

Newberg Multifamily Code Amendments Online Survey: 1/10/2023 to 1/30/2023

Q1. What is your level of support for or opposition to revising the minimum parking standard for multifamily developments?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Responses
Strongly Support	16.11%	24
Support	24.16%	36
Neutral	17.45%	26
Oppose	11.41%	17
Strongly Oppose	30.87%	46
	Answered	149
	Skipped	0

Q2. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 1

Answered	76
Skipped	73

Q3. What is your level of support for or opposition to permitting a reduction in on-site open space for developments within ¼ mile of a public park?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Responses
Strongly Support	10.74%	16
Support	16.78%	25
Neutral	10.07%	15
Oppose	21.48%	32
Strongly Oppose	40.94%	61
	Answered	149
	Skipped	0

Q4. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 3

Answered	62
Skipped	87

Q5. What is your level of support for or opposition to not requiring outdoor furnishings for projects utilizing the clear and objective review path?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Responses
Strongly Support	19.46%	29
Support	18.79%	28
Neutral	26.17%	39
Oppose	15.44%	23

Strongly Oppose	20.13%	30
Answered		149
Skipped		0

Q6. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 5

Answered	51
Skipped	98

Q7. What is your level of support for or opposition to prohibiting these materials on the street-facing façade for projects utilizing the clear and objective review path?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Responses
Strongly Support	15.44%	23
Support	23.49%	35
Neutral	29.53%	44
Oppose	10.74%	16
Strongly Oppose	20.81%	31
Answered		149
Skipped		0

Q8. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 7

Answered	53
Skipped	96

Q9. What is your level of support for or opposition to the proposed amendments to the land use review processes for multifamily developments?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Responses
Strongly Support	9.4%	14
Support	15.44%	23
Neutral	26.17%	39
Oppose	14.77%	22
Strongly Oppose	34.23%	51
Answered		149
Skipped		0

Q10. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 9

Answered	60
Skipped	89

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 1

Respondent ID	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1.14233E+11	Jan 30 2023 09:05 AM	Parking spaces are already difficult to find.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 29 2023 11:37 PM	As long as all parking is off the street and contained within the multi family property parking.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 29 2023 06:04 PM	Parking is already an issue in many residential neighborhoods even under the current codes. Why require even less parking spots?	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 10:49 AM	I do not support less parking. I oppose tiny homes. I can't believe our city leaders are even considering this. Traffic is awful and I oppose an urban growth boundary as well.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 09:53 AM	minimum parking requirements make housing more expensive	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 08:25 AM	Parking is already an issue in Newberg. We need more, not less spaces. There needs to be adequate parking available for any development. The above is not enough parking. There is sometimes not enough street parking to accommodate the extra parking needed and should not be relied upon to provide adequate parking. The development itself should provide the parking needs for that development.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 12:15 PM		
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 11:09 AM	Please more clearly define dwelling unit.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:24 AM	This minimum requirement of 1.5 spaces is not based in the reality of need. The need for more than 1.5 spaces will have to be met somewhere. Where will that be met if not at the residence?	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:05 AM	Parking on the streets just clogs everything up and makes it harder for people to see when driving. 0	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 08:54 AM		
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 07:58 AM	With multi-generation families having to live together this is not enough parking. Plus garages (when available) hardly fit today's cars causing more street parking.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 06:15 AM	none	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:23 AM	Parking is already a problem in more dense neighborhoods. I actually hate visiting friends in these areas because of it ND I would hate to live where I have to hunt for parking	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:18 PM	If there are not sufficient parking spaces, residents have to park on the streets. This narrows existing roads and creates ugly clutter in neighborhoods.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 05:17 PM	There should be enough parking for 2 vehicles every unit.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:56 PM	That's not enough parking place! Families typically have two or more vehicles... We can't pretend otherwise. Because of "affordable housing " near Lilly Court, and not enough parking, the livability in this area has been negatively affected. Several times I've had the police ticket	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:31 PM	vehicles that were either parked on the sidewalk or blocking the Lilly Court intersection itself.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:25 PM	Decreasing the limit for larger units will cause overflow to residential streets due to the high number of college students and car collectors.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:15 PM	Not enough parking on the property causes people to clog the streets with cars or not xtra cars they may have which in turn devalues the neighborhood. Not providing enough parking for the residents of multifamily dwellings will put undue stress on the surrounding residential roadways, and cause an unsafe condition for drivers and pedestrians alike. To assume a residence with up to 5 bedrooms will only have 2 cars is unrealistic.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:42 PM		
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:12 PM	I do not want to see an overabundance of parking on the streets. I think wording should be implemented in the housing contract that each owner is to park in his/her spot and not extra cars on the street. Inadequate parking spaces on site for dwellings forces further congestion along community streets. Example: parking on Debra, where most cars are not licensed or inoperable and I assume belong to residents of the mobile home park or the	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:05 PM	apartments across the street from the middle school. It depends which direction the city wants to move. People need places to park. We are not Portland where there is a more robust transit system. People in Newberg NEED cars to get around and those cars need places to park. If changes need to be	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:01 PM	made it needs to be on the side of increasing available parking, not decreasing.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:00 PM	No need to cram more cars into town. There's already too few spots as is.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:48 PM	1.5 per unit is too low, it should be 1 space per bedroom	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:17 PM	Most Multifamily projects have crowded parking as it is. Cars often double up or park in non-parking locations, or line the local streets which are often too narrow as it is for two direction traffic when cars are parked along the street	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:06 PM	As long as there is no maximum limit on parking 1.5 per dwelling unit should average out ok.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:53 PM	If feasible, some parking spaces should be able to be multi-story parking structures; 2 or 3 level parking garages;	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:48 PM	If I'm reading this correctly a 4 bedroom unit will only need the 1.5 parking space in the new proposal? No way	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:46 PM	The new 45 unit complex on River Street has 75 parking spots but still at least 15 vehicles park on the streets every night from this development. I suggest 2x units for similar developments.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:20 PM	I remember visiting my daughter in Seattle and walking 6 blocks from the first available place to park on the street to her apartment building because there is no parking for her at the building. The current requirement is not enough as it is. starting at 1.5 spaces per unit, we must increase the space requirement for 2 bedrooms on up. The complex at the corner of Villa and Park is a great example of how the current requirements are	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:11 PM	inadequate.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:03 PM	We do not have mass transit so how do you expect people to get to and from work and store?	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	Newberg does not need the parking problems of cities like Portland where people cannot park in front of their own homes because dwellings have been crammed into city limits without sufficient parking provided for all these new residents As it currently stands, multifamily developments in Newberg (at least the one in which my wife and I live) barely have adequate parking. If these requirements are revised as described above, new developments will be almost guaranteed to have	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	inadequate parking, creating issues both for residents of new developments and for those who live nearby. There's already problems all over Newberg with side street parking. It's hard to see if you're a pedestrian without going halfway across the street because cars are blocking your entire view. And if you're living in one of the houses or apartments, you	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:47 PM	have no place to park	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:45 PM	The city is already screwing people on parking in neighborhood.	

