



## **PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION AGENDA**

**Monday, May 12, 2025 - 6:00 PM**

**City Hall, Council Chambers, 169 SW Coast Hwy, Newport, OR 97365**

---

All public meetings of the City of Newport will be held in the City Council Chambers of the Newport City Hall, 169 SW Coast Highway, Newport. The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter, or for other accommodations, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to the City Recorder at 541.574.0613, or [cityrecorder@newportoregon.gov](mailto:cityrecorder@newportoregon.gov).

All meetings are live-streamed at <https://newportoregon.gov>, and broadcast on Charter Channel 190. Anyone wishing to provide written public comment should send the comment to [publiccomment@newportoregon.gov](mailto:publiccomment@newportoregon.gov). Public comment must be received four hours prior to a scheduled meeting. For example, if a meeting is to be held at 3:00 P.M., the deadline to submit written comment is 11:00 A.M. If a meeting is scheduled to occur before noon, the written comment must be submitted by 5:00 P.M. the previous day. To provide virtual public comment during a city meeting, a request must be made to the meeting staff at least 24 hours prior to the start of the meeting. This provision applies only to public comment and presenters outside the area and/or unable to physically attend an in person meeting.

The agenda may be amended during the meeting to add or delete items, change the order of agenda items, or discuss any other business deemed necessary at the time of the meeting.

**1. Call to Order**

*Bill Branigan, Bob Berman, Jim Hanselman, Gary East, Braulio Escobar, John Updike, Robert Bare, and Dustin Capri.*

**2. New Business**

**2.A City Center Revitalization Plan Updates.**

[Memorandum](#)

[April Public Event Summary, by JLA Public Involvement](#)

[Form Based Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Changes, by Urbsworks](#)

[City Center Revitalization Plan - Adoption Phase Schedule](#)

**3. Unfinished Business**

**3.A Planning Commission Work Program Update.**

**4. Adjournment**



# Memorandum

To: Planning Commission/Commission Advisory Committee  
 From: Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director   
 Date: May 8, 2025  
 Re: City Center Revitalization Plan Updates

---

For this work session, I have three items related to the City Center Revitalization Plan process that I would like to cover with the Planning Commission. First is a summary of the outreach efforts the City undertook in early April to gauge community sentiments on whether or not the proposed solutions are in line with the state goals of the effort. The document summarizes feedback from the in-person events, online survey, and targeted efforts made to reach Spanish speaking individuals. Verbatim responses are also enclosed as attachments.

The second item is an introduction to the proposed changes to the comprehensive plan and development code. These materials will be presented to the Citizen Advisory Committee at their final meeting on Friday, May 16, 2025. My plan is to explain the various elements and field clarifying questions. You will then have the materials for a couple of weeks to consider the changes and any elements you believe may need to be revised. Jim Hencke with the David Evans and Associates will attend the May 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission work session to review the amendments in detail. That version is likely to be more refined, and will incorporate feedback from the Citizen Advisory Committee. This is the meeting where you will want to put on the table any issues or concerns that you have with the recommendations.

The last item is a schedule for the adoption phase of the project. Coming out of Planning Commission and Council work sessions, on May 27<sup>th</sup> and June 2<sup>nd</sup> respectively, the consulting team will make a final round of edits before delivering a draft plan for adoption. The schedule then calls for the Commission to hold a final work session on June 23, 2025, after which you would initiate the legislative adoption process. A public hearing would be held on July 28, 2025. Assuming the Commission recommends the package to the City Council for adoption, then the Council will hold work sessions with a hearing in mid-August or early September. The City's Transportation Growth Management Intergovernmental project agreement with the State of Oregon expires on September 11, 2025. Please take a moment to review the schedule, and I look forward to hearing your thoughts about whether or not it looks reasonable of needs adjustment.

#### Attachments

April Public Event Summary, by JLA Public Involvement  
 Form Based Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Changes, by Urbsworks  
 City Center Revitalization Plan - Adoption Phase Schedule

# Newport City Center Revitalization Plan Project

## Event #2 Summary

### Prepared for

Oregon Department of Transportation

City of Newport

### Prepared by

JLA Public Involvement, Inc.

123 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 210

Portland, OR 97232

### Date

05/08/25



## Overview

The City of Newport is completing a City Center Revitalization Plan Project (NCCRP) to improve livability, business opportunities and traffic options and safety in the central city. This round of public outreach was focused on sharing the proposed approach to meeting the project goals, as identified with community feedback in fall 2024.

This report summarizes feedback from in-person events and an online survey

conducted to gauge public support for improvement projects and policies recommended for the City Center Revitalization Plan. Responses from the in-person events and online survey varied slightly, but the largest difference between respondents was along the language spoken by the respondents.

### In-Person Engagement

- 80 attendees at open house
- 40+ attendees at Spanish event
- 34 surveys in English
- 39 surveys in Spanish
- 7,808 postcards mailed to Newport homes and businesses

### Online Engagement

- 52 surveys in English
- 1 survey in Spanish
- 5 social media platforms used to advertise and announce the survey and events (Facebook, Instagram, Facebook Messenger, WhatsApp, NextDoor)

## In-Person Engagement

To promote the in-person and online open houses, and to reach community members that might not know about the project, an **information booth** was held at the Newport Recreation Center on April 3, 2025 from noon to 1:00 pm. However, most community members that spoke with staff were aware of the event and project. City staff also **canvassed the businesses along US 101** to invite them to participate, as well as answer any questions about the project.

About 80 community members attended the in-person **open house** on April 3, 2025 from 4:00-7:00 pm to provide written and verbal feedback. Compared to an open house held in fall 2024, this event saw an increase in the number of business owners from the core project area participate. In addition to conversations with the project team, printed copies of the survey were returned during and after the open house via mail/hand delivery to City Hall. 34 responses were received in English and 39 surveys were collected in Spanish.

City staff also attended a **Spanish-speaking event** at Tacitas de Cafe on April 1, 2025 to distribute the survey and answer project questions. All attendees received an informational packet that included a survey. Participants were asked to take the packet home, review the information, and complete the survey. The completed surveys were collected on April 8.



*Figure 1 - US 101 as it currently appears with narrow sidewalks and some empty buildings.*

## Feedback from In-Person Engagement

Most people who spoke with the project team shared the sentiment that downtown Newport needs redevelopment and revitalization. Conversations and questions mostly revolved around the couplet proposal for US 101 and SW 9th Street.

### Verbal Feedback

Attendees at the open house were focused on:

- Impacts of the couplets, such as increased level of traffic on SW 9th Street and impacts to the roadway or houses near SW 9th Street
- Implementation, particularly the ability for the project to get funds to cover construction
- Couplet for US 101; very little discussion about land use and development code beyond the need for and challenges to redevelopment

Attendees at the Spanish-speaking event were focused on:

- Pedestrian accessibility in the area
- Efforts to enhance the visual appeal of the city center
- The potential for new business development
- Ongoing support and preservation of existing businesses

Businesses along US 101 raised the following questions/concerns during canvassing:

- How will this impact the foot traffic into our business?
- Will we lose our parking spaces and access?
- -Will we have to close during construction?

## Written Feedback

### Project Goals

Of all the written comments received, people generally agree that the proposed approach successfully meets the project goals. However, there was a strong difference of opinion for English and Spanish respondents on whether or not the project goals had been met by the proposed plan.

- Spanish respondents were much more supportive of the goals being met than English respondents.
- There was strong agreement that the “a clean, welcoming appearance” goal was met (84% Spanish; 40% English).
- There was a difference of opinions regarding these goals:
  - “Active mix of uses” Spanish respondents strongly agree the goal was met (89%; 39% English)
  - “Safe and efficient traffic flow and managed parking” English respondents strongly agree the goal was met (44%; 69% Spanish was the lowest level of agreement).
- English and Spanish respondents differed in their thoughts on whether the planned approach met the “planned property development/acquisition” goal (33% English; 79% Spanish strongly supported that this goal was met).

### District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20

A desire to have different aesthetics for each highway had the highest support from Spanish respondents (71%).

- Additional Spanish comments focused on the physical makeup of the two roads, such as US 101 having longer lengths of sidewalks and US 20 feeling like a wider street to cross. A couple of responses shared a desire for improved traffic flow and overall transit.  
*71% of Spanish respondents want Highway 101 to look different than Highway 20, compared to 38% of English respondents (47% of English respondents were unsure).*
- There was less support from English respondents (38%) for having aesthetic differences between the highway segments, with additional comments mentioning existing differences between the two roads and their uses, including a distinct inter-state coastal nature of US 101 while US 20 had less of a known identity.

Half of English-respondents were “unsure or didn’t feel strongly about the aesthetics of the two highways” (47%). Of those English respondents that provided additional comments, traffic safety was a higher priority than aesthetics.

In regard to proposed streetscape improvements:

- “Storefront improvements” was the highest ranked improvement for English respondents (67%) and third highest ranked for Spanish respondents (91%).
- “Trash receptacles” was the most important for Spanish respondents (95%) and second for English respondents (61%).
- The other highly ranked improvements were different between English and Spanish respondents:
  - “Benches/seating” was important for Spanish respondents (92%)
  - “Public art” for English respondents (57%)

*Storefront improvements and trash receptacles were universally popular.*

### Small Business Support

English respondents felt that it was most or very important to support small businesses during “street construction” (77%), followed by providing support through “storefront improvements (painting, windows, signage)” which had 69%. For Spanish respondents these two were tied for second place (at 89%), while “anti-displacement measures to help existing businesses stay in the area as it redevelops” was considered the most important (92%, while only 57% for English respondents). “Asbestos/hazardous materials clean-up” was considered important but to a lesser extent for both English and Spanish respondents.

*Supporting small businesses during street construction and through storefront improvements was important for all respondents, but Spanish respondents highly favored anti-displacement support compared to English respondents.*

### Building Houses and Businesses

A few building features had strong preference from English respondents, while the others were more mixed:

- Alleys as delivery access (100%)
- Storefront/pedestrian-scaled signage (97%)
- Allowing a range of home types (90%)
- Breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections (88%)
- Mixed home ownership and rental housing in the same block (79%)
- Residential on top of businesses/offices (67%)

*Breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections and having residential units on top of businesses/offices were both supported by all respondents.*

There were far fewer Spanish respondents who answered these questions, but there was strong support for:

- Breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections (100%)
- Residential on top of businesses/offices (86%)
- The rest had too few responses to determine a preference.

## Parks and Open Spaces

*New passive- and active-use parks were universally supported.*

For English respondents, the Farmers Market was identified as needing improvements (45%); which reflects concerns voiced about the future accommodation for the Farmers Market. Additional comments focused on the comfort and walkability of the area, along with concerns regarding the level of pollution along US 101. Opinions about new public spaces were fairly evenly split between economic-use spaces; active-use spaces; and passive-use spaces.

For Spanish respondents, the top two existing parks/gathering spaces that could benefit from improvements are the plaza on the corner of Highway 101 and SW Hubert Street (34%) and Yaquina Bay State Park (21%). Additional comments mentioned a need for playgrounds and spaces for children. Over half of Spanish respondents feel that new passive-use spaces are the most important, followed by active-use spaces.

## Online Engagement

An online survey was active on the project website between April 1 and April 17, 2025. 52 responses were received in English and 1 response in Spanish. *The survey was conducted with self-selected members of the community and does not qualify as a scientifically valid survey that is representative of the community. Not all questions were answered, so there is not a consistent number of responses for each question.*

## Project Goals

Overall, many participants (41%) feel that the project recommendations do meet the project goals, with an additional 22% that felt the project goals were somewhat met. The level of agreement about whether the goals were met through the proposed approach was:

- Active mix of uses in a walkable environment through infill, wider, and buffered sidewalks (43% strongly agreed)
- Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed parking through reduced vehicle/pedestrian conflicts (39% strongly agreed)
- Planned property development and acquisition through incentives and partnerships (31% strongly agreed)

- Targeted investment in infrastructure through implementation actions and strategies (33% strongly agreed)

## District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20

Responses weren't clear on the aesthetics of the two highways.

- About a third weren't sure or didn't feel strongly either way. These respondents cited various other areas of interest, including cycling/pedestrian lanes, intersection control(e.g. roundabouts), and landscaping (e.g. trees).
- Similar to the in-person/printed surveys results, people that wanted the highways to feel the same mentioned a desire for cohesiveness, as well as concerns about traffic and pedestrian safety.
- Respondents that want the highways to feel different mentioned that they are currently different. For example, one respondent shared that US 101 is a "main street and carries more traffic" whereas "Hwy 20 has more potential to develop mixed use properties with housing."

*About a third of the respondents want the highways to feel different from each other and a third were unsure.*

## Small Business Support

Online respondents said that supporting small businesses with asbestos/hazardous material clean-up and storefront improvements were tied for the most important items, followed by support during street construction. Additional comments included various suggestions including economic support for storefront improvements and increased parking availability.

*Like the in-person responses, support through storefront improvements and during street construction was important, but asbestos/hazardous material clean up was more important to survey respondents.*

Overall, the most important improvements for online respondents were storefront improvements (80% strongly/somewhat important) and trash receptacles (69%). Additional ideas for improvements included parking (e.g. free parking), pedestrian safety (e.g. accessible crosswalks), gathering spaces (e.g. a central park), and aesthetics (e.g. landscaping). See [Appendix E](#) for additional details from online surveys.

*Storefront improvements and trash receptacles were popular across all respondents, online or in-person.*

## Building Houses and Businesses

All of these building features had strong preferences from respondents:



- Alleys as delivery access rather than on the main streets (87%)
- Storefront/pedestrian-scaled signage (87%)
- Allowing a range of home types (84%)
- Preferred residential homes on top of businesses/offices (79%)
- Breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections (71%)
- Require weather protection (like awnings or porches) (67%)
- Buildings that maximize views from living and working spaces (63%)
- Buildings that have similar façade designs (62%)

*Breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections and having residential units on top of businesses/offices were both supported by all respondents, online and in-person.*

## Parks and Open Spaces

The top two existing parks/gathering spaces that would benefit most from improvements are the Farmer's Market (42%) and City Hall (18%). Additional comments relate to the need for improved aesthetics (e.g. more landscaping, maintenance), parking, and bike/pedestrian spaces. As for the top two gathering spaces, participants felt that the Farmer's Market should be permanent and covered, with one participant describing City Hall as an "unloved lawn space."

*The Farmer's Market was highest ranked for improvement for online and English respondents from the in-person surveys. New passive-use parks were universally supported; online and in-person.*

For new public spaces/features, economic-use spaces (36%) and passive-use spaces (26%) were most important for the future.

## Additional Comments

Online respondents had the opportunity to provide additional comments, which included:

- Concerns about parking (the lack of it and parking on US 101)
- Impacts on transit times
- Concerns about the availability of government funding
- Planting more trees
- Making more storefront improvements
- Increase housing options

See [Appendix E](#) for comments provided by online respondents.

# APPENDIX

Appendix A - Advertising.....	11
Appendix B - Open House Details.....	13
Staff.....	13
Event Format.....	13
Feedback .....	14
Comment Form/Survey .....	16
Context Handout .....	18
Display Content .....	20
Appendix C – English Printed Survey Responses .....	35
Project Goals.....	35
District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20.....	36
Small Business Support .....	39
When we think about different ways to build housing and businesses, what is most important to you? .....	40
Parks and Open Spaces.....	43
Open-ended Comments .....	45
Appendix D - Spanish Printed Survey Responses.....	50
Project Goals.....	50
District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20.....	51
Small Business Support .....	54
Building Houses and Businesses.....	55
Parks and Open Spaces.....	59
Open-ended Comments .....	60
Appendix E - Online Survey Responses.....	62
Project Goals.....	62
District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20.....	64
Small Business Support .....	67

When we think about different ways to build housing and businesses, what is most important to you? .....	68
Parks and Open Spaces.....	71
Open-ended Comments .....	72

## Appendix A - Advertising

The City of Newport advertised the project and online survey through the following venues:

- Social media\*
  - Through the City of Newport's existing accounts including Facebook and Instagram
    - Total social media post reach promoting the event was approximately 2500 through a mix of static posts and stories
  - Newport's Facebook Messenger (50 invites), WhatsApp (215 invites)
  - ODOT's NextDoor account (two posts)
- Updates to the project website\*
- Email invitations to 83 contacts (mostly businesses) directly in the City Center area
- Emails about the project events were sent to:
  - Project Advisory Committee members
  - Social Service Organizations, including OSU Extension of Lincoln County
  - Latin/Mesoamerican community service organizations, including Conexión Phoenix, Arcoiris Cultural, and Centro de Ayuda.
  - People that signed up for updates at previous project events or the website
  - People that signed up for ODOT Region 2 Transportation Planning projects (two emails were sent from ODOT directly)
- Press release to local and regional media outlets\*
- Postcard distributed via carrier route\* (to all addresses in Newport; see below)
- Door-to-door canvassing along US 101 businesses in the project area
- Informational Booth at the Recreation Center day of the event (to help advertise the open house and online survey)
- Electronic message board promoting the website (located on the Chamber of Commerce's board in the project area)

*\*Both English and Spanish*

## City Center Revitalization Plan Project Plan de Proyecto de Centro de Rehabilitación de la Ciudad

The City of Newport is working to create a vibrant, welcoming city center—home to successful businesses, housing options, and community gathering space, that is attractive to residents and visitors.

