



**CITY OF NEWPORT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NEWPORT CITY HALL
JUNE 8, 2017 – 5:30 P.M.**

Chairperson:	Kevin Haley	City Administrator:	Deb Hill
Vice-Chair:	Marvin Taylor	Asst. to the City Admin:	Renee Eisenbeisz
Commissioner:	Anthony Mahmood	Planner:	Sherri Buss
Commissioner:	David Tweeten	Council Liaison:	Bill Sumner
Commissioner:	Saengmany Ratsabout		

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

A. Planning Commission Minutes of the May 11, 2017 Meeting

4. APPOINTMENTS WITH COMMISSION

A. **Public Hearing** – To consider amendments to Section 36-208 regarding lot coverage in residential districts

1. Resolution No. P.C. 2017-6

5. COMMISSION & STAFF REPORTS

6. NEW BUSINESS

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Upcoming Meetings and Events:

1. City Council Meeting	June 15, 2017	5:30 p.m.
2. Park Board Meeting	June 22, 2017	6:00 p.m.
3. City Offices Closed for the 4th of July	July 3-4, 2017	
4. Planning Commission Meeting	July 13, 2017	5:30 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT



**City of Newport
Planning Commission Minutes
May 11, 2017**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Haley called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present – Kevin Haley, Marvin Taylor, Anthony Mahmood, David Tweeten, Saengmany Ratsabout

Commissioners absent –

Also present – Deb Hill, City Administrator; Renee Eisenbeisz, Asst. to the City Administrator; Bill Sumner, Council Liaison; Sherri Buss, TKDA Planner.

3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

A. Planning Commission Minutes of the April 13, 2017 Meeting

Saengmany Ratsabout - David was here.

Motion by Haley, seconded by Mahmood, to approve the April 13, 2017 minutes as amended. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays the motion carried.

4. APPOINTMENTS WITH COMMISSION

A. Public Hearing – To consider an application from David Roering for Approval of a Conditional Use Permit for Property Located at 222 21st Street

Sherri Buss, City Planner, presented on this item as outlined in the May 11, 2017 Planning Commission packet.

The public hearing opened at 5:38 p.m.

Bill Sumner, 737 21st Street - This request is before us today and this gentleman has gone through the required procedure. He has the opportunity to bring a couple of businesses into Newport and is employing some people. Now that he's gone through the required process and with the backing of the Planning official, I think this would be a good addition to the business community.

Jerry Gamer, 1975 3rd Avenue - I think what he's doing here is a good thing. He's been in there about a year and you don't even know he's there. I think it's a good addition and brings business in. We need all the help we can get.

The public hearing closed at 5:42 p.m.

Anthony Mahmood - What is the drain covered up by?

Ms. Buss - It was covered up to expand parking.

Dave Roering, 222 21st Street - I thought it was abandoned so was filling it in when the owner called me to say it was still active so I removed the dirt.

Saengmany Ratsabout - Are they required to put parking spots in?

Ms. Buss - No, they need a hard surface for wherever they park. There's not a required number of spaces for this use.

Chairperson Haley - It shows two parcels and there are two different businesses. I'm concerned that there will be too many cars and the businesses won't like each other. I've seen a lot of cars there.

Mr. Roering - That's a good thing right? I'm in the other part of the building. I do home repair and snow removal.

Chairperson Haley - I'm just concerned that there's a lot of cars. I don't disagree with you that it's a good thing but they need to be kept within the parking lot and off the streets. If those conditions are not met, the permit can be taken away.

Mr. Roering - I hear you and I don't think he's parked anything on the street.

Chairperson Haley - It's well spelled out here and we expect those conditions to be met.

Saengmany Ratsabout - Are they required to do proper signage? I drive by it daily and see the old sign is still there and the detailing sign is very small. Is that a requirement?

David Tweeten - We require signs to be in good repair.

Mr. Roering - We plan on putting up a new sign.

Vice-Chair Taylor - Could it be a condition to remove the abandoned sign?

Ms. Buss - You can say that it would need to be removed within 6 months.

Vice-Chair Taylor - I would like to add that. It's sat there for years. If we don't put a date in it'll still sit there.

