked at where they could build. Tokos confirmed they would be looking at all housing types. Berman asked who the project advisory committee would be comprised of. Tokos thought it would be a range of community interests. This would include the Affordable Housing group, Lincoln County, the Housing Authority, and business interests to get a broad representation.

Tokos reviewed Task #4 for the buildable lands inventory, and Task #5 for the housing constructability assessment. He would be talking to developers to get an idea on the range of costs for development. Escobar asked if they were considering an expansion of Harney Street. Tokos didn't think they would because it would be difficult to serve the land because of the cost to bring the infrastructure online and make the housing affordable. Berman asked if subareas were geographic subareas or subdivisions of groups of parcels. Tokos confirmed they were geographical.

East asked if new apartments would contribute to the housing numbers. Tokos confirmed they would and the developer of the Wyndhaven Ridge Apartments would be pulled into the conversation.

Escobar asked how the community built affordable housing in light of the costs. Capri explained that subsidies were the only way to do this. Tokos reported that the Surf View Apartment project was 60 percent or lower medium area income, and 85 percent of the funding for this project was public.

Hanselman reminded that they weren't discussing water delivery. There had been water restrictions the current summer and there hadn't been discussions on increasing water supplies. Hanselman questioned how the increase to the system would be addressed. Escobar noted the City Engineer had reported the concerns of the sewer system. He thought the sewer and water infrastructure needed to be discussed in terms of housing. Tokos noted they couldn't say no connections unless they did a moratorium. If they did a moratorium, the clock would start on a resolution and the city would have to implement it in a reasonably timely manner. This was often paid by general obligation bonds which would affect taxes and the affordability of units. Capri noted that new construction significantly improved infrastructure. Berman reminded that nothing was being done about the basic improvements such as the source of water and water solutions.

Tokos reviewed Task #6 for the residential land needs analysis, Task #7 for the measures to accommodate needed housing, Task #8 for consultant deliverables, Task #9 for the Final HCA and HPS reports, and Task #10 for the adoption and timeline. Berman noted that the proposal submittal and schedule deadline on Page 12 should be changed from 2021 to 2022.

Tokos asked for a Commissioner to volunteer to review proposals. Hanselman and Berman were interested unless another Commissioner wanted to do it. Escobar was interested but since he was a new Commission member he thought he would need some guidance. Sutton expressed interest but liked the idea of Escobar doing it.

- B. Transportation System Plan Tech Memo #12, Transportation Standards.** Tokos reviewed the memo outline and the changes the consultants thought should be made. Berman noted that under recommendation 6 there was confusing text and it was missing a word. Tokos would fix this. He reviewed the transportation facilities as allowed use, the consolidation of definitions, and the edits to the definitions. Berman asked what a half street was and if it would ever be implemented. Tokos confirmed this was something that was done often in infill development. An example was when a street was underdeveloped and someone built on one side of the street where they were required to do half a street improvement. Hanselman asked if private streets and driveways were required to be kept to a certain standard for emergency vehicle access. Tokos wasn't aware of private streets where the city tried to impose some kind of quality control of the street to a certain level. There were some areas like South Shore with well-developed streets that had a good program in place to maintain the streets. There were others that didn't have anything in place.

Tokos reviewed the traffic impact analysis. He noted that as they went through the adoption process they would bring in examples of new development. Berman asked for clarification on Point F of the traffic impact analysis. Tokos explained that in this context they were talking about something that was potentially creating a safety issue that warranted further analysis. He thought they may need to be more clear on this and have it be more quantifiable.

Tokos reviewed the fee in lieu option and noted the city hadn't done this before. The Commission needed a discussion on if they wanted to do this. Berman asked why someone would want to do this. Tokos explained it involved engineering, design, and time to build a capital expense. Berman asked how they knew how much to charge them. Tokos thought they could do it formulaic and use this as a rule of thumb. He reminded that this was how they did LIDs. Berman didn't think it was a good idea.

3. **Unfinished Business.**

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

4. **Adjourn.** The meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau,
Executive Assistant