In the fall, we asked for community input on how we can reimagine City Center. Please join us at City Hall on April 3 for an open house to learn more about the solutions we have created based on your feedback, ensure that we are meeting the future needs of the community, and to discuss potential next steps.

La ciudad de Newport está trabajando para crear un centro urbano vibrante y acogedor, hogar de negocios exitosos, opciones de vivienda y espacio comunitario que sea atractivo para residentes y visitantes.

En el otoño, le pedimos a la comunidad sugerencias sobre cómo podemos reimaginar nuestro centro urbano. Por favor únase a nosotros en City Hall el 3 de abril en una jornada de puertas abiertas para aprender más sobre las soluciones que hemos creado a partir de sus sugerencias, asegurarse de que estamos cumpliendo con las necesidades futuras de la comunidad y para charlar sobre los próximos pasos potenciales.



Join us at an open house  
Unase a nosotros en una jornada  
de puertas abiertas

Thursday, April 3, 2025  
Jueves, 3 de abril, 2025  
4:00–7:00 p.m. | City Hall 169 SW Coast Hwy

Join us online between April 1–13: // Únase a nosotros en línea entre abril 1–13:  
[publicproject.net/nccrp](https://publicproject.net/nccrp)

## Appendix B - Open House Details

Staff from the City of Newport, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), David Evans and Associates (DEA) and JLA hosted an in-person Open House at Newport City Hall on April 3, 2025. Approximately 80 people attended this event.

The Open House was designed to share the draft approach for the US 101 and US 20 City Center Revitalization Plan. The couplet design and land use suggestions were selected based on feedback from the public and consultants following the fall 2024 community outreach events. The Open House also provided an opportunity for the community to submit verbal and written feedback.

### Staff

- Derrick Tokos, *City of Newport*
- John Fuller, *City of Newport*
- Giovanna Jensen, *City of Newport*
- Jim Hencke, *DEA*
- David Helton, *ODOT*
- Mayrangel Cervantes Juarez, *JLA*
- Katie Nelson, *JLA*
- Ashley Balsom, *JLA*

### Event Format

The event was an opportunity for the project team to share the drafted recommendations for revitalizing US 101 and US 20, as well as collect verbal and written comments and answer questions. Attendees dropped in throughout the three-hour event.

The event was organized as follows:

- Upon arrival, staff at the welcome table informed all attendees of the event logistics, and asked them to sign-in. Staff explained:
  - that signing-in was optional, but that attendees were able to sign up for project updates by providing their email address.
  - other ways to submit comments, such as through the online survey.
  - that the online survey could be completed later and distributed flyers containing QR code links for attendees to take with them.
  - that printed comment forms were on a table in the center of the room.
- Attendees could fill out and submit their printed comment form at the Open House, while also having the option to take the form with them and submit to Derek Tokos by mail or leaving at City Hall before April 13, 2025.
- There were 17 display boards (in English and Spanish) which covered the following: Project Purpose, Background, Project Timeline, Vision and Goals, Highway 101/SW 9th Concept, Safety/Walking, Highway 20 Illustration, City Hall Area, Festival Streets/Parking, Bicycle Routes/Wayfinding, Redevelopment, Funding, and Next Steps.

- Attendees could leave comments on a flip chart.
- Staff from DEA, ODOT, JLA, and the City of Newport walked around the room to explain the project, answer questions, and address concerns.

## Feedback

*A complete set of comments from the printed survey from the Open House are included in Appendix C (English Printed Survey Responses). The Spanish printed surveys were collected from a separate event (Appendix D).*



Almost all attendees shared the sentiment with project staff that downtown Newport needs revitalization and redevelopment. A majority of participants also supported the couplet option for US 101 due to its ability to support the revitalization and redevelopment of downtown Newport by making it more walkable, while still conserving on-street parking.

In terms of concerns, participants spoke mostly about the impact of the couplet options. For example, a few participants expressed concern about the increased level of traffic on SW 9th Street. The uneasiness for most of the participants came from them living on or near the segment of SW 9th Street that would become part of the couplet. However, after speaking to an ODOT representative from the PMT, a couple of participants seemed relieved to learn that it will likely be at least 10 years before construction of the project begins, given the time needed to design the project and obtain funding.

Additional concerns specific to SW 9th Street were whether it can accommodate the weight of freight traffic and specific aspects of the roadway design, such as utility relocation and the location of pedestrian crossings. One participant pointed out that NW 9th Street does not seem to have the width to accommodate the cross-section for the Couplet shown on the display, particularly in locations such as the intersection of NW 9th Street and Lee Street.

Funding was also an area of concern for participants. There were questions about the future of the project if funding is not available. Participants were informed that if funding is not available for the project, then it will not be built.

## Flip charts from the event





## Comment Form/Survey

The following comment form/survey was also printed in Spanish.

# NEWPORT CITY CENTER REVITALIZATION PLAN

The City of Newport is working to create a vibrant, welcoming City Center — home to successful businesses, housing options, and community gathering space, that is attractive to community members and visitors.

### We believe we met these project goals. Do you agree?

Circle your level of agreement from  
1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree)

Active mix of uses in a walkable environment through infill, wider, and buffered sidewalks.	1	2	3	4	5
Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed parking through reduced vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.	1	2	3	4	5
A clean, welcoming appearance through gateways, streetscaping and code updates.	1	2	3	4	5
Planned property development and acquisition through incentives and partnerships.	1	2	3	4	5
Targeted investment in infrastructure through implementation actions and strategies.	1	2	3	4	5

### Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct? Choose one

- ☐ They should feel the same
- ☐ I'm not sure/I don't feel strongly either way
- ☐ They should feel different

### Would you like to explain your answer?

---



---

### How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements?

Circle one per row: 1 (very important) to 5 (very unimportant)

Benches/seating	1	2	3	4	5
Trash receptacles	1	2	3	4	5
Public art	1	2	3	4	5
Decorative streetlights	1	2	3	4	5
Banners	1	2	3	4	5
Storefront improvements	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please explain):	1	2	3	4	5

---

### Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? Choose one

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Founding Rock Park        | <input type="checkbox"/> Farmer's Market   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mombetsu Sister City Park | <input type="checkbox"/> City Hall   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Literacy Park             | <input type="checkbox"/> Plaza on the north corner of Highway 101 and SW Hubert Street |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yaquina Bay State Park    | <input type="checkbox"/> I'm not sure/I don't feel strongly about this                 |

### What type of improvements would be needed?

---

### Which type of new public spaces/features are most important in the City Center? Choose one

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Active-use spaces (where people and pets can play)                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Gateway (creating a sense of place for the City Center or Newport) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Passive-use spaces (where people can walk or sit)                            | <input type="checkbox"/> I'm not sure/I don't feel strongly about this                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic-use spaces (where businesses can have outdoor food carts or events) |   |

**We heard that small business assistance is important. How important is it to support businesses on these topics?** *Circle one per row: 1 (very important) to 5 (very unimportant)*

During street construction	1	2	3	4	5
Asbestos/hazardous materials clean up	1	2	3	4	5
Storefront improvements (painting, windows, signage)	1	2	3	4	5
Anti-displacement measures to help existing businesses stay in the area as it redevelops	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please explain):	1	2	3	4	5

**When we think about different ways to build housing and businesses, what is most important to you?** *Circle only one option per row*

Buildings that maximize views from living and working spaces inside, especially from upper levels	OR	Buildings that are close to the streets
Buildings that have similar façade designs	OR	Letting developers decide on an individual basis
Require weather protection (like awnings or porches)	OR	Letting developers decide on an individual basis
Have business signs at the top of buildings (tall entry marquee-type overhangs)	OR	Have signs at the storefront/pedestrian-scaled level
Alleys or partial alleys to have deliveries through a side/back door	OR	Have areas on the main street for deliveries
Break down big blocks with pedestrian connections	OR	Allow developers to consolidate lots for larger developments
A range of home types (townhomes, cottage clusters, boarding houses, stacked flats, and courtyard apartments).	OR	More standalone homes
Mix home ownership and rental housing in the same block	OR	Encourage home ownership only
Allowing ground level housing	OR	Residential on top of businesses/offices

**What do you do in Newport?** *Check all that apply*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Live - What is your home ZIP code? _____                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Work                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Visit places of worship and/or cultural events           | <input type="checkbox"/> Visit friends, family      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Take care of daily needs (bank, grocery, hospital, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Visit parks, natural areas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please explain) _____                             |   |

**Would you like to join the mailing list?**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Please return today or mail to the City of Newport c/o Derrick Tokos 169 SW Coast Hwy, Newport, Oregon 97365 by April 13, 2025

## Context Handout

The following handout was also printed in Spanish.

# NEWPORT CITY CENTER REVITALIZATION PLAN

### What is the City Center?


Our focus is within 2-3 blocks of US 20 and US 101 – from the east entrance to the City, west to the US 20/US 101 intersection, and then south to the Yaquina Bay Bridge.

### Future Walkable City Center (US 101)

Today, it may be difficult to think about living or walking around US 101. The sidewalks are narrow, and during the summer traffic can be overwhelming, creating an uninviting experience. The paired-street or couplet design is where the travelers that are traveling north or south on US 101 today would instead go north on 9th Street and south on US 101.

### Future Green Gateway (US 20)

A future welcoming gateway into our City Center on US 20. Based on the community values and goals, we have created this draft plan to create a more welcoming gateway into the City Center on US 20.



### This design allows for:

- Greater flexibility as we redevelop the City Center.
- Bigger sidewalks, bike lanes, and parking on both streets which helps businesses thrive.
- Narrower streets that take less time to walk across, which is safer for seniors, children, and everyone else!

### We'd like to make the future of this part of the City Center more welcoming for everyone by:

- Creating safer sidewalks and crossings for school kids (and everyone else) who need to travel across US 20.
- Adding trees and landscaping, plus a gateway sign to announce that travelers are entering our city.
- Changing the development code to allow and encourage "maker's spaces" in the industrial areas along US 20.

### Plazas, Parks and Landscaping

The plan has a few ideas for where parks could go, however, that detail would need to be decided later. As an area in the center of the city, there is less opportunity for parks due to limited space, and there are several nearby parks that residents could use. Once the plan is adopted, we will move into preliminary design work to figure out these details:


- Lighting
- Benches
- Landscaping and trees selection and placement
- Art and other features to achieve this walkable feeling.



# NEWPORT CITY CENTER REVITALIZATION PLAN

## Housing and Building Changes


We did some initial analysis to understand if additional housing and redevelopment can work in the area, and we estimate that it will. While the plan doesn't require a certain "look" or theme for City Center buildings, we want the buildings to connect with the street and sidewalk to make it more walkable, as well as encouraging taller buildings that will allow for more housing options for community members.



## Community Gathering Spaces and Festival Streets

We are looking at many of the nearby streets to create a more comprehensive City Center area that will increase the number of community gathering spaces for events and regular events like the Farmer's Market. The plan proposes a permanent location for a covered farmer's market, which would allow for a longer season of operation. During non-market days, the covered area would be parking.

Festival streets are built so that the road can be closed for a special event, but during most days it is a regular street with parking (see examples below). There would also be flexibility for future development opportunities like a food cart pod.



## Display Content

Below are the display boards that were shown during the open house. Similar information was shown in the online survey.

# Welcome!

## NEWPORT CITY CENTER REVITALIZATION PLAN

**OPEN HOUSE #2**  
**APRIL 3, 2025**



## PLAN DE PROYECTO DE CENTRO DE REHABILITACIÓN DE LA CIUDAD DE NEWPORT

**3 DE APRIL DE 2025**

# ¡Bienvenida!

# Where do you live?

Place a dot  
where you  
live.

Coloca un  
punto donde  
vives.



# ¿Dónde vive?



# Project Purpose

The City of Newport is working to improve and strengthen livability, business and traffic patterns in the city center. To achieve this, we're considering changes to Highway 101's route through the city center, as well as new policies, regulations and financial incentives to encourage desired development and redevelopment.

- CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT
- URBAN MIX (ODOT)
- GOVERNMENT CENTER
- STEEP SLOPES
- HIGHWAY 101/20
- KEY CONNECTIONS
- GATEWAYS



La Ciudad de Newport está en una misión para mejorar la habitabilidad, negocios y tráfico en el centro de la ciudad. Para lograr esto, estamos considerando cambios en la ruta de Highway 101 a través del centro de la ciudad, así como nuevas políticas, regulaciones e incentivos financieros para motivar el desarrollo y remodelación deseada.

- DISTRITO COMERCIAL CENTRAL
- MEZCLA URBANA (ODOT)
- CENTRO DE GOBIERNO
- CUESTA INCLINADA
- AUTOPISTA 101/20
- CONEXIONES CLAVES
- ENTRADAS

# Propósito del proyecto

# Background

**The Urban Renewal District was created in 2015 to generate funding to revitalize the City Center area, including creating conditions that support additional housing.**

- The focus of this planning effort will be within 2-3 blocks of US 20 and US 101 (from the east entrance to the City, west to the US 20/US 101 intersection, and then south to the Yaquina Bay Bridge).
- The Newport Transportation System Plan (TSP) July 2022 evaluated three options improving US 101 in downtown Newport, two involved forming one-way couplets with the existing US 101 and SW 9th Street (long and short options), and one approach retained the highway in its current alignment with bicycle facilities being added to SE 9th Street.
- After considering technical aspects of each option and public feedback, the City Council dropped the long couplet from further consideration and approved the TSP with the other two approaches as potentially viable options.

**The US 101 and US 20 transportation solutions presented this evening were selected by the project Citizen Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council based on feedback from the public and consultants following the initial round of community outreach (fall 2024).**

**El Distrito de Renovación Urbana se creó en 2015 para generar fondos para revitalizar el área del centro de la ciudad, incluida la creación de condiciones que respalden viviendas adicionales.**



- El enfoque de este esfuerzo de planificación estará dentro de 2 a 3 cuadras de la US 20 y la US 101 (desde la entrada este a la ciudad, al oeste hasta la intersección de la US 20 y la US 101 y luego al sur hasta el puente de la bahía de Yaquina).
- **Plan del sistema de transporte de Newport, Julio de 2022:** Se evaluaron tres opciones para mejorar la US 101 en el centro de Newport, dos implicaron la formación de pareados unidireccionales con la US 101 existente y la SW 9th Street (opciones largas y cortas), y un enfoque mantuvo la carretera en su alineación actual con instalaciones para bicicletas que se están agregando. hasta la calle SE 9.
- Después de considerar los aspectos técnicos de cada opción y los comentarios del público, el Concejo Municipal dejó de considerar el pareado largo y aprobó el TSP con los otros dos enfoques como opciones potencialmente viables.

**Las soluciones de transporte de la US 101 y la US 20 presentadas esta tarde fueron seleccionadas por el Comité Asesor Ciudadano, la Comisión de Planificación y el Concejo Municipal del proyecto en función de los comentarios del público y los consultores después de la ronda inicial de extensión comunitaria (otoño de 2024).**

# Los antecedentes



# Project Timeline



# Cronograma del proyecto

# Vision and Goals

The City of Newport is working to create a vibrant, welcoming City Center — home to successful businesses, housing options, and community gathering space, that is attractive to community members and visitors.

## PROJECT GOALS

## MET BY:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1: An active mix of uses in a walkable environment.  | INFILL, WIDER / BUFFERED SIDEWALKS     |
| 2: Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed parking. | REDUCED VEHICLE / PEDESTRIAN CONFLICTS |
| 3: A clean, welcoming appearance.                    | GATEWAYS, STREETSCAPING, CODE UPDATES  |
| 4: Planned property development and acquisition.     | INCENTIVES, PARTNERSHIPS               |
| 5: Targeted investment in infrastructure.            | IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS / STRATEGY      |

La ciudad de Newport está trabajando para crear un Centro Urbano vibrante y acogedor, hogar de negocios exitosos, opciones de vivienda y espacio comunitario que sea atractivo para miembros de la comunidad y visitantes.