1.1423E+11 Jan 26 2023 12:38 PM It's fine the way it is

1.1423E+11 Jan 26 2023 12:37 PM N/A

1.1423E+11 Jan 26 2023 11:04 AM At least Two parking spots are needed. And that's not enough

1.1423E+11 Jan 26 2023 10:27 AM Multi family units 1 bedroom would have a minimum of 2 cars. 2 bedroom, 4 to 5 cars.

1.1423E+11 Jan 26 2023 08:10 AM This would result in many multi-family units without adequate parking.

1.1423E+11 Jan 25 2023 10:33 PM 2 parking spaces for a 4-bedroom unit is not adequate.

1.1423E+11 Jan 25 2023 09:55 PM I have been in neighborhoods where there is not parking provided and vehicles are everywhere along the streets preventing vehicles from passing each other, having to wait for one at a time passage.
I have seen complexes where too little parking is provided. It quickly becomes an issue that overflows into surrounding neighborhoods, creating incohesiveness in the design and flow of the neighborhood. It also makes the neighborhood look cheap and visibility difficult for traffic and pedestrians.

1.1423E+11 Jan 25 2023 06:11 PM

1.1423E+11 Jan 25 2023 04:55 PM I think this needs to be considered holistically with respect to access to services, amenities, and public transit.

1.14229E+11 Jan 25 2023 02:13 PM I support keeping the number of parking places the same
Parking is essential otherwise your streets become more congested since there's less availability. I believe this makes streets unsafe for others. It also restricts emergency response making for less room available to navigate through. Essentially this is a very Portland thing to do. No thanks.

1.14229E+11 Jan 25 2023 12:43 PM

1.14229E+11 Jan 25 2023 11:34 AM Do not decrease parking levels. The apt. complex on Lane and Villa Road is a dangerous NIGHTMARE.
I have been in cities without adequate parking in neighborhoods

1.14229E+11 Jan 25 2023 10:35 AM It becomes neighbor disputes, no place for visitors, tough for deliveries and eventually it becomes a pay to park. Let's keep Newberg clean.

1.14229E+11 Jan 25 2023 10:27 AM There is never enough parking provided for developments. Vehicles are forced to park on the street which decreases driver visibility and increases hazards for safety or pedestrians and drivers alike. It also clutters our town.
The existing parking requirements are realistic based on typical actual household situations. The proposed flat-rate 1.5 spaces will result in more on-street parking. Any simplification of the review process would be minuscule. Supporting the city's goal of providing an adequate level of housing for all income levels are nice sounding Equity style words but the result will be cramming a FEW more units onto smaller lots for the enrichment of the developer/landlord and as I previously stated, push more parking onto streets.

1.14229E+11 Jan 25 2023 10:06 AM

1.14229E+11 Jan 24 2023 02:11 PM Why use a .2 instead of solid number Wrong again and requirements just like renting OUR City streets to the Chamber of Commerce and GFU (that charges students for our street parking !

1.14226E+11 Jan 21 2023 10:38 AM This would help offset the price of land, allowing more units.

