

It needed to be added to the conditions that the sewer for Lots 20 and 21 were not shown on the documents. The applicant shall come up with a plan for utilities to serve Lot 21. The utility plan would include storm water.

The Planning Commission found that the engineering department comments were relevant. There was discussion regarding the subdivision design and that it would have additional, not better, connectivity if it extended to College Street. Because College Street was a minor arterial the access spacing standards in the Development Code required a new street to be at least 300 feet from Mission Drive, however an extension of Rentfro Way would only be 230 feet from Mission Drive. In addition, a Rentfro extension would only be slightly offset from Ella Court on the east side of College. The spacing standards in the Code required the street to either align with the other one or be offset by 100 feet. The other connections would cause negative impacts and would be a taking because all of the surrounding properties were already developed. Requiring a street plan that extended to Illinois would create a negative impact for already developed properties.

Regarding sidewalks, the sidewalk to the west was not practical because of the angle and visibility. The applicant proposed public walkways to bring the subdivision as close to standards as reasonable. The walkway to Clifford Court should not be built because it was narrow, long, and angled. The Planning Commission found that the comments from ODOT were applicable.

There was further discussion regarding the long cul-de-sac street language. It was feasible to subdivide the property without creating a future street plan that would result in negative impacts to currently developed property along Illinois. The Commission wanted the tax lot numbers inserted instead of saying they were adjacent skinny parcels. Language was suggested to say "subdividing the existing R-1 zone site without a variance to cul-de-sac standards would require a. an access to College which would not happen due to ODOT requirements and the offset and b. an access to Illinois through the developed lots which had a negative impact. The only way to provide access and connectivity was through a long cul-de-sac." They also wanted to remove language about this being an infill project. This R-1 property differed from most other R-1 properties in the City in that it had access from only one City street and was surrounded by developed properties. Granting of the variance would not be detrimental and had no negative impact on neighboring properties. The Commission wanted to add a sentence saying this variance avoided producing a traffic plan that would be injurious to neighboring properties.

For the conditions, the Commission wanted to add storm water and sewer for Lot 21. There was discussion regarding how the storm water system would be maintained.

Mr. Steve Olson said staff would finalize the changes and the Planning Commission would make the decision at the next meeting.

V. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

1. Update on Council items: Mr. Steve Olson reviewed what had happened at the last Council meeting including discussion on increasing the hotel tax and fire and police contract negotiations. There was a new City Manager and the budget had been passed.
2. Other reports, letters or correspondence: None.
3. Next Planning Commission meeting: July 10, 2014

VI. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.

Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this 8 day of January, 2015.



Minutes Recorder



Planning Commission Chair