## METAS DEL PROYECTO


## CUMPLIDO CON:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Una mezcla activa de usos en un entorno transitable.      | MEDIANTE ACERAS MÁS AMPLIAS Y PROTEGIDAS              |
| 2. Circulación segura y eficaz y gestión de estacionamiento. | REDUCCIÓN DE LOS CONFLICTOS ENTRE VEHÍCULOS/PEATONES  |
| 3. Una apariencia limpia y acogedora.                        | ENTRADAS, PAISAJE URBANO Y ACTUALIZACIONES DE CÓDIGOS |
| 4. Desarrollo y adquisición de propiedades planeado.         | INCENTIVOS Y COLABORACIÓN                             |
| 5. Inversión específica en infraestructuras.                 | ACCIONES Y ESTRATEGIAS DE IMPLEMENTACIÓN              |


# Visión y objetivos

# Hwy 101/SW 9<sup>th</sup> Concept

The paired-street (or couplet design) is where the travelers that are traveling north or south on US 101 today would instead go north on 9th Street and south on US 101.



**SW 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET**



El diseño de calle pareada o acoplada es donde viajantes que hoy viajan hacia el norte o el sur a través de la US 101 en su lugar irían hacia el norte sobre 9th Street y hacia el sur en la US 101.


# Concepto 101/SW 9<sup>th</sup>



# Safety / Walking

## City Center Walkability / Paseabilidad en el Centro Urbano


### Couplet / Acoplado



24' / 3.5 fps = 6-7 seconds  
 Significant safety improvements  
 Short pedestrian crossings  
 Maximizes buffer/enhancement

24 pies / 3.5 pies por segundo = 6-7 segundos  
 Mejoras significativas de seguridad  
 Cruces peatonales cortos  
 Maximiza la amortiguación/mejora

### Two-way / Doble sentido




56' / 3.5 fps = 16 seconds  
 Minimal safety improvements  
 Long pedestrian crossings  
 Minimal buffer/enhancement


56 pies / 3.5 pies por segundo = 16 segundos  
 Mejoras mínimas de seguridad  
 Cruces peatonales largos  
 Mínima amortiguación/mejora

## Traffic Conflict / Conflicto entre Vehículos

### Couplet / Acoplado




### Two-way / Doble sentido



- Vehicle Conflict (Merge) / Conflicto entre Vehículos (Incorporarse)
- Vehicle Conflict (Crossing) / Conflicto entre Vehículos (Cruzar)
- Pedestrian Conflict / Conflicto con Peatones

# Seguridad / Caminar

# Hwy 20 Illustration




## POTENTIAL FEATURES ELEMENTOS POTENCIALES

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| ① Enhanced Ped. Crossing  | ① Paso de Peatones Mejorado            |
| ② Relocated Bus Stop      | ② Parada para Autobuses Reubicada      |
| ③ Enhanced Bike Corridors | ③ Mejora de los Corredores Ciclista    |
| ④ Gateway Feature         | ④ Elemento de Entrada                  |
| ⑤ Streetscape Enhancement | ⑤ Mejora de Paisaje Urbano             |
| ⑥ New Bike/Ped Connection | ⑥ Nueva conexión de ciclistas/peatones |



## HIGHWAY 20 – CROSS SECTION

## MUESTRA REPRESENTATIVA



## RAPID FLASHING BEACON EXAMPLE

## EJEMPLO DE LÁMPARA DE PARPADEO RÁPIDO

We'd like to make the future of this part of City Center more welcoming for everyone by:

- Creating safer sidewalks and crossings for school kids (and everyone else) who need to travel across US 20.
- Adding trees and landscaping, plus a gateway sign to announce that travelers are entering our city.
- Changing the development code to allow and encourage "maker's spaces" in the industrial areas along US 20.

Nos gustaría hacer el futuro de esta parte del Centro Urbano más acogedor para todos con:

- Crear aceras más seguras y cruces para estudiantes (y todos los demás) que tienen que cruzar la US 20.
- Añadir árboles y paisajismo, además de un letrero de entrada para anunciar a viajeros que están entrando a nuestra ciudad.
- Cambiar el código de desarrollo para permitir e incentivar "distritos de creadores" en áreas industriales a lo largo de la US 20.

# Ilustración de la autopista 20



# City Hall Area



## LEGEND

- 1 Close Segment of Sw 2<sup>nd</sup> Street
  - 2 Bus Pull Out / Transit Shelter
  - 3 Pick-up / Drop-off
  - 4 Parking Lot
  - 5 Farmers Market Lot W/Canopies
  - 6 Landscape Feature
  - 7 City Hall
  - 8 Recreation Center
  - 9 Potential Closure / Plaza
  - 10 Festival Street
  - 11 Potential Infill / Redevelopment
- 
- 1 Cierre de Segmento de SW 2nd Street
  - 2 Retiro de Autobuses/Parada Cubierta
  - 3 Recoger/ Dejar
  - 4 Estacionamiento
  - 5 Lote Del Mercado de Agricultores Con Cubiertas
  - 6 Elemento de Paisaje
  - 7 Ayuntamiento
  - 8 Centro de Recreación
  - 9 Cierre Potencial/Plaza
  - 10 Calle de Festival
  - 11 Relleno Potencial/Reurbanización



STREET FURNISHING EXAMPLES  
EJEMPLOS DE MOBILIARIO URBANO



FARMERS MARKET / PARKING LOT CANOPY EXAMPLES  
EJEMPLOS DE MERCADO DE AGRICULTORES /  
ESTACIONAMIENTO CUBIERTO

# Área del Ayuntamiento

# Festival Streets / Parking



## LEGEND

- ① Festival Street
- ② Plaza Enhancements
- ③ Angled Parking
- ④ Special Paving
- ⑤ Streetscape Enhancement

## CLAVE DEL MAPA

- ① Calles De Festival
- ② Mejoras a la plaza
- ③ Estacionamiento en ángulo
- ④ Pavimento Especial
- ⑤ Mejora de Paisaje Urbano

OPTION 1

OPTION 2

OPCION 1

OPCION 2

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| Límite de Parcela                      | Parcel Boundary           |
| Área de Estudio                        | Study Area                |
| Opción Pareada                         | Couplet Option            |
| Ayuntamiento                           | City Hall                 |
| Highway 101                            | Highway 101               |
| Estacionamiento en la Calle Permanece  | On-Street Parking Remains |
| Estacionamiento en la Calle se Elimina | On-Street Parking Removed |
| Estacionamiento                        | Parking Lot               |
| Rutas Clave                            | Key Routes                |




PARKING / APARCAMIENTO

# Calles del festival / Aparcamiento



# Bicycle Routes / Wayfinding



## BIKE ROUTES / RUTAS DE BICICLETAS




## WAYFINDING SIGN EXAMPLES

### Ejemplos De Mapas De Ubicacion



**DIRECTORY EXAMPLE**

Ejemplo De Un Directorio




## Rutas en Bicicleta/Orientación




# Redevelopment

## RESIDENTIAL FRONTAGES / FACHADAS RESIDENCIALES




## COMMERCIAL FRONTAGES / FACHADAS COMERCIALES



# Reurbanización

# Funding

There will be parallel opportunities that the city is looking at for the short-term and long-term to make this plan become a reality. The funds will come from a variety of sources, including local urban renewal dollars, state resources, federal grants, and partnerships.



Habr  oportunidades paralelas que la ciudad est  estudiando a corto y largo plazo para hacer realidad este plan. Los fondos vendr n de diversas fuentes, como fondos locales de renovaci n urbana, financiaci n estatal, tambi n buscaremos subvenciones, fondos federales, y asociaciones.

# Fondos


# Next Steps

**Public Policy** — including zoning, density, and design requirements — must allow developer to build a profitable project

**Market Feasibility** - sufficient rents and sale prices to support a profitable project

**Capital** - developer must be able to access resources for investment (e.g. Equity investment, bank loans)

**Land** – A developer must control the site with reasonable acquisition costs




**Política Publica** - incluidos los requisitos de zonificación, densidad y diseño -- debe permitir al promotor construir un proyecto productivo

**Viabilidad del Mercado** - alquileres y precios de venta suficientes para sostener un proyecto productivo

**Capital** - el promotor debe poder acceder a recursos para invertir (por ejemplo, inversión en capital o préstamos bancarios)

**Terreno** - El promotor debe controlar el sitio con unos costes de adquisición razonables



# Siguientes pasos

## Appendix C – English Printed Survey Responses

The printed survey was available in English and Spanish. A summary of all printed surveys is below:

- **Total survey responses: 73**
- Spanish: 39
- English: 34


A summary of the written feedback is below. It is important to note that the Spanish survey results differed significantly from the English survey results across many of the questions.

*The survey was conducted with self-selected members of the community and does not qualify as a scientifically valid survey that is representative of the community. Not all questions were answered, so there is not a consistent number of responses for each question.*

### Project Goals

Participants were asked to rank their level of agreement as to whether the proposed plan meets this project goal from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).


#### Goal #1 - Active mix of uses in a walkable environment through infill, wider, and buffered sidewalks.



Of the 33 responses to this question, **13 (39%) strongly agreed that the proposed plan met this goal**, while an additional 7 (21%) somewhat agreed, while eleven (33%) either strongly or somewhat disagreed that this goal was met.


#### Goal #2 - Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed parking through reduced vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

Of the 34 responses to this question, **15 respondents (44%) strongly agreed that the proposed plan met this goal**, while an additional 6 (18%) somewhat agreed, and nine (26%) either strongly or somewhat disagreed.






### Goal #3 - A clean, welcoming appearance through gateways, streetscaping and code updates.




Of the 30 responses to this question, **12 respondents (40%) strongly agreed that the proposed plan met this goal**, while an additional 6 (20%) somewhat agreed, and nine (30%) either strongly or somewhat disagreed.

### Goal #4 - Planned property development and acquisition through incentives and partnerships.

Of the 27 responses to this question, **9 respondents (33%) strongly agreed that the proposed plan met this goal**, while an two (7%) somewhat agreed, and nine (33%) respondents either strongly or somewhat disagreed. This question had the highest level (26%) of “unsure” responses than the other goals.



### Goal #5 - Targeted investment in infrastructure through implementation actions and strategies.



Of the 5 goals respondents were asked to weigh in on, this goal showed the most disagreement. Of the 26 responses to this question, **10 (38%) strongly agreed or somewhat agreed, while 11 (42%) either strongly or somewhat disagreed** that this goal was met by the proposed plan.

## District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20

About half of respondents were unsure or didn't feel strongly about the aesthetics of the two highways (47%). Of those respondents that provided additional comments, traffic safety was a higher priority than aesthetics. While a desire to have different aesthetics for each highway had the next highest support (38%), additional comments mentioned existing differences between the two roads and their uses, including a distinct inter-state coastal nature of US 101. While US


20 had less of a known identity. Overall, respondents who felt that US 101 and US 20 should feel the same mentioned continuity and maintaining familiar conditions.

Of the streetscape improvements, “Storefront Improvements” was the highest ranked improvement with 67% saying it was the most or somewhat important. Trash receptacles (61%) and public art (57%) were ranked next.

### Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct?

Respondents were asked how US 101 and US 20 should feel in relation to one another. Of the 32 responses to this question, **most (47%) were uncertain or didn’t feel strongly either way.**


The majority of the remaining responses felt that US 101 and US 20 should feel different (38%).



### How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements?


#### Benches/Seating

Participants were asked to rank possible streetscape improvements from least important to most important. Of the 29 responses to this question, **14 (48%) ranked the improvement as most or somewhat important.** 28% of respondents ranked improvements to benches/seating either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 24% of respondents felt neutral about the importance of benches/seating.




#### Trash Receptacles

Of the 31 responses to this question, **19 (61%) ranked the improvement as most or somewhat important.** 32% of respondents ranked improvements to public art either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 6% of respondents felt neutral about the importance of trash receptacles.




## Public Art

Of the 28 responses to this question, **16 (57%) ranked the improvement as most or somewhat important.** 21% of respondents ranked improvements to public art either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 21% of respondents felt neutral about the importance of public art.




## Decorative Streetlights

This was the streetscape improvement that respondents felt the most ambivalent about. Of the 29 responses to this question, **12 (41%) ranked the improvement as neither most important nor least important.** 38% of respondents ranked the improvement as most or somewhat important. Finally, 21% of respondents ranked improvements to decorative streetlights either not important or somewhat unimportant.



## Banners


Of the 27 responses to this question, 6 (22%) ranked the improvement as most or somewhat important. **41% of respondents ranked improvements to public art either not important or somewhat unimportant.** Finally, 37% of respondents felt neutral about the importance of banners.



## Storefront Improvements

Of the 33 responses to this question, **22 (67%) ranked the improvement as most or somewhat important.** 21% of respondents ranked improvements to public art either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 12% of respondents felt neutral about the importance of public art.

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other improvements they'd like to see, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their



suggestions. Many respondents mentioned the need for green space, utilizing eco-friendly practices, and proposed adding plants and trees as features of the walkway.


## Small Business Support

Respondents felt that it was most important to support small businesses during street construction, then by providing support through storefront improvements (painting, windows, signage). Asbestos/hazardous materials clean up and anti-displacement measures to help existing businesses stay in the area as it redevelops were considered important but to a lesser extent.

### How important is it to support businesses on these topics?


#### During street construction

The majority of respondents (77%) felt that supporting small businesses during street construction was the most important (21) or somewhat important (3). Nineteen percent of respondents felt that this was the least important (2) or somewhat unimportant (4).




#### Asbestos/hazardous materials clean up

A total of 18 respondents (62%) felt that supporting small businesses through hazardous material clean up was either most important (12) or somewhat important (6). Seven respondents (24%) felt that this was least important (5) or somewhat unimportant (2).



#### Storefront improvements (painting, windows, signage)


Twenty-two respondents (69%) felt that storefront improvements were most important (17) or somewhat important (5) to support small businesses. Four respondents (123%) felt that storefront improvements were either least important (1) or somewhat unimportant (3).





## Anti-displacement measures to help existing businesses stay in the area as it redevelops

Responses to this question varied more than previous questions about supporting small businesses. While 17 respondents (57%) felt that these measures were most important (12) or somewhat important (5), 6 respondents (20%) felt it was either least important (5) or somewhat unimportant (1). An additional 7 respondents (23%) were neutral.



Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other topics they deemed important for small business assistance, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their suggestions. Responses included keeping the highways clean and pollution-free as well as ensuring accessibility for all users within the corridor.

## When we think about different ways to build housing and businesses, what is most important to you?

A few building features had strong preference from respondents, while the others were more mixed:


- alleys as delivery access rather than on the main streets (100%)
- storefront/pedestrian-scaled signage (97%)
- allowing a range of home types (90%)
- breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections (88%)
- mixed home ownership and rental housing in the same block (79%)

Other clear building feature preferences included:

- Allowing ground level housing (77%)
- Require weather protection (like awnings or porches) (70%)
- Buildings that maximize views from living and working spaces (66%)


**Buildings that are close to the streets OR that maximize views from living and working spaces inside, especially from upper levels.**

A total of 66% of respondents prefer buildings that maximize views from living and working spaces inside over buildings that are close to the streets.




**Buildings that have similar façade designs OR letting developers decide on an individual basis.**

While opinions were split, 62% of respondents preferred letting developers decide façade design rather than requiring similar façade design by all developers.




**Require weather protection (like awnings or porches) OR letting developers decide on an individual basis.**

Seventy percent of survey respondents prefer requiring weather protection to letting developers decide on an individual basis.




## Have business signs at the top of buildings (tall entry marquee-type



**overhangs) OR have signs at the storefront/pedestrian-scaled level.**

Almost all respondents (97%) showed a preference for storefront/pedestrian-scaled signage.




**Alleys or partial alleys to have deliveries through a side/back door OR have areas on the main street for deliveries.**

All respondents (100%) prefer alleys as delivery access rather than

providing delivery access on the main streets.


## Break down big blocks with pedestrian connections OR allow developers to consolidate lots for larger developments.

A majority of respondents (88%) prefer breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections rather than allowing developers to consolidate lots for larger developments.




## More standalone homes OR a range of home types (townhomes, cottage clusters, boarding houses, stacked flats, and courtyard apartments).

The majority of respondents (90%) prefer allowing a range of home types rather than promoting only standalone home development.




### Allowing ground level housing OR residential on top of businesses/offices.

Seventy-seven percent of respondents prefer locating residential units over business/offices rather than allowing ground-level housing.




### Mix home ownership and rental housing in the same block OR encourage home ownership only

A majority (79%) would like to see mixed home ownership and rental housing in the same block, rather than encouraging only home ownership.