1.14226E+11 Jan 20 2023 09:53 AM Even at 1.5 spaces per unit, that could still be too high, since for a building that only had 1 bedroom units or mostly had 1 bedroom units, it would require more parking than the current code.
Poorly worded question.

1.14226E+11 Jan 20 2023 07:09 AM Our new buildings at Crest View crossing are a disgrace. The parking is beyond ridiculous. As a realtor I couldn't even park nearby to show the unit.

1.14225E+11 Jan 19 2023 03:18 PM If there's not enough parking provided, where will people park? It's not fair to have folks parking in front of other folks' properties so that they then have to park far from their home...

1.14225E+11 Jan 19 2023 11:15 AM Could reduce them more than proposed.

1.14225E+11 Jan 19 2023 09:43 AM As public transit options increase, parking requirements should decrease. Also, putting housing near services can also reduce the need for parking.

1.14224E+11 Jan 18 2023 09:34 AM Parking is an issue in some residential areas

1.14221E+11 Jan 14 2023 12:06 PM Keep the current parking requirements

1.14221E+11 Jan 13 2023 08:57 PM We need vastly improved public transportation so people don't need cars. We should not be building new housing without adding bus routes, and we need a train to Portland and Salem.
I want people to have adequate parking space. I also do not want the entire planet paved over for parking. If there are ways to make the parking compact, such as parking garages with multiple levels, or parking under residences, that would be better than making parking lots everywhere. I also would rather there was increased public transit so not everyone needs a car.

1.14221E+11 Jan 13 2023 11:01 AM

1.1422E+11 Jan 12 2023 05:38 PM I support the changes, but I'm also interested in a scenario where units close to public transit could have fewer. Hard to do right now though with the lack of enough bus stops.

1.14219E+11 Jan 11 2023 02:39 PM None

1.14219E+11 Jan 11 2023 06:40 AM Most 1 bedroom units have 2 drivers/vehicles. Lack of spaces put vehicles on the street for parking and potentially in front of other residents.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 07:31 PM So you propose reducing the amount of parking? NO! There's not enough parking for any of the new developments as it is.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 04:45 PM Many streets are overcrowded currently. Families need more parking spaces not less

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 02:34 PM I think each 1 bedroom unit or larger should have two spaces available per unit.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 02:11 PM If you are going to reduce parking, you must improve bus transportation.
The mess on E. Park Lane caused by the development of Chehalem Point Apartments should be a clear indication that more parking spaces need to be required per unit. That street isn't wide enough to allow parking on both sides of the street, yet it's happening. I've been nearly hit on that street multiple times.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 02:08 PM

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 12:32 PM We need to be thinking about ways to create a more walkable Newberg, inflated parking requirements take up needless space and are counter productive to the kind of city infrastructure that promotes a healthy lifestyle and high quality of life.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 12:18 PM We need to talk about this in conjunction with the proximity of these zones with amenities/grocery/public transit/communal spaces and parks. We need to ween away from car dependence. Also. We need to have better bike infrastructure.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 12:09 PM It's important to have enough parking for tenants, once the streets are crowded with parked cars the overall quality of the neighborhood goes downhill.

1.14218E+11 Jan 10 2023 11:44 AM I'd rather see more visitor parking required, but I'd support it as written.