Mr. Roering - I didn't want to put a sign in until things got approved.

Ms. Buss - How long do you want to give?

Vice-Chair Taylor - 6 months. I have some more concerns about your use. I was told that you are using that side for residential use to a certain extent.

Mr. Roering - To a point. My primary residence is in St. Paul.

Vice-Chair Taylor - Single-family residential use is not allowed in this district.

Ms. Buss - There are existing residential uses that are permitted to stay but anything new would need to be multi-family.

Mr. Roering - So an addition with apartments could be an acceptable use?

Ms. Buss - Could be.

Vice-Chair Taylor - I think it's a safety issue. If you have a detailing use and the chemicals and someone sleeping in the other half.

Ms. Buss - You would also need an occupancy permit for the residential side. I think the city is working on that through another direction.

Asst. to the City Administrator Eisenbeisz - They applied for a certificate of occupancy so that will be done once this is approved.

David Tweeten - I don't know if that needs to be tied to the CUP, it can be dealt with separately.

Vice-Chair Taylor - Just so you know that you cannot live there. Residential is not allowed there. This is an important area for the city. I just want to make sure that things are followed and it's used within the context of our ordinances. That's where a lot of my concerns are. That'll be inspected. Another question I had was the culvert. Do we need to put a distance for it?

Ms. Buss - The engineer didn't say that.

Vice-Chair Taylor - Another question, there are two entries but one is blocked by cars. Do we need to require anything there?

Chairperson Haley - No.

Ms. Buss - There's an entrance on the back as well. If a fire truck needed to get in there, they would drive over the grass. Jon didn't comment on that at all.

David Tweeten - I'd like to be sure that we're not overly concerned about updating the appearance of the place. I think there should be some clarification on what he can do in terms of landscaping.

Ms. Buss - I think the City would encourage improvement. Maybe once this permit is approved, he'll do some work on it.

Mr. Roering - I take pride in the buildings I own. I am just leasing it now so until the sale goes through I don't want to do too much.

Motion by Haley, seconded by Mahmood, to approve Resolution No. P.C. 2017-5 as amended. With 4 Ayes, Taylor voting Nay, the motion carried.

B. Verbal Update on Variance Request for 1808 3rd Avenue

Asst. to the City Administrator Eisenbeisz provided an update on this variance request. The property owners worked with Engineer Herdegen to reduce the lot coverage so they no longer needed a variance.

5. COMMISSION AND STAFF REPORTS

A. Residential Lot Coverage Discussion

Sherri Buss, City Planner, presented on this item as outlined in the April 13, 2017 Planning Commission packet. The Planning Commission directed staff to put together a table to include in the City Code stating what would need to be done if someone wanted to exceed the 35% lot coverage. These plans would be reviewed at a staff level if allowed. Vice-Chair Taylor noted a concern with going above 40% due to long-term maintenance and enforcement. David Tweeten also noted that he wasn't inclined to go over 40%. The Planning Commission directed the City Engineer to identify a maximum number for lot coverage and to bring that forward for a June 8th public hearing.

6. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Buss - The Bailey's came in to talk about their 40 acres on the north end of the City and asked if we would be willing to consider it as "commercial/industrial" use in the next comp plan. Woodbury has identified their parcels surrounding it has "places to work" which would allow commercial or industrial. We'll change that if it works for you guys.

Chairperson Haley - That's a great place to have industrial. It's just a potting field right now.

Anthony Mahmood - Are we getting that interesting that you guys wanted to come watch?

Robert Conklin, 2025 1st Avenue - When we bought our house 20 years ago, the realtor said that the area behind us is a buffer zone and that no one can build there.

Chairperson Haley - They lied to you.

Mr. Conklin - Now it's up for sale as residential. In fact, the letter you sent me last year had that area as a park.

Chairperson Haley - It's private property and is zoned as residential. The owner was using it as buffer. It's their choice and land. It could be developed for houses. If the County or City chose to buy it for parks they could.

Admin. Hill - There has been no talk about it being park.

Mr. Conklin - If that area gets developed would I need to pay for taxes to get that road improved?