## Parks and Open Spaces

### Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? (choose one)




Of the six park and gathering spaces referenced in this survey, the Farmers Market was most frequently identified as needing improvements (45%) by a large margin. This reflects concerns previously heard about the future accommodation for the Farmers Market, which is currently located in a parking lot within the proposed reconstruction area.

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share improvements they deemed important for existing parks/gathering spaces. Responses focused on comfort and walkability of the area as well as concern for the level of pollution that US 101 is currently exposed to.

### Which type of new public spaces/features are most important in the City Center? (choose one)

Opinions about new public spaces were not conclusive.

While economic-use spaces had the highest response rate at 33%, both active-use spaces (30%) and passive-use spaces (27%) received a similar number of responses.



## Open-ended Comments

### Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct?

Respondents had the opportunity to elaborate on their answer to this question. Below are their responses:

They should feel the same

- Are you changing current maps and Google?
- Continuity town identity
- One way highways make a city feel unfriendly I have to go around

They should feel different

- 101 is a main access highway from Canada to Mexico
- 101 is unique + can (should) be more people friendly
- 101 should centralize commerce and provide safe bike travel - 20 doesn't share those priorities
- 20 is a long road; w/ end at Beach 101 is parallel
- City center/101 can be a community space with a real "downtown"
- Different businesses that appeal to residents and tourists
- Such different type of use and flow [illegible] major corridor vs minor
- US 20 is too short to develop businesses

I'm not sure/I don't feel strongly either way

- As long as they are safe and allow traffic flow they do not have to be the same
- Because I think the streets are similar.
- Both are boring and unappealing
- Traffic is very still fast at rush hours and not pedestrian friendly now

### How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other improvements they'd like to see, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their suggestions, below are the responses received.

- Better directions to public parking that already exists!
- Comfort/Aesthetics - 1
- Curb cleaning; paint, with storefront cleaned - 2
- Fill the potholes - 1

- Green spaces, THIRD SPACES, places where people want to be, "hang out" and meet with others - 5
- Greenery (pots, planters, baskets) - 1
- Keep 101 friendly with two way traffic
- Landscaping - 3
- Participant wrote in "who wants to sit on a highway" next to Benches/Seating
- Participant wrote in: "recycling" next to trash receptacles and "environmentally good" next to decorative streetlights
- Pedestrian Spaces - 1
- Planting strips and street trees - 1
- Plants in spots - 1
- Simple down lights
- Trees! - 1

### How important is it to support businesses on these topics?

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other topics they deemed important for small business assistance, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their suggestions, below are the responses received.

- Access and signage
- Accessible - 1
- ADA accessibility
- How?
- Participant wrote in the margins "depends on the businesses - if pot shops, pawn shops NO!" in response to anti-displacement
- Pollution reduction air cleaners
- Street sweep; grade gravel streets - 2
- Two way 101, as is remove on street parking - 1

### Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? (choose one)

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share improvements they deemed important for existing parks/gathering spaces, below are the responses received.

- 101 is a dirty Hwy. I know I worked upstairs in a school dist. Bldg. Please - NO residential FACING 101 - Exhaust, dust etc. = unhealthy
- Art and buffer plants
- Art and buffers to support the gateway

- Better circulation, walkways to parking areas, improved transit/active transp. hub, landscaping. Plaza needs work too!
- City hall covered walk ways, benches + outdoor toilet facilities.
- Clean up benches and clear some salal, make it occupiable to the public
- Comfort, engagement of port
- Covered would be a great addition
- Expand parking; have a new trail across east side to North side of the PARK
- Improved walkability, and separation from roadways for "buffer" from traffic
- Make it stand out more and be more noticeable
- Make it year round so residents and sellers could benefit.
- Need larger area and better access/parking (not on 101)
- Public art + park seating #2 Yaq Bay Park needs repair of rock walls - badly damaged
- Remove 101 parking keep it friendly so people don't have to circle around, keep SW 9th 2 way
- Sidewalks leading from 101, down past Mombetsu Sister City Park to Nye Beach
- STAGES for performance; gathering places for pedestrians
- This really the only one! Don't take it away
- Use south lawn and open space to create a community gathering space - NOT MORE PARKING!!
- Walkability of Downtown. As it stands right now, the Farmer's Market can be dangerous to get to.

**Respondents were also given the opportunity to share any other thoughts or comments they wanted to share with the PMT. Below are their responses:**

- For Questions 4 and 5, participant wrote in "I don't know enough to answer"
- Participant wrote in "NO" next to "We believe we met these project goals. Do you agree?"
- Participant wrote in "smaller signs?" next to "have signs at the storefront/ped level," under Question 13. Under same question, participant wrote in "NO STACK AND PACK" next to "allow developers to consolidate lots..." and "only 47%? \$ too high" next to "encourage home ownership only".
- Participant wrote in "TBD" under Question 1 next to "safe, efficient traffic flow..." and "targeted investment..." Under Question 14, they wrote in "playground" next to "Yaquina Bay State Park." Under Question 10, participant wrote "!!!!" next to "storefront improvements..." Under Question 13, they wrote in "depends" next to "break down big



blocks...," "YES" next to "a range of home types..." and "GOD NO" next to "more standalone homes"

- Participant wrote in "This all requires \$\$\$" under Question 2. Also wrote in "!!!" next to Banners/Storefront improvements, under Question 8. As well as, "Who has the funds to build" next to question about a range of home types vs. standalone homes, under Question 13. Notes in the margins: "Tell Derrick to stay in Philomath" and "Need to make current businesses clean up - be more presentable!"
- Participant wrote in "variety" next to "letting developers decide," under Question 13. Under the same question, participant wrote "it rains here a lot!" next to "require weather protection"
- Participant wrote in "what incentives" next to "planned property development" under Question 1
- To the right of Question 14, participant wrote in "Plant more trees wherever you can." Under Question 16, participant wrote in "101 is not meant for Housing due to exhaust and noise - Honest!!" Under Question 13, participant wrote in "101 for commercial use only" and next to "require weather protection" they wrote "if it doesn't impede foot traffic." Under the same question, participant wrote "no residential Bldgs" next to "a range of home types" and "not suitable for residential" next to the "mix home ownership vs encourage home ownership only" question.
- Under Question 1, participant wrote in "unable to determine based on posters" as well as "NO COUPLET, please"
- Under Question 1: participant added in "free" to "safe, efficient traffic flow..." so that it would read "Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed free parking..." and "who wants to promenade on a highway" next to "active mix of uses in walkable environment." Under Question 13: "within limits" next to "letting developers decide" opposite "buildings that have similar facade designs." Within the same Question, wrote in: "on housing buildings" next to "require weather protection," "if you want walkability" next to "break down big blocks..." "if you want a bigger tax base" next to "allow developers to consolidate..." and "who can afford to buy?" next to "encourage home ownership." Margin notes: "These are lofty goals, too bad public input wasn't given. Rather, it's been decided whether we want it or not." "Why can't our downtown look like Camus - something attractive with charm. Newport's downtown has NONE!"
- Under Question 13, next to question about "different facades..." vs. "letting developers decide...", participant wrote in "depends"
- Under Question 13, participant drew an arrow pointing at "pedestrian connections," and wrote "maybe 50% of this area." Under Question 10, participant wrote "?" next to "anti-displacement measures"
- Under Question 13, participant wrote in "?" next to "break down big blocks..." and "Allow developers to consolidate lots..."

- Under Question 13, participant wrote in "different zones for each" next to "mix home ownership/rental housing on same block" vs. "home ownership only"
- Under Question 14, participant wrote in "Sidewalks!" next to Mombetsu Sister City Park and "Restoration" next to Yaquina Bay State Park"

## Appendix D - Spanish Printed Survey Responses

The printed survey was available in English and Spanish. A summary of all printed surveys is below:


- **Total survey responses: 73**
- Spanish: 39
- English: 34

A summary of the written feedback is below. It is important to note that the Spanish survey results differed significantly from the English survey results across many of the questions.

*The survey was conducted with self-selected members of the community and does not qualify as a scientifically valid survey that is representative of the community. Not all questions were answered, so there is not a consistent number of responses for each question.*

### Project Goals

[1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree]



#### Goal #1 - Mezcla activa de usos en un entorno transitable mediante aceras más amplias y protegidas.

[Active mix of uses in a walkable environment through infill, wider, and buffered sidewalks.]

Of the 37 responses to this question, an overwhelming majority (89%) strongly agreed that the City's proposed plan meets Goal #1, and another 8% somewhat agreed. This was one of several questions that no respondents disagreed with.

## **Goal #2 - Circulación segura y eficaz y gestión de estacionamiento a través de la reducción de los conflictos entre vehículos/peatones.**

*[Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed parking through reduced vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.]*

The majority of respondents either strongly agreed (69%) or somewhat agreed (23%) that Goal #2 was met. This question received no “disagree” or “strongly disagree” responses.

## **Goal #3 - Una apariencia limpia y acogedora a través de entradas, paisaje urbano y actualizaciones de códigos.**

*[A clean, welcoming appearance through gateways, streetscaping and code updates.]*

Of the 39 responses to this question, 33 (85%) strongly agreed that Goal #3 was met, while another 5% somewhat agreed. One respondent disagreed that this goal had been met by the proposed plan.

## **Goal #4 - Desarrollo y adquisición de propiedades planeado a través de incentivos y colaboración.**

*[Planned property development and acquisition through incentives and partnerships.]*

A total of 31 respondents (79%) either agreed or strongly agreed that Goal #4 was met. This Goals question had the highest rate of “unsure” responses, which may suggest that the ways in which this goal is met are not as apparent as the others.

## **Goal #5 - Inversión específica en infraestructura a través de acciones y estrategias de implementación.**

*[Targeted investment in infrastructure through implementation actions and strategies.]*


While this goal had a majority of responses either agree or strongly agree (81%), it had the lowest number of “strongly agree” responses (25; 68%) and was the only Goals question where a respondent selected “strongly disagree”.

## **District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20**

### **¿La US 101 y la US 20 deben ser iguales o distintas?**

*[Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct?]*






Of the 31 responses to this question, 22 (71%) believe that US 101 and US 20 should feel different. Respondents had the opportunity to elaborate on their answer to this question. Respondents cited existing differences between US 101 and US, mostly related to the physical makeup of the two roads, such as US 101 having more sidewalks but US 20 being wider. A couple of responses shared a desire for improved traffic flow and overall transit.

## ¿Qué importancia tienen los siguientes elementos en la mejora del paisaje urbano del Centro Urbano?

[How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements]



### **Bancas/asientos [*Benches/Seating*]**

A majority of respondents (79%) feel that benches and seating are very important to include in City Center streetscape improvement plans; another 13% feel that they are somewhat important (92% in support).

### **Contenedores de basura [*Trash Receptacles*]**

This was the highest ranked improvement with 95% in support. A majority of respondents feel that trash receptacles are either somewhat important (23%) or very important (72%).

### **Arte publico [*Public Art*]**

Similar to trash receptacles, 72% of respondents feel that public art is important when planning the City Center, while 8% of respondents feel it is somewhat important.

### **Postes de luz decorativos [*Decorative Streetlights*]**

While this question did receive a lower number of “very important” responses (33%), another 26% responded that decorative streetlights are somewhat important. This Streetscape question had the highest amount of “unsure” responses at 28 percent.

### **Pancartas [*Banners*]**

The question on banners was the only streetscape question that did not have a conclusive response. Sixteen respondents (42%) feel that banners are important or very important, and sixteen respondents (42%) feel that banners are somewhat unimportant or not important. Sixteen percent of respondents were not sure of the importance of banners for streetscape redesigns.

### **Mejoras en las fachadas [*Storefront Improvements*]**


The overwhelming response (95%) to this question was that streetscape improvements are either somewhat important (14%) or very important (81%).

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other improvements they’d like to see, which the survey didn’t account for. One written response was received for this portion of the survey. The participant shared a desire for public transportation for long and short distance travel.

## Small Business Support

**Hemos oído que la ayuda para pequeños negocios es importante. ¿Qué tan importante es apoyar negocios en estos temas?**

*[How important is it to support businesses on these topics?]*



### **Durante construcción de carreteras *[During street construction]***

A majority of respondents (89%) feel that supporting small businesses during construction is either somewhat important (21%) or very important (68%). No respondents feel that this is somewhat unimportant or not important.

### **Limpieza de asbesto/materiales peligrosos *[Asbestos/hazardous materials clean up]***

A total of 33 respondents (89%) feel that asbestos/hazardous materials support is very important (68%) or somewhat important (22%) for small businesses. One respondent (3%) feels that asbestos/hazardous materials support is not important.

## Mejoras en las fachadas (pintar, ventanas, letreros) *[Storefront improvements (painting, windows, signage)]*

While storefront improvements had the widest variety of responses, the majority (92%) feel that providing support for storefront improvements is either very important (70%) or somewhat important (22%).

## Medidas antidesplazamiento para ayudar a los negocios existentes a permanecer en el área mientras se remodela *[Anti-displacement measures to help existing businesses stay in the area as it redevelops]*

Providing anti-displacement support had the largest proportion of agreement (92%), with 71% of respondents feeling that it is very important and 21% of respondents feeling that it is somewhat important.

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other topics they deemed important for small business assistance, which the survey didn't account for. There were no responses to this question.


## Building Houses and Businesses

### Cuándo pensamos en diferentes formas para construir viviendas y negocios, ¿qué es más importante para usted?

*[When we think about different ways to build housing and businesses, what is most important to you? (Choose between the two options)]*

This section had a much smaller response rate than the rest of the survey questions with only about seven responses collected. However, there was strong support for breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections (100% of 10 responses) and residential on top of businesses/offices (86% of 21 responses). The rest had too few responses to determine a preference.

**Edificios cercanos a la calle  
O que maximizan las vistas  
desde las habitaciones y  
espacios de trabajo en el  
interior, especialmente desde  
los niveles superiores.**




*[Buildings that are close to the streets OR that maximize views from living and working spaces inside, especially from upper levels.]*

Of the seven answers to this question, 4 (57%) responded that they would prefer buildings that are close to the streets.

### Edificios con diseños de fachada similares O dejar que los promotores decidan individualmente.

*[Buildings that have similar façade designs OR letting developers decide on an individual basis.]*


Responses to this question were split evenly between requiring similar façade designs and allowing developers to decide façade design on an individual basis.



### Requerir protección meteorológica (como toldos o porches) O dejar que los promotores decidan individualmente.

*[Require weather protection (like awnings or porches) OR letting developers decide on an individual basis.]*

Of the four answers to this question, three (75%) prefer allowing developers to decide on weather protection, rather than requiring weather protection in the development code.






## Tener letreros comerciales en la parte superior de los edificios (voladizos altos tipo marquesina de entrada) O tener letreros al nivel de los escaparates/peatones.

*[Have business signs at the top of buildings (tall entry marquee-type overhangs) OR have signs at the storefront/pedestrian-scaled level.]*


Three respondents (75%) would prefer that signage in the City Center be designed at a pedestrian scale.



## Callejones o callejones parciales para hacer entregas a través de una puerta lateral/trasera O tener zonas en la calle principal para las entregas.

*[Alleys or partial alleys to have deliveries through a side/back door OR have areas on the main street for deliveries.]*


Five respondents (71%) would prefer that the city designate delivery areas on the main street, rather than requiring deliveries through an alley.



## Dividir las grandes cuadras con conexiones peatonales O permitir a los promotores consolidar parcelas para desarrollos más grandes.

*[Break down big blocks with pedestrian connections OR allow developers to consolidate lots for larger developments.]*


All ten respondents (100%) answered that they would prefer to break down big blocks with pedestrian connections, rather than allowing developers to consolidate lots.



## Más hogares individuales O una gama de tipos de hogares (casas adosadas, grupos de casas de campo, casas de huéspedes, pisos apilados y apartamentos con patio).

*[More standalone homes OR a range of home types (townhomes, cottage clusters, boarding houses, stacked flats, and courtyard apartments).]*


This either/or question had the highest response rate with 24 responses. Preferences were fairly split, but more respondents preferred more standalone homes as opposed to allowing a range of housing types.



## Permitir viviendas a nivel del suelo O Viviendas encima de negocios/oficinas

*[Allowing ground level housing OR residential on top of businesses/offices.]*


Of the 21 responses to this question, a large majority (18; 86%) answered that they would prefer to see residential on top of businesses/offices, rather than ground-level housing.



## Animar a la vivienda en propiedad únicamente O mezclar vivienda en propiedad y en alquiler en la misma cuadra.

*[Mix home ownership and rental housing in the same block OR encourage home ownership only]*

Of the five responses to this question, the majority (80%) would prefer a mix of home ownership and rental housing in the same block.