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 3

Respondent ID	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1.14233E+11	Jan 30 2023 08:36 AM	The yards of multi-family home are small enough. Reducing the yards even more you might as well just build apartments.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 29 2023 06:04 PM	Open spaces are important for quality of life. I like the requirement as it currently exists.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 10:49 AM	We need more parks!! And open spaces. Not less!!	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 09:53 AM	The city already pays for the public space to be maintained, incentivizing the construction of denser multi-unit housing near parks will make community engagement more vibrant and organic. this proposal will benefit the community	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 08:25 AM	We need to keep open and green spaces around the city available for citizens to still enjoy a bit of nature without paving over everything.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:09 PM	In my opinion, it is not healthy for us to live in the types of densities being advocated today.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 12:15 PM	The reduction in open space is detrimental to the people living in the development and the areas around the development. Kids need more than parks to run, climb and be active for their physical development as well as their mental/emotional development. The tall, close together building that are being built in Newberg are NOT good for the people living in those tight quarters, nor are they good for the community.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 11:09 AM	If the public park is accessible (walkable continuous sidewalks that are usable for those with disabilities)	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:24 AM	People need open spaces conveniently located near their residence. As a parent living in the Pacific NW weather and safety are always a concern so being able to play close by so I can keep an eye on my children for safety reasons is paramount.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:05 AM	We don't need to just cram everything together and everyone needs space outside their door with easy access.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 08:54 AM		0
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 07:58 AM	I do not want cars lining streets around parks. Parks should be inviting.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 06:15 AM	none	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:41 PM	Crowded housing and lack of green space result in shortage of places to walk and play, and simply feel there is some privacy. More green space also improves mental health.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:18 PM	This will take away available parking near parks, so that people will find it much more difficult to visit the parks.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 05:17 PM	The developments should have to supply enough spots for 2 cars every unit.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:31 PM	This code was originally put into place for a good reason and that reason hasn't changed.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:15 PM	The current open space requirement helps to combat congestion. Any requirement to lessen the amount of open space required only hurts the neighborhoods.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:05 PM	I think the further scrunching of people into ever smaller spaces will eventually lead to people demonstrating less and less respect for property maintenance and eventual slum zones.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:01 PM	We need green spaces. We need trees to provide shade protection and provide oxygen. Kids need places to play outside safely and close to their dwellings. 1/4 mile is to far in some cases.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:00 PM	You're going to take away parking for long time residents? No.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:17 PM	The open space in multifamily projects is often not used, and creates more maintenance. With a park close by, it seems to meet the objectives and makes sense to reduce that requirement from the development	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:12 PM	I have mobility issues so walking 1/4 mile to a park is not an option.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:06 PM	Currently there is only 1 park with access to a major arterial. All other parks are accessed through neighborhood streets. This proposal will increase traffic in neighborhoods an make it more likely that under school age children will not have close to home facilities.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:53 PM	Kids need places to play & dogs & cats can run quite near their homes & not always at nearby parks or school District places;	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:46 PM	How is the 1/4 mile measured? It should be walking distance from the most distal part of the development to the childrens playground. If there is no children's playground in the park, then it shouldn't be counted.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:20 PM	Why do we want to be so much like a big city and get rid of our open spaces for some companies gain in profit.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	Again Newberg does not need to transform into Portland where projects style housing is built	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:45 PM	That dip shit Brett with the city doesn't care,about public safety	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:38 PM	It's fine	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:37 PM	N/A	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 10:27 AM	Need close open space for dogs and kids. Healthy outdoor activities leads to healthy lifestyle	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:41 AM	Gardens and open spaces make for better places to live. What if the apartments are within a qtr mile of Jaquith but on the east side of College. No cross walks. Poor access. A long way for a young mother. Let's keep our building grounds desirable	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:10 AM	1/4 mile from a park is too far to allow children to play unattended. Maintaining current public space requirements where children can be seen from a home's windows is much safer.