Ms. Buss - No, that would be charged to the development.

Chairperson Haley - They are still zoned lots but it's in a floodplain so you may not be able to build on it.

Greg Bakken, 1735 1st Avenue - This is also in my back yard. Can they build the land up to be out of the flood zone?

Ms. Buss - Only if they create new flood storage somewhere else which is probably unlikely.

Mr. Bakken - If they tear down these woods, our backyards will be illuminated from the lights on the tank farm.

Chairperson Haley - We have ordinances that don't allow that. If that does happen please come into City Hall and we'll work with the property owners about it.

Ms. Buss - That would be something for the developer to think about on how many trees they'll be removing. Also the tank farm will need to address it.

Vice-Chair Taylor - They are lit up for safety reasons.

Chairperson Haley - If the federal government has laws about lighting, ours doesn't supersede that.

Vice-Chair Taylor - They won't want to screen their property. I think it's deliberately barren.

Ms. Buss - That's a good point to think of if this area gets developed.

Chairperson Haley - Telling a developer that they need to block light from another property is not right.

Ms. Buss - It would need to go to the tank farm folks. I think it's a good thing for us to think about a little bit.

Mr. Bakken - The trees also worked to reduce the noise. To cut that down, the enjoyment of our land is gone. We would like to have that discussed heavily.

Chairperson Haley - I hope you understand that it is private property.

Ms. Buss - It's good to know your concerns if something moves forward with this.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Upcoming Meetings and Events:

- | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------|
| 1. City Council Meeting | May 18, 2017 | 5:30 p.m. |
| 2. Park Board Meeting | May 25, 2017 | 6:00 p.m. |
| 3. City Offices Closed for Memorial Day | May 29, 2017 | |
| 4. City Council Meeting | June 1, 2017 | 5:30 p.m. |

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mahmood, seconded by Tweeten, to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:32 p.m. With 5 Ayes, 0 Nays, the motion carried.

Signed: _____
Kevin Haley, Chairperson

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Eisenbeisz
Asst. to the City Administrator



444 Cedar Street, Suite 1500
 Saint Paul, MN 55101
 651.292.4400
 tkda.com

Memorandum

To:	Newport Planning Commission	Reference:	June Planning Commission Meeting: Residential Lot Coverage Requirement—Public Hearing and Wastewater Chapter of Comprehensive Plan
Copies To:	<hr/> Deb Hill, City Administrator <hr/> Renee Eisenbeisz, Assistant to Administrator <hr/> Jon Herdegen, City Engineer <hr/> Bruce Hanson, Public Works Director <hr/>	Project No.:	16321.000
From:	Sherri Buss, RLA AICP, Planner	Routing:	
Date:	May 31, 2017		

Lot Coverage Amendment—Additional Info and Public Hearing

The Planning Commission discussed options for providing limited flexibility to the lot coverage standard in the R-1 Zoning District at its May meeting. The current maximum coverage in the district is 35%. The Commission recommended that the maximum coverage with approved best management practices could be capped at 40%, and requested that the City Engineer develop more information for the Commission for a public hearing on the ordinance amendment to permit flexibility and provide a recommendation to them on maximum coverage.

Jon Herdegen provided the attached table to provide additional information for the Commission regarding the Best Management Practices (BMP’s) that he recommends, and the sizing and design requirements for each that would be provided to residents that are seeking the exception to go above 35% coverage. Jon indicated that this could be further refined based on discussion with the Commission on June 8.

I have also attached the draft ordinance amendment with the proposed language for the exception that will be discussed at the public hearing on June 8. The Engineer’s table would not be included in the ordinance as practices and standards may change.

Comprehensive Plan – Draft Waste Water Chapter

Jon Herdegen proved a draft Waste Water chapter and maps for the 2040 Comp Plan for discussion at the June meeting. Please review these for the discussion on June 8.