## Parks and Open Spaces


### De los parques/espacios de reunión existentes cerca del Centro Urbano, ¿cuál se beneficiaría más de las mejoras? (elija uno)

[Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? (choose one)]

The top two existing parks/gathering spaces that respondents felt would benefit most from improvements are the plaza on the corner of Highway 101 and SW Hubert Street (34%) and Yaquina Bay State Park (21%).

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share improvements they deemed important for existing parks/gathering spaces.


Several respondents mentioned playgrounds and spaces for children.



### ¿Qué tipo de nuevos espacios públicos son más importantes en el Centro Urbano? (elija uno)

[Which type of new public spaces/features are most important in the City Center? (choose one)]

Over half (58%) of respondents feel that passive-use spaces are the most important to the City Center. Another 34% of respondents feel that active-use spaces are the most important to the City Center.



## Open-ended Comments

### ¿La US 101 y la US 20 deben ser iguales o distintas?

*[Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct?]*

Respondents had the opportunity to elaborate on their answer to this question. Responses include...

Respondents cited existing differences between US 101 and US, mostly related to the physical makeup of the two roads, such as US 101 having more sidewalks but US 20 being wider. A couple of responses shared a desire for improved traffic flow and overall transit.

- Porque el 101 atraviesa el pueblo y el 20 no (Because the 101 goes through the town and the 20 does not)
- La carretera 101 tiene más paso peatonal y es más ancha a comparación de la 20 (Highway 101 has more crosswalks and is wider compared to Highway 20)
- Mejor transito (better transit)
- Que fluya más el tráfico (more traffic flow)

### ¿Qué importancia tienen los siguientes elementos en la mejora del paisaje urbano del Centro Urbano?

*[How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements]*

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other improvements they'd like to see, which the survey didn't account for. One written response was received for this portion of the survey. The participant shared a desire for public transportation for long and short distance travel.

- Transporte públicos en corta distancia y larga distancia (Short and long distance public transportation)

### Hemos oído que la ayuda para pequeños negocios es importante. ¿Qué tan importante es apoyar negocios en estos temas?

*[How important is it to support businesses on these topics?]*

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other topics they deemed important for small business assistance, which the survey didn't account for. There were no responses to this open-ended question.

## **De los parques/espacios de reunión existentes cerca del Centro Urbano, ¿cuál se beneficiaría más de las mejoras? (elija uno)**

*[Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? (choose one)]*

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share improvements they deemed important for existing parks/gathering spaces, below are the responses received.

- Mas carriles de manejo en las carreteras principales (more driving lanes on the main roads)
- Mas limpieza y juegos para los niños (More cleaning and games for the children)
- Mejoramiento de los juegos y de túnel. Y mejora del baño público. (Improvement of the playground and tunnel. And improvement of the public restroom.)
- Parqueaderos gratis para los residentes (Free parking for residents)
- Parques para niños con más juegos columpios resbaladillas etc. (Playgrounds for children with more playgrounds swings slides etc.)



## Appendix E - Online Survey Responses

The City of Newport hosted an online survey on their [project website](#), which received 53 total responses between April 1 and April 17, 2025.


- **Total survey responses: 53**
- Spanish: 1
- English: 52

*This survey was conducted with self-selected members of the community and does not qualify as a scientifically valid survey that is representative of the community. Not all questions were answered, so there is not a consistent number of responses for each question. Since there was only one Spanish-language respondent, averages can't be made on this response.*

### Project Goals


**Most participants (41%) agreed that the proposed plan strongly meets the project goals.** Of the 49 responses to this question, a little over a quarter (27%) believed that the plan does not meet the goals, and an additional 22% felt that the plan somewhat meets the goals.

Unfortunately, “Goal #3 - A clean, welcoming appearance through gateways, streetscaping and code updates” was left off the online survey, so there are no responses to this question.




### Active mix of uses in a walkable environment through infill, wider, and buffered sidewalks.

Of the 49 responses to this question, **21 respondents (43%) felt that the proposed plan strongly met this specific goal, while an additional 16 (33%) felt the proposed plan somewhat met this goal.** Twenty percent of respondents felt that this goal was not met by the proposed plan.




### Safe, efficient traffic flow and managed parking through reduced vehicle/pedestrian conflicts.

Of the 46 responses to this question, **18 respondents (39%) felt this goal was strongly met by the proposed plan, while an additional 12 (26%) felt the proposed plan somewhat met this goal.** Twenty-eight percent of respondents felt that this goal was not met by the proposed plan.




### Planned property development and acquisition through incentives and partnerships.

Of the 48 responses to this question, **15 (31%) respondents felt the proposed plan met this goal, while an additional 13 (27%) felt this goal was somewhat met by the proposed plan.** Seventeen percent of respondents felt that this goal was not met, and a quarter of respondents felt unsure. Out of the 4 goals in this survey this was one that seemed to pose the most uncertainty amongst participants.



### Targeted investment in infrastructure through implementation actions and strategies.

Of the 46 responses to this question, **15 (33%) respondents felt that this goal was met by the proposed plans, while an additional 10 (22%) felt the goal was somewhat met.** While 20% of respondents felt this goal was not met by the proposed plan, a little over a quarter of respondents (26%) felt unsure. Of the 4 goals respondents were asked about this was one that seemed to pose the most uncertainty amongst participants.




## District Aesthetics: US 101 and US 20

Overall, respondents who felt that US 101 and US 20 should feel the same cited a desire for cohesiveness, as well as concerns about traffic and pedestrian safety. As for why US 101 and US 20 should feel different, respondents cited existing differences between the two roads, and what they represent. For example, one respondent shared that US 101 is a “main street and carries more traffic” whereas “Hwy 20 has more potential to develop mixed use properties with housing.”

Respondents who weren’t sure or didn’t feel strongly either way cited various areas of interest, including cycling/pedestrian lanes, street layouts (e.g. roundabouts), and aesthetics (e.g. trees). Important to note are the concerns mentioned by respondents of the survey. Concerns ranged from local housing insecurity to the timing of the project given the economic landscape of the US at large, as well as overall skepticism about the feasibility of the project.

### Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct?



Of the 49 responses to this question, **most respondents (45%) did not feel strongly or felt unsure about whether US 101 and US 20 should feel the same or different.** In comparison, 12 (24%) felt they should feel the same, while an additional 15 (31%) felt it should feel different. Respondents were provided with the opportunity to explain their


response.

### How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements

Overall, the most important improvements were storefront improvements (80% strongly/somewhat important) and trash receptacles (69%). Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other improvements they’d like to see, which the survey didn’t account for along with the level of importance of their suggestions. Responses included improvements related to parking (e.g. free parking), pedestrian safety (e.g. accessible crosswalks), gathering spaces (e.g. a central park), aesthetics (e.g. landscaping) and more.


## Benches/Seating

Participants were asked to rank possible streetscape improvements from 1 (least important) to 5 (most important). Of the 46 responses to this question, **18 (39%) ranked benches as most or somewhat important.** Thirty-three percent of respondents ranked benches/seating either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 28% of respondents felt neutral about the importance of benches/seating.




## Trash Receptacles

Of the 46 responses to this question, **18 (39%) ranked this improvement as most important, while an additional 14 (30%) ranked it as somewhat important.** Four percent of respondents ranked improvements to trash receptacles as somewhat unimportant, while no one ranked this as not important.




## Public Art

Of the 46 responses to this question, **11 (24%) ranked this improvement as most important, while an additional 15 (33%) ranked it as somewhat important.** Twenty percent of respondents ranked this as either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 24% of respondents felt neutral about public art improvements.




## Decorative Streetlights

Of the 46 responses to this question, **8 (17%) ranked this improvement as most important, while an additional 16 (35%) ranked it as somewhat important.** 26% of respondents ranked this as either not important or somewhat unimportant. Finally, 22% of respondents felt neutral about improvements to decorative streetlights.




## Banners

Of the 45 responses, 36% of respondents felt neutral about improvements made with banners, while **almost half (49%) of respondents ranked this as either not important or somewhat unimportant.** One respondent (4%) ranked this improvement as most important, while an additional six (13%) ranked it as somewhat important.



## Storefront Improvements

Of the 46 responses to this question, **a large majority (31; 67%) ranked this improvement as most important, while an additional 6 (13%) ranked it as somewhat important.** 2% of respondents ranked improvements to storefronts as somewhat unimportant, and no one felt it was not important.





## Small Business Support

### How important is it to support businesses on these topics?


Similarly to the previous question, the following questions asked participants to rank a series of topics related to supporting small businesses, from 1 (least important) to 5 (most important).

Supporting small business with asbestos/hazardous material clean-up and storefront improvements were tied for the most important items, followed by support during street construction.

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other topics they deemed important for small business assistance, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their suggestions. Overall, respondents cited various suggestions, ranging from economic support for storefront improvements to increased parking availability.


#### During street construction

Of the 45 responses to this question, **25 (56%) ranked this topic as most important, while an additional 8 (18%) felt this topic was somewhat important.** Seven percent of respondents felt this topic was either somewhat important or not important. Finally, 20% felt neutral about supporting small businesses during street construction.




#### Asbestos/hazardous materials clean up

Of the 46 responses to this question, **28 (61%) ranked this topic as most important, while an additional 7 (15%) felt this topic was somewhat important.** 9% of respondents felt this topic was either somewhat important or not important. Finally, 2% felt neutral about supporting small businesses during asbestos/hazardous material clean-up.




## Storefront improvements (painting, windows, signage)

Of the 46 responses to this question, **27 (59%) ranked this topic as most important, while an additional 8 (17%) felt this topic was somewhat important.** Seven percent of respondents felt this topic was either somewhat important or not important. Finally, 17% felt neutral about supporting small businesses during storefront improvements.



## Anti-displacement measures to help existing businesses stay in the area as it redevelops

Of the 46 responses to this question, **21 (46%) ranked this topic as most important, while an additional 10 (22%) felt this topic was somewhat important.** Fifteen percent of respondents felt this topic was either somewhat important or not important. Finally, 17% felt neutral about supporting small businesses with anti-displacement measures.



Respondents were also given the opportunity to share other general thoughts or comments with the PMT in this section. Overall, respondents used this space to voice their concerns, which ranged from concerns about parking (the lack of it and parking on US 101) to impacts on transit times and the availability of government funding. Improvements that were suggested included planting more trees and storefront improvements, among other suggestions. Housing was another topic that participants cited as an area of interest.


## When we think about different ways to build housing and businesses, what is most important to you?

A few building features had strong preference from respondents, while the others were more mixed:

- alleys as delivery access rather than on the main streets (87%)
- storefront/pedestrian-scaled signage (87%)
- allowing a range of home types (84%)
- breaking down big blocks with pedestrian connections (71%)
- preferred residential homes on top of businesses/offices (79%)


### Buildings that are close to the streets OR that maximize views from living and working spaces inside, especially from upper levels.

Of the 40 responses to this question, **25 (63%) preferred buildings that maximize views from living and working spaces, especially from upper levels.** 15 (38%) responses preferred buildings that are close to the street.




### Buildings that have similar façade designs OR letting developers decide on an individual basis.

Of the 42 responses to this question, **26 (62%) preferred buildings that have similar façade designs,** whereas 16 (38%) responses preferred buildings that are close to the street.




### Require weather protection (like awnings or porches) OR letting developers decide on an individual basis.

Of the 43 responses to this question, **29 (67%) preferred that weather protection be required.** Fourteen (33%) responses preferred letting developers decide on an individual basis.




### Have business signs at the top of buildings (tall entry marquee-type overhangs) OR have signs at the storefront/pedestrian-scaled level.

Of the 39 responses to this question, **34 (87%) preferred having business signs at the storefront/pedestrian level.** 5 (13%) responses preferred business signs at the top of buildings.




### Alleys or partial alleys to have deliveries through a side/back door OR have areas on the main street for deliveries.

Of the 45 responses to this question, **39 (87%) preferred that alleys or partial alley to have deliveries through a side/back door.** 6 (13%) responses preferred having areas on the main street for deliveries.




### Break down big blocks with pedestrian connections OR allow developers to consolidate lots for larger developments.

Of the 42 responses to this question, **30 (71%) preferred that big blocks be broken down with pedestrian connections.** 12 (29%) responses preferred letting developers consolidate lots for larger developments.




## More standalone homes OR a range of home types (townhomes, cottage clusters, boarding houses, stacked flats, and courtyard apartments).

Of the 44 responses to this question, **37 (84%) preferred having a range of home types**. 7 (16%) responses preferred more standalone homes.



## Allowing ground level housing OR residential on top of businesses/offices.

Of the 42 responses to this question, **33 (79%) preferred residential homes on top of businesses/offices**. 9 (21%) responses preferred allowing ground level housing.




## Parks and Open Spaces

### Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? (choose one)

The top two existing parks/gathering spaces that respondents felt would benefit most from improvements are the Farmer's Market (42%) and City Hall (18%).

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share improvements they deemed important for existing parks/gathering spaces. Overall, participants cited the following as areas of interest: aesthetics (e.g. more landscaping,






maintenance), parking, and bike/pedestrian spaces. As for the top two gathering spaces, participants felt that the Farmer's Market should be permanent and covered, with one participant describing City Hall as an "unloved lawn space."

### Which type of new public spaces/features are most important in the City Center? (choose one)

The top three new public spaces/features that respondents felt are most important in the City Center are economic-use spaces (36%), passive-use spaces (26%) and a gateway (17%).



### Open-ended Comments

All open-ended comments collected online were in English.

### Should US 101 and US 20 feel the same or distinct?

Respondents had the opportunity to elaborate on their answer to this question. Below are their responses.

They should feel the same:

- Biggest issue is the unsafe traffic and pedestrian areas on Hwy 101 and Hwy 20.
- Cohesiveness in design/style of buildings is key. Hodgepodge of different styles/paint colors etc looks disorganized and tacky. Look to Florence for an example of relative cohesiveness.
- I think a cohesive vision is important from a wayfinding perspective. It's less confusing for drivers/pedestrians when it's all planned similar and less "random" looking.
- Spend the money on the housing issue. Having one way streets through downtown would be absurd for the price
- We already have so many cut up areas nine Beach the bayfront 1 oh one it would be nice to have a more cohesive flowing District that felt connected and not disjointed

They should feel different:

- 20 should be a welcome environment for drivers, increase in focus on walking traffic for 101.
- HWY 101 is main street and carries more traffic. It's the north/south corridor and tends to be a drive through for non locals. Hwy 20 has more potential to develop mixed use properties with housing above and behind frontage.
- I can not think of a worse way to spend money in this economy right now. Why the f\*\*\* are we worried about this instead of housing or things that the taxpayers could actually use? Y'all are f\*\*\*\*\* stupid as hell. Also, you should hire someone to proofread these things before being posted so y'all look like you know what you're talking about.
- I only saw one of the two proposed plans presented
- The "Deco District" should a building and development codes to match existing historic building weather they be 1930 Deco (the old "Ark" movie theater on 101) or earlier Victorian (Volta Bakery, Episcopal Church) and Craftsman style. Please no modern styles later than 1940.
- The proposed plan just does the same thing that has not worked here or anywhere. Using false assumptions and forced outcome. Way to expensive for an area that could be bought 1/4 of projected cost.
- To me, 20 represents the mtns and 101 screams ocean. I think the stretch of 20, from the gateway, should ease you out of the mtns and into the beachy-vibe by the time you hit 101. Just my 2 cents.
- What do the orange dashed lines in the Hwy 20 illustration represent? There's nothing in the legend to define them, but they make it look like 20 will split and use 1st street for Hwy 20 traffic. Why??? There are some businesses there, but also houses and that plan looks crazy.
- What happened to the plan to get rid of parking on 101 and dump the couplet plan? Your last survey was totally BIASED to the couplet. You have NOT surveyed the public directly whether they would prefer keeping 101 where it is and getting rid of parking VS couplet. I am appalled at the lack of transparency regarding that specific decision and believe you have pulled a fast one on the citizens of Newport.

I'm not sure/I don't feel strongly either way:

- Bike routes are useless if they are only a few miles long and don't feed anywhere.
- Do not see roundabouts...THANK YOU! The cartoon plan and fonts are difficult to read. Too much bureaucratic language.
- Hard to visualize
- Highways are designed to efficiently move people and products. The project prioritizes economics over transportation efficiency. What evidence is there that demonstrates that

such projects have created economically revitalized city centers? Seems like a large financial gamble/expenditure without a guaranteed benefit.