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:33 PM	There is no provision to ensure that the park size is adequate for the properties that would be eligible for the reduction. A tiny park could allow a 50% reduction in on-site open space for a multitude of properties within a 1/4 mile radius.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 25 2023 04:55 PM	Unless you are going to increase parks and trails and public green space preemptively, green space earmarked for development needs to be honored or even expanded upon.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 02:13 PM	I am for keeping the amount of outdoor open space the same if not increasing it	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 12:43 PM	Let me rephrase the question you asked : Do we want to lower the livability by making less green space? Do we want families to walk farther in Oregon weather to have kids play? No.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 11:34 AM	People need oen areas. Cramming them like sardines is bad for mental health and crime goes up when you cram people together.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:27 AM	People need private space for their mental health and well being.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:06 AM	The proposed revision would complicate the review process. It would also reduce the open spaces, garden, paths, and other beneficial aspects to the on-site location. It will create lower-tier living accommodations. And it will add more units onto smaller lots for the enrichment of the developer/landlord at the expense of livability for future residents. Sitting areas/tables may benefit young families/children	
1.14229E+11	Jan 24 2023 02:11 PM	Safety and recreation needs at home instead of having to transport or walk to the park area -they should be allowed the space at their home as well. You are just GIVING the developer more land	
1.14226E+11	Jan 20 2023 09:53 AM	With the reduced open space requirement, it is important that the city ensure adequately fund public parks.	
1.14226E+11	Jan 20 2023 07:09 AM	The city has parks set aside for public use. This is at a great cost to the property owners of the city. In order for a developer to profit from his/her development they need to maximize their cash generating decisions. Having more housing on site is a cost benefit to the person taking the financial risk to provide housing. Hobbling them with a requirement to provide something already provided in our city is a development deterrent.	
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 03:18 PM	Open space is important to quality of neighborhoods. If we wanted to live in a dense urban atmosphere we would live in a dense urban atmosphere already.	
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 09:43 AM	As the city grows, parks should be planned to be built near land zoned for higher density housing.	
1.14224E+11	Jan 18 2023 09:34 AM	apartments or town houses around a park is great	
1.14221E+11	Jan 14 2023 12:06 PM	Open space should be kept at the current required minimum. If more housing is desired for the same space, build up not out. Reduce urban sprawl.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 08:57 PM	Apartment complexes should be required to offer vegetable garden space to tenants - perhaps 2 raised beds per dwelling unit, or a community garden type arrangement.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 11:01 AM	Everyone needs open space. A public park is nice, but we already have those, and we're talking about developing more places. We need to make sure we're keeping enough open space, too--particularly keeping trees, which help the whole neighborhood to not be as hot in the summer.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 12 2023 06:39 PM	Should be within 1/2 mile not 1/4 mile.	
1.1422E+11	Jan 12 2023 05:38 PM	It makes sense, and I would vote for this, but as a parent of a toddler in an apartment complex, I'm always going to prefer a playground closer than further. 1/4 mile is fine for our family to go together but feels too far to send children unaccompanied. But if it encourages more housing per acre, it's a worthwhile sacrifice.	
1.14219E+11	Jan 11 2023 06:40 AM	The current open spaces make the properties look better and are easier on caregivers.	
1.14219E+11	Jan 10 2023 10:01 PM	Multi family dwellings surrounding parks will make the parks less accessible for everyone else.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 07:31 PM	While affordable housing is a critical need, we cannot balance that against the benefits that come from greenspace. Greenspace allows for better drainage into our aquifers, allows for space for birds and other wildlife, and is important to children and many others.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:34 PM	No! Current dwellings are already too crowded in too small of a lot. Stop this nonsense! Newberg has limited land and it's already impacted the quality of life not to mention the ridiculous traffic problems with little to no roadway improvements to existing overly traveled routes.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:11 PM	We need more green space, but less, regardless of proximity to other parks. Trees which must be removed from property being developed should be replaced 1:1 by new trees.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:08 PM	This reduction will only work if there are safe and easy-to-use sidewalks and bike paths with good pavement surfaces.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 12:32 PM	As long as there is a park within 1/4 mile, this is a positive for housing development.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 12:18 PM	This is a great ideal Public parks not only provide equal access to open space to all, but bring communities together in a way that spaces on private developments do not!	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 12:09 PM	Do not sacrifice green space. You greedy bastards.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 11:44 AM	Let's not compress our neighborhoods more than they are, keep the present requirements in place but also enhance our public parks.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 11:44 AM	1/4 mile is a long way with small children or a disability. Open space should be required for all, wether a park is nearby or not. It's what keeps the suburbs from looking like cities.	