Impervious area above 35% (SF), to a maximum of 40%	BMP Type	Minimum BMP Size	Submittal Information
Each Additional 100 SF	Rain Garden	20 CF	Site Plan Depicting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface area & dimensions for rain garden bottom & top • Rain garden outlet location & depth to bottom (must exceed 20 CF volume below outlet) • Overall depth • Approximate area captured by rain garden; identify cover types • Rain garden plantings or vegetation type
	Pervious Pavers/Pavement	200 SF	Site Plan Depicting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of previous pavement/pavers (dimensions and area) • Approximate area directing runoff toward pervious pavement/pavers • Pervious paver manufacturer & other installation examples
	Disconnect impervious	50% of Entire Lot	Site Plan Depicting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All surface coverage on the lot (impervious or pervious) • General direction of runoff from impervious surface to the property boundary



ARTICLE IV. - RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

Sec. 36-206. - Purpose.

The residential districts are established to accomplish the general purposes of this article and for the following specific purposes:

- (1) To preserve existing living qualities of residential neighborhoods;
- (2) To ensure future high quality amenities, including, but not limited to, the provision of adequate light, air, privacy, freedom from noise and convenience of access to property;
- (3) To increase convenience and comfort by providing usable open space and recreation space on the same lot as the housing units they serve;
- (4) To prevent additions or alterations of structures which would damage the character or desirability of existing residential areas;
- (5) To protect residential areas, to the extent possible and appropriate in each area, against unduly heavy motor vehicle traffic;
- (6) To encourage a variety of dwelling types and a wide range of population densities with emphasis on home ownership; and
- (7) To implement the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan.

(Code 1997, § 1340.01)

Sec. 36-207. - Intent.

The specific intent of each residential district is as follows:

- (1) *RE, Residential Estates District.* This district shall be intended:
 - a. For residential areas without public utilities;
 - b. To preserve lands in their natural state or in agricultural uses pending the proper timing for the economical provision of utilities, streets, parks, and other public facilities so that orderly development will occur; and
 - c. To preserve and extend areas for single-family dwellings at very low densities within spacious environments.

Any lot or parcel of land located in a residential estates zone (RE) served by municipal sewer shall be treated as a Single-Family Residential (R-1) parcel and shall be required to meet all requirements of R-1 zoning.

- (2) *R-1A, River Residential District.* This district shall be intended to preserve, create, and enhance areas for low-density single-family development along and near the Mississippi River where public utilities are available.
- (3) *R-1, Low Density Single-Family Residential District.* This district shall be intended to preserve, create and enhance areas for low-density single-family dwelling development as an extension of existing residential areas and to allow low-density development in areas indicated as such in the comprehensive plan where public utilities are available.
- (4) *R-2, Medium Density Residential District.* This district shall be intended to allow development of townhouses, row houses, and other types of low-density multifamily units in areas consistent with the comprehensive plan and serviced by public utilities.

(5) *R-3, High Density Residential District.* This district shall be intended to create, preserve and enhance areas for multifamily use at higher densities for both permanent and more transient families. It is typically appropriate only in areas served by public utilities, with good accessibility to thoroughfares, public services, commercial areas, and where such development fits the comprehensive plan and planning policies.

(Code 1997, § 1340.02)

Sec. 36-208. - Residential lot area, depth, width, coverage, setbacks and heights.

The following minimum requirements shall be required in all residential districts:

	RE	R-1A	R-1	R-2	R-3
Minimum Lot Area per Unit (Square Feet)					
Dwellings, single-family	Two acres	15,000	9,100	9,100	9,100
Dwellings, two-family	—	—	—	7,800	7,800
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	5,750	3,000
Other uses	Two acres	One acre	One acre	One acre	One acre
Minimum lot depth in feet	200	150	130	130	130
Minimum Lot Width in Feet (Number in parenthesis is the lot width for a corner lot)					
Dwellings, single-family	160/(200)	100/(120)	70/(90)	70/(90)	70/(90)
Dwellings, two-family	—	—	—	120/(140)	120/(140)
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	120/(140)	120/(140)
Other uses	160	100	70	120	120