- I am a current business owner, The Medication Station. I am concerned with Plan 1 that I will lose visibility and accessibility to my business for survival. I would like to be on the local committee for this input. I support Plan 2.
- I love this plan as I understand it. Being the same is advantageous because if they're different, some travelers will only experience one. However, if both are as inviting as it seems the plans so far reflect, hopefully they'll stop, shop and support businesses. I'm sure locals will enjoy this. I'm in my seventies and hope I live long enough and stay healthy enough to experience this great plan!
- I think that both need to feel welcoming (neither do at this point). I think trees are critical (for shade/to keep our city cooler, to soften the surfaces viewed) as are safe cycling/pedestrian lanes so, if that can be accomplished I don't care if they look similar.
- This looks attractive on paper, but you've overlooked the weather conditions we have on the Oregon Coast. Besides 101, we don't get a lot of pedestrian traffic. I think we're wasting valuable ROW space that can be used for additional traffic lanes and on-street parking. Also, the redevelopment areas need to be more specific. What are the plans for those areas?
- I believe you need to consider the local traffic, as well. By creating the one way street on Ninth St., this will create more traffic problems for locals, especially getting to and from the hospital. I'm not sure about the effectiveness of the Highway 20 design. It seems that the development of NE 1st street will take major acquisition of property, as well as construction challenges. I'm not in favor of making this a part of the redevelopment project.
- Two completely different transit avenues with different goals: moderate traffic pattern via US 20, but heavier US 101 traffic, and different physical roadway capabilities
- US 101 looks like it will present an attractive corridor that also helps move traffic efficiently.
- US 20 dead ends in Newport. 101 goes through Newport and seems to carry more traffic and to have more potential for development and a focus on pedestrians and gatherings.

## How important are the following as part of City Center streetscape improvements

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other improvements they'd like to see, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their suggestions, below are the responses received.

- A central park the size of a city block is missing from these plans. The city has no park to function as it's "heart" for gatherings and small festivals and events.
- All that needs to be done is to eliminate parking in deco district area of highway 101
- Any infrastructure related to pedestrian safety and improvements I consider the most important.

- Bike lanes, pedestrian access, free parking
- City center will not thrive if it remains a home base and hangout for the homeless.
- Driveability. Most important. This is a mess.
- Established areas where small groups could gather, sit, talk and/or eat take away food - 3
- Flower baskets on streetlights
- Toledo looks better than Newport
- Forget couplet, remove parking on 101 use that space for a middle turn lane, go to standard stop light, not staggered wait.
- Ground floor boutique businesses with apartments above -- Efficiency to 3-bedroom. More Efficiency-size and one-bedroom apartments than 3-bedroom units.
- I can't think of any at the moment.
- I don't see the intersection of 101/20 being addressed. That intersection really needs a roundabout to keep the traffic flowing or it backs up into the new downtown area.
- I think it's important as far as landscaping that we try to use native Oregon plants, and that if there are areas that the public is responsible for that, they are encouraged to use native plants. also, you might want to include a few covered areas since it rains here maybe with benches or seating areas some of those could be covered in case people are walking and get caught in the rain. They'd have a place to stay a little dryer.
- I would like to see colorful flowers and hanging baskets throughout the downtown area with a reliable watering system to maintain these plants. For example: Toledo or Sweet Home
- I'd like to see less cosmetic shit done by the city. Y'all have no clue what people want anyways. You just want to spend our money.
- Landscaping would be lovely. Level 4 importance.
- More planter boxes and trees. Add murals for art by local artists
- No bikes on highways. In a very rainy area, walking is less important than close parking. And meter parking is the worse idea possible.
- Parking - 4
- Marketing research re. business opportunities - 5
- 9th street impact on existing business/housing - 4
- Parking needs to be available and convenient. Safe access to park from the busy Hwy.
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Pedestrian friendly and safe pathways to get from the bay front to Nye Beach. I'd like to see some pedestrian only streets, and some food truck pods.

- Plants
- Please make room for public restrooms. Businesses (besides restaurants) should not be responsible and we get asked allllll the time.
- Roads need to be repaired as they are hazardous to our lives and cars.
- Safety is top priority for pedestrians and drivers.
- The importance of the different amenities depends entirely on location so there's no blanket priority. Benches on 101 traffic would be noisy.
- To maintain free parking options. As a local I am less likely to go to an area that I have to pay for.
- Trees (level 5), landscaping to make the new areas like a welcoming town instead of an impersonal city (level 5), bioswales to help with runoff. To add to above: streetlights that don't make our night skies diminish.
- Trees and plantings, perhaps hanging baskets
- Trees!!!! You mention adding trees - the city has removed dozens of public trees in the last few years, replacing none - but trees aren't listed here to show level of support. More than benches or trash receptacles or fancy storefronts, Newport needs trees Trees TREES!
- Very Important: More greenery - grassy areas, trees, etc.
- Very Important: Accessible crosswalks
- Way finding and maps.
- Weed control and walkways maintained -5

### How important is it to support businesses on these topics?

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share other topics they deemed important for small business assistance, which the survey didn't account for. They were asked to also include the level of importance of their suggestions, below are the responses received.

- 1. Lower cost barriers to commercial development.
- 2. Focus on appealing business models which will generate foot traffic and activities.
- 3. Pawn, cannabis shops and poor performing businesses should be relocated.
- Equal application of benefits. Certain businesses in Bay Blvd are making a killing off your parking meters while others are suffering. You made an areas where people who own lots get all the advantage. Don't do that here, every single property must be given the same priority.
- Follow Sisters Oregon model: Provide loan to restore existing storefronts on historic buildings to deco or Victorian style. Storefronts that maintain the new storefront for 7 years will have the loan forgiven.
- I think it's important to help small businesses find out how they could apply for their own individual grants to improve their areas.



- If businesses with store fronts remain, they should have to make improvements at their expense.
- Increase beautification and accessibility
- Make sure business owners are involved and not just property owners.
- making provision for parking so that customers are easily able to access businesses
- none
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Parking
- Remove functionally obsolete and deteriorated buildings. Use space for small seasonal retail or farmers type market.
- signage for vehicles and peds     parking displacement     safety
- Support for small businesses should start with analyzing what makes the ones that have been in business for a long time successful. Like Cyclegrind it has a parking lot off the highway next to it that it shares with a few other businesses. This is what makes it a place that is accessible and comfortable to park near because you don't have to park on highway 10 one the farmers market is successful because they have so much to offer that people want. The Kite store owner says he successful because people can park on the side street. There are other stores that have been in business a long time. What factors do they think are important?
- Teach coastal businesses how to keep their hours and information updated, how to have an online presence, and how to keep that presence up to day. And not just a silly Facebook page. It has amazed me living here how far behind businesses are in customer service and keeping all of their information accessible and up to date. The schools and local governments fail miserably in this too.
- The best small businesses will survive. The new environment will be the test for what small businesses are most desirable.
- This is going to be VERY IMPORTANT, I have paid the City of Newport over \$160,000 in the past 8 years and need to be heard on this plan.
- Trees to shade the sidewalks in front of businesses, to make walking along the street more comfortable in heat or rain.
- Would be cool to see less chain stores

Respondents were also given the opportunity to share any other thoughts or comments they wanted to share with the PMT. Below are their responses:

- (1) I'm not clear how the expense and disruption necessary to reroute northbound 101 a few blocks is justified.
- (2) If it happens, it is imperative that the speed limit leading into and throughout the northbound bypass be 20-25 mph and is enforced.
- 1. Please be transparent with what this project will do to the expect transit time between the two gateway points. This is important as decreased transit time equals more vehicles in an area per unit of time, more vehicle emissions, etc. 2. From the way Highway 101 curves through downtown, it looks more efficient to start the south gateway point onto 9th Street between Bayley and Bay Streets. Why not start there? Is the hospital opposed to the additional traffic near them?
- A driving school, so local teens can learn to drive correctly. The driving of local residents is frightening, and so many rules are unknown to them.
- City Center should have all first floor developments as storefront, with office space, trendy hotels or condos in upper levels
- Exorbitant amount of money for a project that is not even supported by folks who actually live here (Derrick!)
- Get rid of couplet and keep 101 the same without on street parking.
- It is long overdue. The downtown Newport has deteriorated and is an embarrassment right now for a tourist town. Sorry.
- It's as if Newport and this planning can only give tiny nod to the possibility of trees - even though the artist rendition of street improvements include trees in the drawings bc trees add beauty and value. Actual trees added to the city add carbon storage units (one of their bio functions) as well as habitat for many types of beneficial species, cooling and shade in heat, mental health lift (look up MH and trees if you aren't aware of this significant role of trees), and beauty. Trees!
- Looking at your maps were a little confusing but it looks like SW. 2nd St. is maybe gonna be part of the bike path it looks kind of cut up. The only thing that's bad about SW. 2nd St. is where it comes out below the post office that's a big hill on the west side and often cars come zooming down there past Cottage Street in Lee Street and it's very hard if people are in those areas to see up over that hill if anything is coming specially in bad weather.
- Parking seems to be discounted. The side street offer new or better designed parking. If you increase residential uses, parking needs to be better addressed. Also, ADA spaces are lacking. The slope between Hwy 101 and 9th St is steep in places. That is challenging for some pedestrians. Consider more robust pedestrian ways on the least steep portions.
- Please let me know how I can be a part of these decisions. Carla Remington (541) 270-6565. Email: carlare62@gmail.com

- PLEASE NO COUPLET! The residents have been weighing in against couplets since this process started a decade ago. The residents DO NOT WANT A COUPLET. What do we have to do to get this bad solution off the table forever?
- Still believe removing existing street parking on 101, to provide lane width improvement would be cheaper. Also provide incentives to existing business owners to improve their store fronts.
- The CCR Committee has been working hard to fulfill their job and create a vibrant district but citizen engagement is lacking and the so-called pedestrian -bike network is not there.
- Housing as sited as a priority but the type of housing us not defined.
- Newport needs single-family homes and senior house.
- The current administration and State funds will not be available for a large project. You can build retail or housing that will return enough to make it possible to build.
- The current small businesses in the core are poor performing and under capitalized. They need to be replaced with appealing well run entities which pull in day traffic and tourists with good curb appeal. In that sense many businesses may not exist at the end of this process. Also the idea of imbedding low income housing and mixed use commercial zoning will probable stop investment from serious business operators.
- There isn't enough parking
- We need our property taxes cut for seniors, and all cuts as we cannot afford luxuries from the people in Newport. Gas tax and other taxes too high.
- Whatever signage is permitted for businesses, please consider enough to be visible, but not so much it's cluttered looking and no "sandwich" signs on the sidewalk to impede pedestrians.
- While the city does need housing, the Deco District is not the best location. Housing is needed near schools, the colleges, and the hospital; NOT in the business and tourist oriented Deco District. Who wants to live between northbound and southbound 101?

### **Of the existing parks/gathering spaces near City Center, which would most benefit from improvements? (choose one)**

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to share improvements they deemed important for existing parks/gathering spaces, below are the responses received.

- A playground for children, a shelter/yurt for gatherings, and picnic tables need to be repaired.
- Anything that encourages areas for walking (safe, quiet, beautiful).
- Areas for public activities.
- Beautification, landscaping as it's at the north entry/exit of the project and we should be proud and have it look nice. It looks nice now, just needs a little spiffing up. I read recently

that currently proposed landscaping has been scaled back which is good planning, thank you.



- Bike/ped pathway
- Break up of concrete with more greenery.
- Certainly don't remove existing parking lot, but add awnings and power outlets.
- Complete renovation! Poor quality buildings and business environment. Traffic patterns and parking is unsafe for cars and pedestrians.
- Founding Rock Park could become a park. Benches, picnic tables, pedestrian walkways, bushes & trees, water feature/fountain accessible to children so they could play in the water, playground area, grassy area, food carts
- Green Grass and trees. A central park where small community events could be held.
- Homeless population dealt with.
- I don't even think of this as a plaza, it seems like a parking lot so, if it's supposed to feel like something welcoming and comfortable, landscaping, trees, benches, water fountain (for drinking water).
- I think our farmers market really needs to be year-round. We gave up on the winter market because there was nowhere to house it, but it was very successful, and if you move it in an area where tourists would see it too it would provide year-round place for our artisans that rely on this income
- It should be inviting. Storefronts should not be empty. Needs flowers, benches water feature.
- Just do a better job of improving and maintaining existing parks, and keep it clean and free of campers.
- Just do some maintenance. Fix the sidewalks and plant some rhododendrons
- Larger space for vendors
- Look at City Hall, was it built 2 years ago which could explain the lack of trees or mature landscaping? Well no, we all know it's been there decades. But it looks fly-by-night with few shrubs and no trees, just unloved lawn space. Another parched, haphazard-looking space among many in Newport. Why do we have environments that look like we haven't yet recovered from a terrible community-wide fire disaster, but are just limping along with ugly public spaces until basic utilities are restored or something? Or as if someone (not big on imagination) heard a park described but has never actually been to one, and just made up something with some basic components but no sense of beauty or richness of nature. Sorry to be so harsh, but jeez look around!
- Maintenance.
- more parking and pedestrian access without stopping traffic on 101
- Newport needs an update for sure, but we do not need to stress small businesses in order to give it a facelift. Plan 2 seems less invasive to everyone involved.

- Parking
- permanent covered structure
- permanent place for market with coverings and seatings as planned
- Permanent, all weather, location with sufficient parking so people don't park in business lots.
- Put back stop signs that have been removed as they are causing too many accidents.
- Trees
- Your this-or-that choices above do not allow for nuance and creativity
- Also...a city theme suggestion would be great for Newport...think Sisters and Jacksonville and Solvang




# 14.30.020 (B) – City Center Design Review District

## The Newport City Center Revitalization Plan Project: Memo #9 City Center Design District



bruary 2025



u r b s w o r k s

---

## Newport City Center Revitalization Plan Project

Memo #9 | 14.30.020 (B) City Center  
Design Review District Form Based Code

Contents	03	INTRODUCTION
	04	01 INTRODUCTION
	06	02 FORM BASED APPROACH
	10	03 REGULATING PLAN
	16	04 PUBLIC REALM
	24	05 DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS
	38	06 REFERENCES



### Consultant Team

#### Urbsworks, Inc.

Marcy McInelly, AIA  
Emily Montalvo Diaz  
Kevin Howard  
Taylor Berberich  
David Berniker

This Project is partially funded by a grant from the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) Program, a joint program of the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. This TGM grant is financed, in part, by federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), local government, and the State of Oregon funds.

The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect views or policies of the State of Oregon.

February 2025

---

#### David Evans and Associates Inc.

#### ECOnorthwest

## Introduction

### Newport City Center Revitalization Plan: Memo #9 Objectives


Urbsworks' scope of work for Draft Memorandum #9: Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments, reads:

*Subconsultant shall lead the preparation of Draft Memorandum #9 with Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments that implement the preferred alternative in Revised Memorandum #4, the public investments in Revised Memorandum #7, and the public-private partnerships in Revised Memorandum #8. Subconsultant shall submit to DEA, and DEA shall provide to City and APM. Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments in Draft Memorandum #9 must reflect feedback on conceptual amendments in Memorandum #5 from Joint Planning Commission / City Council Work Session #2. Consultant team shall coordinate with Agency Region 2 Traffic on any aspects of Draft Memorandum #9 that may affect the State highway system.*

*Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments in Draft Memorandum #9 must be indicated by underlined text for additions and strikeout text for deletions to City's existing Development Code and related documents.*


## INTRODUCTION





## City Center Design District

This document translates the vision created during the public involvement process into a series of land use, streetscape, and urban design strategies, using a form based approach.



Form based codes (FBCs) are development regulations used by local government agencies that emphasize the physical character of development and deemphasize the categorization of land uses and activities. They provide greater predictability about the look and feel of development and offer developers a clearer understanding of what the community seeks. In return, FBCs can make it easier for citizens to help create the physical development they want, which will more likely lead to their acceptance of development and street designs in their community.



## FORM BASED APPROACH





The new 14.30 City Center Design Review District and amendments to the municipal code, Engineering and Construction Standards Manual, and Comprehensive Plan will:

## FBC Approach

---

Promote a “form based” approach that emphasizes building shape, size, and relationship to streets and open spaces and de-emphasizes land use.

---

Use a “Regulating Plan” to translate the CCARP vision into a plan and map of the project area. The regulating plan will show where different development and design standards apply.

---

Utilize clear and objective dimensional standards. An example of a dimensional standard is “front yard setback – 20 feet.”

---

In general, provide as much information in tables as possible to aid clarity of the provisions and use graphics to communicate the intent of the development standards and provisions..

---


Display development and design standards in tables. The standards in the table will be keyed to the Regulating Plan, Frontage Types, or other diagrams.

---

Provide purpose or intent statements and visual examples to help explain the intended outcome.


