

**MINUTES**  
**City of Newport Planning Commission**  
**Work Session**  
**Newport City Hall Conference Room A**  
**December 10, 2018**  
**6:00 p.m.**

**Planning Commissioners Present:** Jim Patrick, Lee Hardy, Bob Berman, Mike Franklin, Rod Croteau, Bill Branigan, and Jim Hanselman.

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

**Public Members Present:** Michelle Geltner, and Madeline Shannon.

**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. **Unfinished Business.** No unfinished business.
  3. **New Business.**
- A. **Status of Proposed Revisions to Flood Insurance Rate Maps.** Tokos reviewed his memo and explained the dates of the last map updates. He noted FEMA used LIDAR data to do more accurate updates to the maps. Tokos reviewed the timeline on the updates and open houses since 2016. The maps were used to regulate development within in the City of Newport. Tokos noted there had been appeals by property owners who were successful in showing how the maps weren't accurate for their properties. He stated that in September of 2018 FEMA approved the change for these properties.

Berman asked what the implications for property owners were for being in or out of the flood plain. Tokos explained that if they were to build within a 100 year flood plain they would have to build at least one foot above base point flood elevation and they couldn't develop in a floodway. They would have to build on piles and there would be special considerations for septic systems. Berman asked if property owners would be required to get flood insurance. Tokos said typically flood insurance was tied into this and explained the rules and exceptions. Tokos said there wasn't much exposure in Newport and there was only 621 notices sent out to property owners. Berman asked what the PC's role was and what they had to do with maps. Tokos said the PC would have to formally adopt an overlay. If they failed to adopt the maps, people would lose the ability to get flood insurance. Tokos noted that property owners were waiting for the updates to the maps because there were less properties that were impacted by the maps than before the updates were done.

- B. **Review Standards for Manufactured Dwellings and Tiny Homes on Residential Lots.** Tokos said he reached out to Frank and Michelle Geltner to come to the current meeting since they were interested in implementing tiny homes on their property. He reviewed his memo concerning the standards and how they applied to manufactured dwelling and tiny homes inside and outside of mobile home parks. He explained how tiny homes were a new thing and they wouldn't be seen outside of parks because they didn't meet building codes. Tokos said that the Building Codes Division decided to make changes to their reach code to include separate standards for tiny homes.

Tokos thought the new code might mean the city would see more tiny homes. Berman asked what the impediment would be currently for someone who wanted to put a community of tiny homes on a R-3 or R-4 zone. Tokos said nothing if they met the lot density requirement. He said there had been a discussion on what constituted a tiny home. Tiny homes would have to have sanitation, bathing, and cooking facilities in order to be an accessory dwelling unit, and would also have to meet the density requirements for the lot in the zone. Berman asked if people could still do an accessory dwelling unit on a lot. Tokos said yes, as long as there was a main dwelling on the lot. Branigan asked if someone could do more than one accessory dwelling unit on a lot. Tokos said not in Newport, but some jurisdictions allowed up to two.

Croteau asked for the difference between a tiny home and a park model in a mobile home park. Tokos said a park model would be towed in and subject to the RV code. Manufactured homes would be subject to Federal HUD standards. He said a tiny home wasn't built to any particular code but had to meet the plumbing, electrical, and possibly mechanical provisions. Tokos said they would also be subject to system development charges.

Franklin asked if a tiny home had to meet earthquake standards. Tokos said if they were in a geologic hazards area they would be subject to the requirements for all new builds.


Berman asked if the city should look at some incentives to encourage tiny homes. Tokos said the city was more likely to see more tiny homes coming in the city. They should consider how the city should be responding through the land use regulations and asking if they should be clustered on residential lots, be accessory dwelling units, be subject to some compatibility standards, or if the city should revisit the manufactured dwelling standards and pull them away. Franklin wanted more information on what Portland was struggling with and wanted to see how it was working for them. Croteau thought there should be some compatibility standards. Michelle Geltner addressed the PC and noted that there was a stigma between a RV park compared to a tiny home village in some social structures and felt this would be a factor. Tokos said what he was hearing was the PC wanted to see more on the issue, including compatibility standards and more information on what was currently being done in other jurisdictions.

Capri asked if someone could have a tiny home village as a hotel. Tokos said this would be different because the units would be considered transient. A discussion ensued on the current rules for accessory dwelling units. Branigan asked if tiny homes met the fire code. Tokos said the reach code was created to cover this.

Capri thought that Public Works would have some input on the plumbing standards. Tokos said the connection to city sewer would be up to the plumbing code. A discussion ensued regarding how tiny homes were plumbed when they were on wheels versus when they were on foundations. Franklin was concerned about tiny homes that were parked for a few months and then they were moved. He felt these were more like RVs. Tokos said there were provisions in the reach code on how units were used as an RV compared to being permanent. Capri thought if someone was putting a tiny home in as a residence, they needed to be considered permanent. Geltner stated that many people who were building tiny homes were putting them on wheels. She said the trend was going this way and tiny homes were an alternative to RVs. Tokos said what he was hearing was the PC wanted to have a discussion in a future work session meeting to walk through what the allowances were for connection types. He noted that if a connection type was authorized under a building type code that the city had adopted, this would be a standard that would be applied and the city couldn't deviate from it. A discussion ensued regarding how tiny homes were bolted down. Tokos referenced the Oregon Reach Code, Section R101.4, that stated that a local Building Official was not required to accept a permit application for a tiny house under this code if the local municipality had adopted an ordinance prohibiting tiny house structures, their use, installation, set-up, or any other matter consistent with planning and zoning standards adopted for that community. Tokos said the city could put in place some siding standards for siding. He said what he what he heard was the PC wanted him to bring some specific standards for an upcoming work session and include details on siding standards for tiny homes. He said he would also look at what other jurisdictions were doing.

4. **Director's Comments.** No Director comments.
5. **Adjournment.** Having no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sherri Marineau,  
Executive Assistant