Minimum front yard in feet***	40	30	30	30	30
Minimum Side Yard in Feet (Number in parenthesis is the setback for a corner lot, street side)					
Dwellings, single-family or two-family	20/(40)	10/(30)**	10/(30)**	10/(30)	10/(30)
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	20/(40)	20/(40)
Garages or accessory structures***	20/(40)	5/(30)	5/(30)	10/(30)	10/(30)
Other uses	20	30	30	20	20
Minimum Rear Yard in Feet					
Dwellings, single-family or two-family	50	30	30	30	30
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	30	30
Garages or accessory structures***	20	Five	Five	30	30
Other uses	50	40	40	40	40
Maximum lot coverage, impervious surfaces					
Single-family dwelling units	20 percent	20 percent	35 percent <u>****</u> (25 percent in Shoreland District <u>****</u>)	35 percent	35 percent
Maximum lot coverage, impervious surfaces					

Dwellings, more than two-family	N/A	N/A	N/A	<u>N/A50%</u>	<u>N/A-50%</u>
Maximum building height in feet***	35 feet or three stories, whichever is greater, in all districts, but in no case higher than 1,000 feet U.S.G.S. sea level elevation; 25 feet in Shoreland Management Overlay District				

* Regardless of the setback standards noted in this table, the distance between a proposed foundation wall and an existing foundation wall on an adjacent lot may not be less than 15 feet.

** Side setbacks for substandard lot widths in R-1A: ten percent of lot width (25 percent for corner lot, street side). Side setbacks for substandard lot widths in R-1: 15 percent of lot width (33 percent for corner lot, street side).

*** See additional standards in section 36-161(3).

**** Maximum lot coverage up to 40% may be permitted in the R-1 Zoning District if the property owner incorporates Best Management Practices approved by the City. Approval requires application to the City for site plan review and approval by the City Engineer.

(Code 1997, § 1340.03)

Sec. 36-209. - Uses in the residential districts.

Use	RE	R-1A	R-1	R-2	R-3
Residential Uses					
Single-family detached, one dwelling per lot	P	P	P	P	P
Single-family detached, more than one dwelling unit per lot	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD
Two-family residences	N	N	N	P	P
Multifamily (eight units or fewer per building)	N	N	N	C	P
Multifamily (eight or more units per building)	N	N	N	C	P
Homes for handicapped or infirm including group homes or halfway houses but not containing more than six unrelated persons	P	P	P	P	P
Planned residential developments	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD	PUD

Manufactured single-family dwelling	P	P	P	P	P
Mobile homes	C	N	N	N	N
Public and Semi-Public Services					
Airport	C	N	N	N	N
Churches, synagogues, temples and associated facilities except schools	C	P	P	P	P
Medical clinics	N	N	N	N	C
Day care facilities in single-family homes with 14 or fewer children being attended to	P	P	P	P	P
Nursery school/day care facilities in single-family homes with more than 14 children being attended to	C	C	C	P	P
Nursery school/day care facilities in multifamily homes	N	N	N	C	C
Public facilities including government offices, emergency facilities, public works facilities, schools, libraries, museums, art galleries, and other municipally owned or operated facilities	C	C	C	C	C
Public utility	C	C	C	C	C
Commercial					
Bed and breakfast	C	C	C	C	C
Country club and golf course	C	C	C	C	C
Private athletic fields or courts	C	C	C	C	C
Horseback riding, stables	C	N	N	N	N
Animal kennel for more than six animals	C	N	N	N	N
Agricultural operations, row cropping, tree farming (excluding livestock)	P	N	N	N	N

Commercial greenhouse operations	C	N	N	N	N
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

P = Permitted use.

C = Permitted with a conditional use permit.

N = Not permitted.

PUD = Permitted with a planned unit development.

Sec. 36-210. - Multiple dwellings.

The following lot area credits and allowances shall be applied for multiple dwellings in R-2 and R-3 districts but in no event shall the minimum lot area with allowances be less than 5,000 square feet per dwelling unit in the R-2 District nor less than 2,200 square feet in the R-3 District based on the following schedule:

- (1) For each parking space provided within or beneath a principal structure, subtract 300 square feet;
- (2) If the site upon which the multiple dwelling is being constructed is adjacent to a site zoned for a commercial use, subtract 300 square feet;
- (3) If the adjacent site is zoned R-1 or R-1A, add 300 square feet per unit for that portion of the multiple dwelling site within 150 feet of the R-1 or R-1A District;
- (4) If the total lot coverage is less than 20 percent, subtract 150 square feet per unit;
- (5) For each unit containing bedrooms in excess of two, add 300 square feet.