---

## APPLICABILITY



Public Realm Standards

Street Cross Sections (Section 04)




General Standards

Street Cross Sections (Section 04)

General Standards (Section 05)

## APPLICABILITY




### Gateway Frontage Types

Street Cross Sections (Section 04)

General Standards (Section 05)

Gateway Frontage Types



### Traditional Downtown Frontage Types

Street Cross Sections (Section 04)

General Standards (Section 05)

Gateway Frontage Types (Section 5)

Traditional Downtown Frontage Types (Section 5)

## REGULATING PLAN



## Regulating Plan



The purpose of the Regulating Plan is to translate the vision created during the public involvement process into an actionable plan and map. Each regulating plan component explains which areas are subject to specific regulations. The regulating plan is a critical tool to inform development of the Newport CCARP Design District and ensure the community vision is realized.

### Regulating Plan Components

The regulating plan identifies mandatory components to be implemented through a combination of private development and public capital improvement projects. It provides flexibility for the Newport CCARP Design District to support a wide range of land uses and development types while ensuring strong connectivity, a form and character that aligns with the surrounding context, and effective placemaking and economic development to complement public investments on Hwy 101, SW 9th Street, and Hwy 20.

The Regulating Plan identifies requirements that are geographically located and apply regardless of the proposed development approach. This plan is supplemented by development standards that vary based on proposed development and land uses.

## HWY 20 GATEWAY ZONE AND HWY 101 GATEWAY ZONE





## HWY 20 GATEWAY ZONE AND HWY 101 GATEWAY ZONE

### LEGEND




URBAN FRONTAGE REQUIRED




RETAIL OR RETAIL-READY FRONTAGE REQUIREMENT



LANDSCAPE FRONTAGE REQUIRED




GENERAL STANDARDS APPLY



PRIMARY STREET



TRADITIONAL DOWNTOWN ZONE



## TRADITIONAL DOWNTOWN ZONE

### LEGEND




URBAN FRONTAGE REQUIRED



RETAIL OR RETAIL-READY FRONTAGE REQUIREMENT



LANDSCAPE FRONTAGE REQUIRED



GENERAL STANDARDS APPLY



PRIMARY STREET





# 04

## PUBLIC REALM

## APPLICABLE ODOT URBAN BLUEPRINT STANDARDS

## ALIGNMENT WITH ODOT URBAN BLUEPRINT RECOMMENDATIONS

Key | Fixed dimension

	CCARP Core - Traditional Downtown		CCARP Gateway – Urban Mix	
Public Realm Standards	Hwy 101	SW 9 <sup>th</sup> St	Hwy 20 / SW Olive St After development	Hwy 20 / SW Olive St Pre-development
Pedestrian realm (feet)	14 or greater	14 or greater	14 or greater*	Existing conditions
Frontage / Pedestrian / Buffer / Curb-gutter (feet)	2 / 8 / 5 / .5	1 / 8 / 5 / .5	1 / 8 / 5 / .5	8 to 10 feet
Transition realm (feet)	16	8	8	none
Bike / Buffer / Parking (feet)	5 / 3 / 8	5 / 3 / 8	0 / 0 / 8	
Travelway realm	22	22	11 / 16 / 11	14-plus lanes /
Travel lane / Left turn lane and/or Raised Median (feet)	11 / 11	11 / 11		continuous left turn ln
Totals	74	66	82	

\* Meets Blueprint Pedestrian Realm standards through property dedication to ROW (typically 2-x feet)



## STREET CROSS SECTIONS

### Hwy 101 – Southbound couplet

Traditional Downtown Main Street

Supports residential and retail uses at the ground level.

Aligns with ODOT Blueprint for Urban Design Traditional Downtown / CBD Recommendations.




### SW 9th St. – Northbound couplet

Traditional Downtown Secondary Street

Supports residential and retail uses at the ground level.

Aligns with ODOT Blueprint for Urban Design Traditional Downtown / CBD Recommendations.





## STREET CROSS SECTIONS

### Hwy 20 –Olive St.

Improved pedestrian realm supports residential and retail uses at the ground level.

Street environment and function will be improved with the consolidation of driveways on Olive Street; business access is relocated to central location and side streets.



## STREET CROSS SECTIONS

SW Hurbert St.

Parklet Street





## STREET CROSS SECTIONS

### SW Alder and SW Lee Streets

Festival Street or Plaza Street




## STREET CROSS SECTIONS

### Hwy 20 –South of the couplet

Does not align with ODOT Blueprint for Urban Design Urban Mix recommendations.

Unimproved pedestrian realm does not supports residential and retail uses and lack of on-street parking does not support additional retail and residential development.




Cross Section showing existing conditions within existing right of way with Landscape Frontage Type applied (right) and General Design Standards applied (left).

## STREET CROSS SECTIONS


### Commercial Alley

Private or public



### Residential Alley

Private or public





## DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS







## SUMMARY OF BASE ZONE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

The base zone development standards will apply to new development along with the new form based standards.

Most lots within the CCARP are zoned C-1, C-3, or P-1. The building envelope standards for these three zones are the same except for a minor difference in lot coverage.



14.13.010 DENSITY LIMITATIONS	C-1 AND C-3	P-1
<b>A</b> Minimum lot size (square feet)	5,000	5,000
<b>B</b> Minimum width (feet)	0	0
<b>C</b> Setbacks – Front and 2nd Front / Side / Rear (feet)	0 / 0 / 0	0 / 0 / 0
<b>D</b> Lot coverage (%)	85-90	100
<b>E</b> Maximum building height (feet)	50	50
Density – Land Area Required per Unit (sq. feet)	1,250 *	1,250 *
*Amend NMC 14.13.020 (Table "A") to permit townhouses on 1,250 sf lots in CCARP C-1, C-3, and P-1-zoned lots <u>except for along Hwy 101, SW 9th, and Hwy 20/Olive St.</u>		

## GENERAL STANDARDS

## 14.30 City Center Design Review District General Standards

---

### 14.30(B) General Standards

#### Section 14.30(B) Purpose

The design standards for the City Center Design Review District require a minimum level of design on every building. These standards are intended to promote district character, attention to detail, human-scale and pedestrian-oriented design, while affording flexibility to use a variety of architectural styles.

City Center development is intended to implement the CCARP community vision and must address the following design objectives:

- Articulation – All street-facing buildings must incorporate design elements that break up façades into smaller planes.
- Eyes on the street – A certain percentage of the area of each street-facing façade must be windows.
- Main entrance – On street-facing façades, at least 1 main entrance must meet standards for location, orientation, and visibility.
- Detailed design – All street-facing buildings must include several features selected from a menu.

## Section 14.30(B) Applicability

Table. Applicability by building type

Design Standard	Applicability				
	Plexes (1-4 units)	Cottage clusters and courtyard apartments	Townhouses	Apartments	Mixed-Use Building or Development
1. Articulation	[2]	[2]	[2]		
2. Windows	[2] [3]	[2] [3]	[2] [3]	[2] [3]	
3. Main entrance	[2] [3]	[2] [3]	[2] [3]		
4. Detailed design	[2]	[2] [3]	[2] [3]		
5. Transitional space	DRAFT				
6. Pedestrian circulation					
7. Off-street parking		[1] [4]	[1] [4]		

[1] Applicable to the entire site

- [2] Applicable to dwellings facing the street
- [3] Applicable to dwellings in a cluster or grouping, either facing a shared open space (e.g. a common courtyard) or a pedestrian path.
- [4] Applicable to clustered parking where parking spaces exceed 4
- [5] Applicable only for additions or new buildings
- [6] Applicable only for new buildings
- [7] Applicable to ground floor dwellings with access from the street or shared open space (e.g. a common courtyard), and access entry door is:
  - (a) Within 10 feet of the street-facing property line, or
  - (b) Within the front yard setback, or
  - (c) Within 10 feet of a shared open space common tract or easement.

---

The design standards in this subsection apply to the types of development listed below when the closest wall of the street-facing façade is within 50 feet of a front or street side lot line.

1. New dwellings.
2. Expansions of structures in that add area to any street-facing façade. The design standards for such expansions are applicable as follows:
  - a. Expansions that add 75 square feet or less of street-facing façade area are exempt from all design standards.
  - b. Expansions that add more than 75 square feet and less than 200 square feet of street-facing façade area are subject to Subsection Section 14.30(B)(1), Eyes on the Street. The expanded façade area must meet the standards of Section 14.30(B)(1), Eyes on the Street, without consideration of the original street-facing façade area.

- c. Expansions that add 200 square feet or more of street-facing façade area are subject to the following design standards:
  - 3. The entire street-facing façade shall comply with Section 14.30(B) P (2) Windows.
  - 4. Section 14.30(B)(3) Main Entrance is applicable if an expansion would create a new main entrance. No expansion shall bring the street-facing façade out of conformance, or further out of conformance if already nonconforming, with the design standard.
  - 5. Section 14.30(B)(1) Articulation is applicable for expansions that add 20 lineal feet or more to the length of the street-facing façade.
  - 6. Section 14.30(B)(4) Detailed Design is not applicable for expansions. However, no expansion shall bring the street-facing façade out of conformance, or further out of conformance if already nonconforming, with the Detailed Design standards.
  - 7. Multiple expansions are allowed within a 5-year period if the street-facing façade will comply with the design standards that would have been applicable if the expansions occurred at the same time.
  - 8. Remodels that convert an attached garage to a habitable residential space. When applicable, the design standards apply only to the street-facing façade of the garage being converted. The following design standards are applicable:
    - a. Section 14.30(B)(3) Main Entrance is applicable if the garage conversion would create a new main entrance. No conversion shall bring the street-facing façade out of conformance, or further out of conformance if already nonconforming, with the design standard.
    - b. Section 14.30(B)(4) Detailed Design is not applicable. However, no conversion shall bring the street-facing façade out of conformance, or further out of conformance if already nonconforming, with the design standard.

### Section 14.30(B) Standards

All buildings that meet the applicability provisions in Section 14.30(B) Applicability shall meet the following design standards. The graphics provided are intended to illustrate how development could comply with these standards and should not be

interpreted as requiring a specific architectural style. An architectural feature may be used to comply with more than one standard.

1. Articulation. All buildings shall incorporate design elements that break up all street-facing façades into smaller planes as follows.
  - a. For buildings with 25 to 50 feet of street frontage, a minimum of 1 of the following elements shall be provided along the street-facing façades.
    - i. A porch at least 5 feet deep.
    - ii. A balcony that is at least 2 feet deep and is accessible from an interior room.
    - iii. A bay window that extends at least 2 feet wide.
    - iv. A section of the façade that is recessed by at least 2 feet deep and 6 feet long.
    - v. A gabled dormer.
  - b. For buildings with over 50 feet of street frontage, at least 1 element in Subsection 4.161(1) i.-v. above shall be provided for every 25 ft of street frontage.
  - c. Elements shall be distributed along the length of the façade so that there are no more than 25 feet between 2 elements.
  - d. For buildings with less than 25 feet of street frontage, the building articulation standard is not applicable.
2. Windows. At least 15% of the area of each street-facing façade must be windows.
  - a. Windows used to meet this standard must be transparent and allow views from the building to the street. Glass blocks and privacy windows in bathrooms do not meet this standard.
  - b. Window area is considered the entire area within the outer window frame, including any interior window grid. Glazed portions of entrance doors count as window area.
  - c. Doors used to meet this standard must face the street or be at an angle of no greater than 45 degrees from the street.



- d. Door area is considered the portion of the door that moves. Door frames do not count toward this standard.
3. Main entrance. At least 1 main entrance must meet both of the following standards.
- a. Be no further than 8 ft behind the longest street-facing wall of the building.
  - b. Face the street, be at an angle of up to 45 degrees from the street, or open onto a porch. If the entrance opens up onto a porch, the porch must meet all of these additional standards.
    - i. Be at least 25 sq ft in area with a minimum 4-ft depth.
    - ii. Have at least 1 porch entry facing the street.
    - iii. Have a roof that is no more than 12 ft above the floor of the porch.
    - iv. Have a roof that covers at least 30% of the porch area.
4. Detailed design. All buildings shall include at least 5 of the following features on any street-facing façade.
- a. Covered porch at least 5 ft deep, as measured horizontally from the face of the main building façade to the edge of the deck, and at least 5 ft wide.
  - b. Recessed entry area at least 2 ft deep, as measured horizontally from the face of the main building façade, and at least 5 ft wide.
  - c. Offset on the building face of at least 16 in from 1 exterior wall surface to the other.
  - d. Dormer that is at least 4 ft wide and integrated into the roof form.
  - e. Roof eaves with a minimum projection of 12 in from the intersection of the roof and the exterior walls.
  - f. Roof line offsets of at least 2 ft from the top surface of 1 roof to the top surface of the other.
  - g. Tile or wood shingle roofs.
  - h. Horizontal lap siding between 3 to 7 in wide (the visible portion once installed). The siding material may be wood, fiber-cement, or vinyl.

- i. Brick, cedar shingles, stucco, or other similar decorative materials covering at least 40% of the street-facing façade.
  - j. Gable roof, hip roof, or gambrel roof design.
  - k. Window trim around all windows at least 3 in wide and 5/8 in deep.
  - l. Window recesses, in all windows, of at least 3 in as measured horizontally from the face of the building façade.
  - m. Balcony that is at least 3 ft deep, 5 ft wide, and accessible from an interior room. For Townhouses this standard is 2 ft deep and 4 ft wide.
  - n. One roof pitch of at least 500 sq ft in area that is sloped to face the southern sky and has its eave line oriented within 30 degrees of the true north/south axis.
  - o. Bay window at least 2 ft deep and 5 ft long. For Townhouses this standard is 2 ft deep by 4 ft wide.
  - p. Attached garage width, as measured between the inside of the garage door frame, of 35% or less of the length of the street-facing façade.
  - q. For Townhouses, balconies and bay windows may encroach into a required setback area.
5. Transitional space. Ground floor dwellings which have their entry access from the street or a shared open space (e.g. a common courtyard) must include an area of transition between the public realm of the right-of-way (or tract or easement). The standards below apply when the private dwelling entry access door is within 10 feet of the street-facing property line; within the front yard setback, or within 10 feet of a shared open space common tract. The transitional space between the public realm and the entry door may be either vertical or horizontal, as described below.
- a. A vertical transition must be an uncovered flight of stairs that leads to the front door or front porch of the dwelling. The stairs must rise at least 3 ft, and not more than 8 ft, from grade. The flight of stairs may encroach into the required front yard, and the bottom step must be at least 4 ft from the front lot line.

- b. A horizontal transition shall be a covered porch with a depth of at least 6 ft. The porch may encroach into the required front yard, but it must be at least 4 ft from the front lot line.
- 6. Pedestrian circulation. The on-site pedestrian circulation system must include the following:
  - a. Continuous connections between the primary buildings, streets abutting the site, ground level entrances, common buildings, common open space, and vehicle and bicycle parking areas.
  - b. At least 1 pedestrian connection to an abutting street frontage for each 200 linear ft of street frontage.
  - c. Pedestrian walkways must be separated from vehicle parking and maneuvering areas by physical barriers such as planter strips, raised curbs, or bollards.
  - d. Walkways must be constructed with a hard surface material, must be permeable for stormwater, and must be no less than 3 ft wide. If adjacent to a parking area where vehicles will overhang the walkway, a 7-ft-wide walkway must be provided. The walkways must be separated from parking areas and internal driveways using curbing, landscaping, or distinctive paving materials.
- 7. Off-street parking.
  - a. Off-street parking may be arranged in clusters, subject to the following standards:
    - i. Cottage cluster projects with fewer than 16 cottages are permitted parking clusters of not more than five (5) contiguous spaces.
    - ii. Cottage cluster projects with 16 cottages or more are permitted parking clusters of not more than eight (8) contiguous spaces.
    - iii. Parking clusters must be separated from other spaces by at least four (4) feet of landscaping.
  - b. Clustered parking areas may be covered.
  - c. Off-street parking spaces and vehicle maneuvering areas must not be located:
    - i. Within of 20 feet from any street property line, except alley property lines;

- ii. Between a street property line and the front façade of cottages located closest to the street property line. This standard does not apply to alleys.
- d. Off-street parking spaces must not be located within 10 feet of any other property line, except alley property lines. Driveways and drive aisles are permitted within 10 feet of other property lines.
- e. Landscaping, fencing, or walls at least three feet tall must separate clustered parking areas and parking structures from common courtyards and public streets.
- f. Garages and carports (whether shared or individual) must not abut common courtyards.
- g. Individual attached garages up to 200 square feet must be exempted from the calculation of maximum building footprint for cottages.
- h. Individual detached garages must not exceed 400 square feet in floor area.
- i. Garage doors for attached and detached individual garages must not exceed 20 feet in width.

intentionally blank page

FRONTAGE  
TYPES

FRONTAGE  
CATEGORIES

SHOPFRONT



FORECOURT



PORCH-STOOP-  
TERRACE



LANDSCAPE  
FRONTAGE 2



URBAN Frontages

LANDSCAPE Frontages



## EXAMPLES



Shopfront frontage is characterized by a façade that is aligned close to the frontage line with the building entrance at sidewalk grade.