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 5

Respondent ID	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 10:49 AM	Developers only see money. They must be held accountable to provide for our citizens if they want to build here. Our infrastructure can't handle more. Period!	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 09:53 AM	these required amenities are rarely used by tenants, be it public housing or class A multi developments. outdoor amenities may look good and help an owner lease-up but the reality is they sit unused.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 08:25 AM	Also great to have nice places to sit and rest and enjoy the outdoors. Let's keep these spaces available to citizens so that we can encourage more outdoor time, and foster more community. Certain types of furnishings are appropriate depending on the target population of the housing (family, elderly). If left to the developer you will get the minimum support facilities and a t a cost that is of benefit to the developers bottom line.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:09 PM	The outdoor space needs to be usable. Not providing the equipment needed to enjoy the space is irresponsible at best.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 12:15 PM		
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:24 AM	My concern is that this is not left up to the builder to decided whether of not to spend more money on they items and they most likely will decide not to in order to cut costs and increase profits resulting in less desirable open spaces	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:05 AM	None	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 08:54 AM		0
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 06:15 AM	none	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:23 AM	It just feels like you are trying to squeeze in more dwellings into a small space	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:41 PM	People can bring their own badminton racquets or soccer balls to their outdoor space.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:18 PM	In dense housing, there should be areas where children can play and neighbors can visit.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:15 PM	Not every open space needs outdoor furniture etc.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:12 PM	personally i don't believe contractors will provide outdoor furnishings. it will cost them more to do so.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:05 PM	R we concerned about developers bottom lines or the livability of the structures and amenities for residents?	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:01 PM	Kids need places to play safely outside. Outdoor places in multifamily dwellings give a place to build community and for people to gather.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:00 PM	No. Leave it up to the neighborhood's discretion via space committee and developers.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:48 PM	That many residence need additional area to spread out	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:17 PM	Let the developer decide what is appropriate for outdoor furnishings	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:06 PM	None	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:53 PM	We must continue to allow developer/owners the right to add special features to bring joy to their tenants; these features are also helpful marketing features;	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:20 PM	Why would a city depend on a developer who is a for profit company to decide whether they can build another building and not a place to let kids and pets play.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	Let's keep Newberg a place that has a pleasant atmosphere and isn't just rows and rows of project style housing like some type of dystopian nightmare sci-fi movie	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:47 PM	I'd like a picnic tables and benches. Would also really like it if more places had bathrooms that isn't a bush or a porta potty. It's hard for some people to do a lot of walking without needing to take a break, similar with the bathroom	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:45 PM	None	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:38 PM	Nope	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:37 PM	N/A	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 11:04 AM	It's nice to have places to sit	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 10:27 AM	Again outdoor space is a top priority for healthy living	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:41 AM	When combined with #3 above which reduces open spaces, this zero requirement for outdoor furnishings takes us in the direction of building Barracks for workers. If newberg wants to compete for desirability, it needs to provide homeowners with nicely planned communities that provide adequate outdoor spaces for recreation, parking, leisure, shopping (shopping as a leisure, not as a necessity; like outside gathering places in and around retail).	
1.1423E+11	Jan 25 2023 06:11 PM	Developer discretion is never in favor of community development. Minimum outdoor furnishings and accessibility must be met or exceeded.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 04:55 PM	I think developers should provide outdoor furnishings	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 02:13 PM	A developer will choose to keep costs down by not adding these features.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 12:43 PM	Requirements like this aren't cost effective and make rents higher with little benefit. Let the builder/owner decide.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 11:34 AM	The nice park like feel is nice	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:35 AM	What is the meaning of "proposed clear and objective review path"? It's Not defined and sounds like word-smithing to evoke comfort and agreement with the proposed position.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:06 AM	Developers should have the financial freedom to not have government decide on frivolous amenities requirements for their financial risk. Safety requirements of course but not design decisions.	
1.14226E+11	Jan 20 2023 07:09 AM	This is acceptable as long as it is demonstrated that it results in more-affordable housing.	
1.14224E+11	Jan 18 2023 09:34 AM	if reducing private outdoor space for apartments/townhomes then developers should provide nice common space for grills, playgrounds and walking paths for dog walks	
1.14221E+11	Jan 14 2023 12:06 PM	Minimum outdoor furnishings should be required in development plans	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 08:57 PM	Again, I think vegetable gardening should be promoted in the landscape design.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 11:01 AM	I don't think there needs to be one set of rules governing all outdoor furnishings. I think there needs to be flexibility based on that particular location.	
1.1422E+11	Jan 12 2023 06:39 PM	Developers should not be required to install outdoor furnishing	
1.1422E+11	Jan 12 2023 05:38 PM	The lack of these features hinders the development of community relationships, which are already deficient in rental complexes. But developers generally don't prioritize building spaces that foster neighbor-to-neighbor relationships. I don't think the city is obligated to legislate this either, but I do wish our rental communities chose to offer such gathering spaces, especially for children.	
1.14219E+11	Jan 11 2023 02:39 PM	This helps facilitate usage. "Flexibility" sounds like cost savings for developers rather than providing what will be helpful to residents	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:34 PM	Developers should pay the CPRD a fee for each green space that needs to be furnished, and allow the people who specialize in park planning to determine what should be added. Developers will not chose to spend money on recreational components unless it is required, so how about a specific percentage based on projected gross sales be set aside for these recreational components to be decided by the neighborhood association within the first year of residency.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:11 PM		
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:08 PM	N/A	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 12:18 PM	We need to encourage community building and that means interacting with neighbors even passively. Fewer cars and more neighborly interaction.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 11:44 AM	Builders will do the least amount required. This just allows them to do less.	