(Code 1997, § 1340.05)

Secs. 36-211—36-225. - Reserved.

**PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. P.C. 2017-6**

**A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVE A ZONING AMENDMENT TO
SECTION 36-208, RESIDENTIAL LOT AREA, DEPTH, WIDTH, COVERAGE, SETBACKS AND
HEIGHTS**

WHEREAS, The City has received requests to increase its maximum lot coverage for residential districts; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission feels it is advantageous to allow up to 40% lot coverage in the R-1 District if the property owner incorporates best management practices for stormwater and to increase the maximum lot coverage for dwellings over two families in the R-2 and R-3 Districts; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this Zoning Amendment at its meeting of Thursday, June 8, 2017; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Newport Planning Commission recommends Newport City Council approval of a Zoning Amendment to amend the present language found in *Section 36-208*. They will read as follows:

Sec. 36-208. - Residential lot area, depth, width, coverage, setbacks and heights.

The following minimum requirements shall be required in all residential districts:

	RE	R-1A	R-1	R-2	R-3
Minimum Lot Area per Unit (Square Feet)					
Dwellings, single-family	Two acres	15,000	9,100	9,100	9,100
Dwellings, two-family	—	—	—	7,800	7,800
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	5,750	3,000
Other uses	Two acres	One acre	One acre	One acre	One acre
Minimum lot depth in feet	200	150	130	130	130
Minimum Lot Width in Feet (Number in parenthesis is the lot width for a corner lot)					
Dwellings, single-family	160/(200)	100/(120)	70/(90)	70/(90)	70/(90)
Dwellings, two-family	—	—	—	120/(140)	120/(140)
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	120/(140)	120/(140)
Other uses	160	100	70	120	120
Minimum front yard in feet***	40	30	30	30	30
Minimum Side Yard in Feet (Number in parenthesis is the setback for a corner lot, street side)					

Dwellings, single-family or two-family	20/(40)	10/(30)**	10/(30)**	10/(30)	10/(30)
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	20/(40)	20/(40)
Garages or accessory structures***	20/(40)	5/(30)	5/(30)	10/(30)	10/(30)
Other uses	20	30	30	20	20
Minimum Rear Yard in Feet					
Dwellings, single-family or two-family	50	30	30	30	30
Dwellings, more than two-family	—	—	—	30	30
Garages or accessory structures***	20	Five	Five	30	30
Other uses	50	40	40	40	40
Maximum lot coverage, impervious surfaces					
Single-family dwelling units	20 percent	20 percent	35 percent **** (25 percent in Shoreland District)	35 percent	35 percent
Maximum lot coverage, impervious surfaces					
Dwellings, more than two-family	N/A	N/A	N/A	50%	50%
Maximum building height in feet***	35 feet or three stories, whichever is greater, in all districts, but in no case higher than 1,000 feet U.S.G.S. sea level elevation; 25 feet in Shoreland Management Overlay District				

* Regardless of the setback standards noted in this table, the distance between a proposed foundation wall and an existing foundation wall on an adjacent lot may not be less than 15 feet.

** Side setbacks for substandard lot widths in R-1A: ten percent of lot width (25 percent for corner lot, street side). Side setbacks for substandard lot widths in R-1: 15 percent of lot width (33 percent for corner lot, street side).

*** See additional standards in section 36-161(3).

**** Maximum lot coverage up to 40% may be permitted in the R-1 Zoning District if the property owner incorporates Best Management Practices approved by the City. Approval requires application to the City for site plan review and approval by the City Engineer.

Adopted this 8th day of June, 2017 by the Newport Planning Commission.

VOTE: Haley _____
Mahmood _____
Taylor _____
Tweeten _____
Ratsabout _____

Signed: _____
Kevin Haley, Chairperson

ATTEST: _____
Deb Hill, City Administrator