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 7

Respondent ID	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1.14232E+11	Jan 29 2023 06:04 PM	These types of exterior cladding are a fire risk. Just look at what happened to Grendel Tower in London, UK.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 06:21 PM	Supportive if D and E	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 10:49 AM	Should not use sub standard materials. These questions are like trick questions.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 09:53 AM	I know that T-111 is ugly as, but what's wrong with unpainted CMUs or corrugated metal?	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 08:25 AM	No opinions on this	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 12:15 PM	The real question is not whether they should not be on the street facade, but whether they should be visible within the whole project. Allowing low quality materials is questionable.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 11:09 AM	Vinyl siding should be allowed. It is allowed on single homes lasts a very long time, requires less painting.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:24 AM	I support this from a beautification standpoint but won't this increase building costs thus making housing less affordable?	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:05 AM	None 0	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 08:54 AM		
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 06:35 AM	Not an advocate for vinyl siding. It damages easily and depreciates quickly.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 06:15 AM	none	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:23 AM	So now we just let neighborhoods be densely packed and ugly?	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:18 PM	Such a prohibition is needed because these materials are not in any way attractive.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 05:17 PM	Efis stucco are fine. Ban T-111	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:31 PM	I'm not clear on vinyl siding.... If the pvc type is problematic. Usually vinyl siding looks pretty good... At least when new!	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:00 PM	Absolutely not. Who are you to tell us what kind of siding we can or can't use? Rediculous... This is not a gated community run by a homeowners association.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:48 PM	The type of material is less important then the design that is used	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:17 PM	Properly incorporated and installed, all of these alternative products can be very attractive and possibly require less maintenance	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:06 PM	Limiting the materials to be used serves no purpose other than to soothe the sensibilities of those who can afford better.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:53 PM	The entire structure needs to be finished correctly not just the side facing the street!	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:46 PM	This is too much government control for appearances. Give some freedom.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:20 PM	Why would you give up a street view of a community that cares over a concrete jungle.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:11 PM	The is government overreach. If they are safe and effective material the city should not dictate this.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	Newberg does not need ugly industrial designs on homes	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:45 PM	If you let them build fast a cheap, Newberg will soon become the next portland	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:38 PM	Nope	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:37 PM	N/A	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:41 AM	What materials are considered best? We don't want unsightly facades throughout Newberg. It is probably a bit of a tradeoff with slightly higher construction costs, but a better tradeoff in the long run for maintaining home value and the city's appearance.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:10 AM		
1.1423E+11	Jan 25 2023 04:55 PM	Aesthetic is less important than sustainability and ecological impact.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 02:54 PM	New construction is ugly enough already. I think there are modern cement facings that look good that should be considered not sure about t1-111 or others it's on a case-by-case basis because these materials change over time so perhaps they need to be considered on a product by product basis	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 02:13 PM		
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 12:43 PM	Those are garbage building materials. Short life span and don't weather well. Cheap and ugly.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 11:34 AM	Makes higher costs for little benefit.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:35 AM	Keep Newberg looking nice Probably an unneeded requirement that unnecessarily limits building materials. We have plenty of attractive T-111 or vinyl sided structures in Newberg. What then, are the encouraged materials and finishes?	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:06 AM		
1.14226E+11	Jan 21 2023 10:38 AM	While i don't like the look of corrugated metal, it seems to be a popular siding. Not sure about the cost--if it could iave some money, then it's ok Government needs to stay out of design demands. Government can make sure their land and buildings are pretty but they should not over reach the public's decision on esthetics. Exterior materials is a financial decision for the builder/developer. Require an HOA to maintain the esthetic if that's a concern.	
1.14226E+11	Jan 20 2023 07:09 AM		
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 03:18 PM	Totally depends on what the materials look like - are they esthetically pleasing? Do they look like good quality construction or low-budget and cheap?	
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 09:43 AM	Materials should be reviewed in context of the location of the development and the overall site plan.	
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 07:19 AM	I'm not entirely sure what the materials mean for building code or structures, but aesthetics are subjective. I could see "industrial" materials like concrete and corrugated metal being used tastefully.	
1.14224E+11	Jan 18 2023 09:34 AM	new developments should keep with the existing neighborhoods architectural esthetic I don't understand why they are prohibited. More information would be nice. Are they environmentally unsustainable? That would be the only acceptable reason. Otherwise you are legislating taste.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 08:57 PM	I don't like vinyl siding, but I think corrugated metal looks really cool in a house.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 11:01 AM	I don't feel like I have enough info to answer this question well.	
1.1422E+11	Jan 12 2023 06:39 PM	The city should not be in the business of deciding materials	
1.14219E+11	Jan 11 2023 02:39 PM	Neutral	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 07:31 PM	So you're only concerned with street appeal? How about all materials be long lasting The planning department needs to do a better job of communicating what is necessary for each project and to expedite simple material replacement projects. A similar recent project took nearly 4 months to approve with poor or no communication from the planning department.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:34 PM		
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:11 PM	Any facade that is visible from a public place (i.e, street) should be a preferred material.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:08 PM	I'm fine with an ugly facade if it helps house people. Who really gives a shit? A place for people to stay warm and dry is more important. I don't understand why vinyl/PVC siding and unfinished concrete would be prohibited from use on street-facing facades of buildings in the first place, much less why we should mandate that prohibition for all multi-family housing.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 01:08 PM		
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 12:18 PM	Looks are secondary to sustainable practices and materials.	

Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding Question 9

Respondent ID	Response Date	Responses	Tags
1.14233E+11	Jan 30 2023 05:58 PM	There should always be hearing for zone changes	
1.14232E+11	Jan 29 2023 11:37 PM	The public should always have a chance to give input if their surrounding community is going to be effected by construction.	
1.14232E+11	Jan 29 2023 06:04 PM	I support red tape around building and planning permission. Homeowners have the right to a say on what developments get added to our neighborhoods. The city must be open and honest	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 10:49 AM	Don't really understand	
1.14232E+11	Jan 28 2023 08:25 AM	I don't think it is ever a good idae to eliminate the publics oppotunity to know and comment on whaqt is going on in the neighborhood.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:09 PM	Those living near and impacted by the project should be notified and have the right to either say they approve of the development or they do not and why. They have a right to know when a development is going in near them. Also, the city staff NEEDS to adhere to city code in reviewing the proposed requests. Their job is NOT to figure out how to get the approval of the project (which I have personally seen when the development did not meet city codes) but figure out if the project meets code and what changes need to be made so the project does meet code.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 12:15 PM	These descriptions are getting technical. Simplify use common terms and speech if you want us in the public to understand better.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 11:09 AM	Need more information on the implication of this	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:24 AM	We need to be able to review what is going in and filling up our areas.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 10:05 AM		
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 08:54 AM	The community should be at least made aware as new projects to be able to provide input in any new building. I know it takes time to do that, but if we want to stay a "community", people voices should be heard. That said, it doesn't mean we vote on every little thing.	0
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 07:58 AM	none	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 06:15 AM	While Newberg makes things very hard with permits, I think there should be caution with building of this kind.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 27 2023 03:23 AM	Public notice allows input on any number of particular circumstances that individuals should have input on.	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:41 PM	If something is going to be built that is potentially ugly, and going to lower neighborhood property values, the public SHOULD have a say in these projects!	
1.14231E+11	Jan 26 2023 07:18 PM	All projects should go through the same scrutiny.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 05:17 PM	There should always be a public review.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 04:31 PM	A type 1 review is not acceptable for any development in any city there must be oversight.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:42 PM	I think all proposed amendments should be public notice.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:12 PM	Current residents close to the impacted property deserve to have a say in what happens to the land surrounding them. The decision should not be made by a few without input from those it will effect.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:01 PM	Stop messing with things and fix the potholes. This is all unnecessary busy work brought to charge more money. No.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 03:00 PM	Homes are purchased many time based in Zoning Codes, all existing R codes should stay as is	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:48 PM		
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:17 PM	Streamline the processes. Less blue tape. Needs community input if it falls into an area of a zone that does not allow multifamily outright. But if approved for it, why not allow to be design review and not require community input	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 02:06 PM	None	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:53 PM	As a former Planning Commission member I prefer Type 2 plans have Public Notice & PC approval as long as the process is extremely streamline & fast!	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:46 PM	I don't understand this as written and don't have time or motivation to dig into it. A more thorough explanation of what it really means should have been done here.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 01:20 PM	I'm sure every developer would file a type 1	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	There should be review of major projects that will impact the lives of all Newberg residents	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:52 PM	Since a multifamily development significantly changes a neighborhood, residents should be given the courtesy of at least a public notice if not a public hearing as well for any new development.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:47 PM	No, I want to have an opinion about it	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:38 PM	It's the right of the people to decide not just staff...	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 12:37 PM	N/A	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 10:27 AM	All planning and building of single family neighborhoods, multi family or businesses should have notice and hearing from the public.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:41 AM	The proposed change would reduce public awareness and transparency which is IMO unacceptable. Most people, including myself, don't understand R and C codes/numbering system. They should be fully explained before these survey questions are asked. In general, the more the public knows about proposed developments, the better, but it should not hamper or create barriers to construction completion. If one could count on "Clear and Objective" as actually meeting the dictionary definitions of those words, that part would be acceptable. History has shown that Newberg can't be counted on to follow that. Similarly, it is clear that "public notice" is generally nothing more than that. That is, the public is made aware of the pending decision, but little weight is given to their input.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 26 2023 08:10 AM	Let residents weigh in ALWAYS.	
1.1423E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:33 PM	None	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 02:54 PM	Public should get to decide, not politicians with special interests	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 02:13 PM	I eed more information	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 12:43 PM	Citizens should have input on these developments as they directly affect the livability and value of their neighborhood. City officials tend not to have a as much of vested interest in the livability of the specific neighborhoods.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 11:34 AM	I can't support reducing the transparency that comes from the current land-use public notification processes. People need to be informed. In this way Newberg residents are allowed involvement. The proposed changes would give more decision authority to city staff. However, City staff may live in Sherwood or Lafayette and not have the same concern for a multi-family development as would the Newberg neighbors to the development.	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:27 AM	The Citizens need to have input on their backyards and what is going into them or next to .	
1.14229E+11	Jan 25 2023 10:06 AM	I would also strongly support a Type 1 proceeding for clear and objective path in R-2, C and I districts.	
1.14226E+11	Jan 21 2023 10:38 AM	Neutral because the city does not listen to the citizens during the public comment phase. It's a cursory event with no weight. Pretty much will be rubber stamped through regardless of how people feel.	
1.14226E+11	Jan 20 2023 07:09 AM	Neighbors who have invested in their home should have a say in what is built near them! Public notice and/or hearing is important!	
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 03:18 PM	Not sure I understand. The law requires a clear & objective path, so this is correcting for an erroneous procedure? Type 1 should be available for C&O proposals regardless of what zone they are in.	
1.14225E+11	Jan 19 2023 11:15 AM	support this proposed change, current residents in the area should have a say on if a multifamily complex is to be build in their neighborhood as the quality of the complex will directly affect their housing value	
1.14224E+11	Jan 18 2023 09:34 AM	I didn't understand any of what you outlined above. Definitely multi family developments need to go through extensive review. Like how on earth did the hideous Crestview Crossing development ever get approved?????	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 08:57 PM	I don't have enough information to answer this question.	
1.14221E+11	Jan 13 2023 11:01 AM	Multifamily housing should have the fastest approval process.	
1.1422E+11	Jan 12 2023 06:39 PM	Need to improve efficiency	
1.14219E+11	Jan 11 2023 02:39 PM	Very confusing question.	
1.14219E+11	Jan 11 2023 02:39 PM	I want public input on proposed developments of multi family units. Absolutely no lessening of time for reviews. They already take so little time they spring up overnight.	
1.14219E+11	Jan 11 2023 06:40 AM		
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 07:31 PM	Furthermore, this is not a fair survey. The questions and very poor explanations are not enough. Far more info is necessary.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:34 PM	I think there should be more community input to the type of housing being developed- not less.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:11 PM	The public hearing process can raise a lot of concerns that may not become apparent to the commissioners because staff and the applicant may not present some for consideration.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 02:08 PM	I don't feel that this has been fully explained with all the codes for me to make an informed decision. Do better with your explanations, including info on what the codes mean. I don't understand either of the review processes as described or what the changes would be, based on this question, explanation, and charts... Is there a way to make this entire question clearer, with fewer undefined references and a more explicit explanation of the approval process?	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 01:08 PM	Just make everything transparent.	
1.14218E+11	Jan 10 2023 12:18 PM		