Forecourt frontage is characterized by portions of the façade close to the frontage line alternated by portions of the façade which are set back.




Porch-stoop-terrace frontage is characterized by a façade that is aligned close to the frontage line with the first story set back from the frontage line with a porch, a stoop, or a terrace.



Landscape frontage 2 is characterized by a low wall, fence, and/or vertical landscaping such as a hedge that is aligned with the frontage line.

## FRONTAGE TYPES



### URBAN FRONTAGE – SHOPFRONT


- |          |   |  |
|----------|---|--|
| <b>A</b> | Minimum ground floor height (feet)          | 18   |
| <b>B</b> | Minimum ground floor depth (feet)           | 40   |
| <b>C</b> | Separation of ground floor residential uses | Vertical separation – Distance from ground: Minimum 18 inches; maximum 3 feet;<br>Horizontal separation – Distance from Build To Line: Minimum 3 feet; maximum 15 feet |
| <b>D</b> | Building Setback from Build-to Line (feet)  | 0  |

Retail ready ground floor shall be constructed to meet commercial building standards.

Characterized by a façade that is built up to the Build To Line. The building entrance shall be at sidewalk grade, except where there are ground floor residential uses. Linear Building Frontages have substantial glazing on the ground floor, and, where required, provide awnings or canopies cantilevered over the sidewalk. Building entries must either provide a canopy or awning and/or be recessed behind the front building façade.



## FRONTAGE TYPES



### URBAN FRONTAGE - FORECOURT

**A** Minimum ground floor height (feet) 18

**B** Minimum ground floor depth (feet) 40

**C** Separation of ground floor residential uses  
Vertical separation – Distance from ground: Minimum 18 inches; maximum 3 feet;  
Horizontal separation – Distance from Build To Line: Minimum 3 feet; maximum 15 feet

**D** Building Setback from Build-to Line (feet) 0


Retail ready ground floor shall be constructed to meet commercial building standards.

Created by recessing a portion of the façade behind the Build To Line. Urban Frontage 2 shall be used in conjunction with the Shopfront Building Frontage. Forecourt Building Frontage is appropriate for commercial or residential uses, outdoor seating, and hardscaped plaza and/or landscaped gardens.





## FRONTAGE TYPES



### URBAN FRONTAGE – RESIDENTIAL PORCH, STOOP, TERRACE


<b>A</b>	Minimum ground floor height (feet)	18
<b>B</b>	Separation of ground floor residential uses	Vertical separation – Distance from ground: Minimum 18 inches; maximum 3 feet; Horizontal separation – Distance from Build To Line: Minimum 3 feet; maximum 15 feet
<b>C</b>	Building Setback from Build-to Line (feet)	0

Retail ready ground floor shall be constructed to meet commercial building standards.

Urban Residential Building Frontage is characterized by a façade which is set behind the Build To Line and a building entry threshold, such as a porch or terrace, set between the building and the Build To Line. The threshold may be at the pedestrian sidewalk level, elevated above it, or sunken below it. The residential building entry is accessed from this threshold. Landscaping may be provided in the setback area between the building and the sidewalk. A Porch-Stoop-Terrace Frontage is appropriate for residential uses and service commercial or office uses.



## FRONTAGE TYPES



### LANDSCAPE FRONTAGE 1 – LOW WALL AND TRELLIS

- A** Vertical Landscaping or Structure Setback from Build-to Line, maximum feet

5

- B** Height of Structure or Planting, feet

The underside of the Trellis portion of a Low Wall and Trellis shall be a minimum of 8 feet above grade and a maximum of 14 feet above grade. The Low Wall portion of a Low Wall and Trellis shall be a minimum of 1.5 feet and a maximum of 3 feet and have a minimum depth of 1.5 feet.

- C** Materials

The Trellis shall be heavy timber or steel (or a similar material) and shall consist of open structure with no decking or awning material. The Trellis shall have masonry, heavy timber, or steel (or similar metal) supporting columns spaced no more than 30 feet on center. The Low Wall shall be wood, masonry, and/or concrete.

- D** Openings

Openings in the Low Wall and Trellis are allowed for pedestrian pathways, sidewalks, plazas, and driveways.


- E** Surface Parking Setback

Surface Parking shall be set back a minimum of 3 feet from the Low Wall and Trellis.

- F** Ground Cover and Planting

The area between the Build-to Line and the Trellis shall be hardscaped with either masonry pavers or stamped concrete. The setback between the Low Wall and surface parking shall be planted with low shrubs, groundcover, and climbing plants.

## FRONTAGE TYPES




### LANDSCAPE FRONTAGE 2 – URBAN FENCE OR WALL

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>A</b> Vertical Landscaping or Structure Setback from Build-to Line, maximum feet | 5   |
| <b>B</b> Height of Structure or Planting, feet                                      | The fence or the wall shall be at least 2 feet high and no more than 3 feet high.   |
| <b>C</b> Materials  | Walls shall be wood masonry, and/or concrete; fences shall be made of wrought iron, steel, or a similar material (but not chain-link) and must be dark in color. Fences may be no more than 50% sight obscuring.                          |
| <b>D</b> Openings   | Openings in the Urban Fence or Wall are allowed for pedestrian pathways, sidewalks, plazas, and driveways.  |
| <b>E</b> Surface Parking Setback  | The surface parking area shall be set back, at a minimum, an additional 5 feet to provide room for required landscaping and stormwater infiltration and/or retention.   |
| <b>F</b> Ground Cover and Planting  | In addition to the required fence or wall, trees and shrubs shall be provided. One large tree is required every 30 linear feet minimum. The shrubs shall be at least as high as the wall or fence, and shall be no more than 6 feet high. |



## FRONTAGE TYPES



### LANDSCAPED FRONTAGE 3 - LOW HEDGE

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>A</b> Vertical Landscaping or Structure Setback from Build-to Line, minimum feet | 5  |
| <b>B</b> Height of Structure or Planting, feet                                      | <p>The shrubs shall be a minimum of 3 feet high. If a low wall is provided in place of shrubs it shall be a minimum of 3 feet high.</p> <p>The surface parking area shall be screened with a continuous row of hedges or shrubs immediately adjacent to the parking area, except where there is a driveway. Shrubs must be mostly opaque year round. A low wall may be substituted for the shrubs but the trees and groundcover plants are still required.</p> |
| <b>C</b> Materials  |  |
| <b>D</b> Openings   | <p>Openings in the Landscape Frontage are allowed for pedestrian pathways, sidewalks, plazas, and driveways.</p>   |
| <b>E</b> Surface Parking Setback  | 10 feet minimum  |
| <b>F</b> Ground Cover and Planting  | <p>In addition to the required shrubs, one large tree is required every 30 linear feet. The shrubs/hedge shall be interrupted with a gap of up to 2 feet wide in order to accommodate trees.</p>   |



# 07

---

## References



### Traditional Downtown/CBD

Table 3-11 provides design guidance for the respective design elements for ODOT roadways through the Traditional Downtown/CBD context. With this design approach, the goal is to design roadways in the Traditional Downtown/CBD context for a target speed of 20-25 mph. Figure 3-8 illustrates various cross section scenarios for how the design elements within this type of context may be arranged.

Table 3-11: Design Element Recommendations for Traditional Downtown/CBD

	Design Element	Guidance
Pedestrian Realm	Frontage Zone	4' to 2'
	Pedestrian Zone	10' to 8'
	Buffer Zone	6' to 0'
	Curb/Gutter <sup>1</sup>	2' to 0.5'
Transition Realm <sup>6</sup>	Separated Bicycle Lane (Curb Constrained Facility) <sup>2</sup>	8' to 7'
	On-Street Bicycle Lane (not including Buffer) <sup>2</sup>	6' to 5'
	Bicycle/Street Buffer <sup>2</sup>	3' to 2'
	Right Side Shoulder (if travel lane directly adjacent to curb) <sup>3,5</sup>	2' to 0'
Travelway Realm <sup>5</sup>	On-Street Parking	7' to 8'
	Travel Lane <sup>4,5</sup>	11'
	Right Turn Lane (including Sny Distances)	11' to 12'
	Left Turn Lane <sup>4</sup>	11'
	Left Side / Right Side Sny Distance	1' to 0'
	Two-Way-Left-Turn Lane	11' to 12'
	Raised Median – No Turn Lane (including Sny Distances)	8' to 11'
	Left-Turn Lane with Raised Curb Median/separator (includes 16" separator & Sny Distances)	12' to 14'

<sup>1</sup> Where curb and gutter is used and on-street parking is provided or travel lane is directly adjacent to curb, gutter pan should be included in shoulder/sny or on-street parking measurement. Gutter pan should be included in travel lane, bicycle lane or turn lane measurements only where a smooth transition from gutter pan to roadway surface is provided.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Bicycle Facility Selection process (Section 3.2.2) to determine appropriate bicycle facility type. Consider raised bicycle lanes where appropriate. 5-foot on-street bicycle lane is allowed only with a street buffer. When a raised buffer is used to protect the bicycle lane, the width should be 6' if parking is adjacent or if signs or other features are anticipated.

<sup>3</sup> Overall shoulder width depends on other section elements. Elimination of shoulder width/lateral offsets should only be considered in constrained locations and needs to be balanced with all cross-section and drainage needs. If the travel lane is next to a curb with a gutter (e.g., a 2-foot curb zone), the gutter typically serves as the right-side shoulder. A wider shoulder may be needed to accommodate drainage based on hydrological analysis or other specific needs.


<sup>4</sup> 11-foot lane width preferred to 12-foot lane; 10-foot lane width requires design approval from the State Roadway Engineer. On freight or transit-oriented streets, a 10-foot travel lane is generally not appropriate without a buffer zone or shoulder.

<sup>5</sup> On Reduction Review Routes, comply with ODOT Freight Mobility Policies, ORS 366.215 and OAR 731-012. Element dimensions may need to be modified.

<sup>6</sup> When painted buffers or vertical elements like curbing or flexible delineators are proposed to provide separation in a bicycle facility design, evaluate long-term maintenance needs and provide a solution to identified problems.

# ODOT Urban Blueprint

Figure 3-8: Example Cross Section Options for Traditional Downtown/CBD. See Table 3-11 for additional information.





## Urban Mix

Table 3-12 provides design guidance for the respective design elements for ODOT roadways through the Urban Mix context. With this design approach, the goal is to design roadways for a target speed of 25-30 mph. Figure 3-9 illustrates various cross section scenarios for how the design elements within this type of context may be arranged.

Table 3-12: Design Element Recommendations for Urban Mix

	Design Element	Guidance
Pedestrian Realm	Frontage Zone	1'
	Pedestrian Zone <sup>7</sup>	8' to 5'
	Buffer Zone	6' to 0'
	Curb/Gutter <sup>1</sup>	2' to 0.5'
Transition Realm <sup>6</sup>	Separated Bicycle Lane (Curb Constrained Facility) <sup>2</sup>	8' to 7'
	On-Street Bicycle Lane (not including Buffer) <sup>2</sup>	6' to 5'
	Bicycle/Street Buffer (preferred for On-Street Lane) <sup>2</sup>	4' to 2'
	Right-Side Shoulder (if travel lane directly adjacent to curb) <sup>3,5</sup>	2' to 0'
	On-Street Parking	8'
Travelway Realm <sup>5</sup>	Travel Lane <sup>4,5</sup>	11' to 12'
	Right Turn Lane (including Shy Distances)	11' to 12'
	Left Turn Lane <sup>4</sup>	11' to 12'
	Left Side / Right-Side Shy Distance	1' to 0'
	Two-Way-Left-Turn Lane	11' to 12'
	Raised Median – No Turn Lane (including Shy Distances)	8' to 11'
	Left-Turn Lane with Raised Curb Median/Separator (including 16" separator & Shy Distances)	12' to 14'

<sup>1</sup> Where curb and gutter is used and on-street parking is provided or travel lane is directly adjacent to curb, gutter pan should be included in shoulder/shy or on-street parking measurement. Gutter pan should be included in travel lane, bicycle lane or turn lane measurements only where a smooth transition from gutter pan to roadway surface is provided.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Bicycle Facility Selection process (Section 3.2.2) to determine appropriate bicycle facility type. Consider raised bicycle lanes where appropriate. 5-foot on-street bicycle lane is allowed only with a street buffer. When a raised buffer is used to protect the bicycle lane, the width should be 6' if parking is adjacent or if signs or other features are anticipated.

<sup>3</sup> Overall shoulder width depends on other section elements. Elimination of shoulder width/lateral offset should only be considered in constrained locations and needs to be balanced with all cross-section and drainage needs. If the travel lane is next to a curb with a gutter (e.g., a 2-foot curb zone), the gutter typically serves as the right-side shoulder. A wider shoulder may be needed to accommodate drainage based on hydrological analysis or other specific needs.

<sup>4</sup> 11-foot lane width preferred; 10-foot lane width requires design approval from the State Roadway Engineer. On right- or transition-oriented streets, a 10-foot travel lane is generally not appropriate without a buffer zone or shoulder.


<sup>5</sup> On Reduction Review Routes, comply with ODOT Freight Mobility Policies, ORS 366.215 and OAR 731-012. Element dimensions may need to be modified.

<sup>6</sup> When painted buffers or vertical elements like curbing or flexible delineators are proposed to provide separation in a bicycle facility design, evaluate long-term maintenance needs and provide a solution to identified problems.


<sup>7</sup> 5-foot pedestrian zone requires a paved frontage zone and/or a paved buffer zone. Minimum "sidewalk" width is 6-feet.

# ODOT Urban Blueprint

Figure 3-9: Example Cross Section Options for Urban Mix. See Table 3-12 for additional information.



# Base Zones





## Land Uses

### ZONING DESIGNATIONS THAT OCCUR IN THE CCARP AND LAND USES

Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Uses					
Office/Professional Offices	P	P			C
Retail sales and service					
Sales-oriented, general retail	P	P			
Sales-oriented, general retail	C	P			
Personal services / Beauty and Barber Shops	P	P			C
Entertainment	P	P			
Repair-oriented	P	P			
Major Event Entertainment	C	P			
Vehicle Repair	C	P			
Self-Service Storage	X	P			
Parking Facility	P	P			
Contractors and Industrial Service	X	P			
Manufacturing and Production					

DRAFT

Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Custom Creative Work	P	P			
Light Manufacturing	X	C			
Warehouse, Freight Movement, & Distribution	X	P			
Wholesale Sales	X	P			
Waste and Recycling Related	C	C			
Basic Utilities	P	P			
Utility Corridors	C	C			
Community Service	P	P			
Family Child Care Home	P	P			P
Child Care Center	P	P			P
Educational Institutions					
Elementary & Secondary Schools / Public Schools	C	C	P		
College and Universities / Public Colleges or Universities	P	P	P		C
Trade/Vocational Schools/Other	P	P			
Hospitals	C	C			P

Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Courts, Jails and Detention Facilities	X	P	P		
Communication Facilities	P	P			
Residences on Floors Other than Street Grade	P	P			
Affordable Housing	P	P			
Transportation Facilities	P	P	P		P
Residential					
Single-Family					P
Two-Family					P
Townhouse					P
Single Room Occupancy					P
Cottage Cluster					P
Multi-family					P
Manufactured Homes					P
Manufactured Dwelling ark					P
Accessory Dwelling Units					P
Accessory Uses					P

Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Home Occupations					P
Community Services / Community Buildings			P		
Parks					P
Publicly Owned Recreation Facilities					C
Libraries					C
Utility Substations					C
Public or Private Schools					P
Religious Institutions / Places of Worship					C
Emergency Shelter					P
Residential Care Homes					P
Nursing Homes					P
Motels and Hotels					C
Rooming and Boarding Houses					P
Membership Organizations					P
Museums					P
Condominiums					P

Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Hostels					C
Recreational Vehicle Parks					C
Necessary Public Utilities and Public Service Uses or Structures					C
Residential Facility					P
Movies Theaters					C
Assisted Living Facilities					P
Bicycle Shop					C
Short-Term Rentals					P
Public Open Space			P		
Any Building Erected by a Governmental Entity			P		
Fairgrounds			P		
Public Cemeteries			P		
Water & Wastewater Treatment Plants			P		
Performing Arts Centers			P		
Visual Arts Centers			P		


Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Senior Centers			P		
Airport and Accessory Structures			P		
Public Golf Courses			P		
City Halls			P		
County Courthouses			P		
City of County Maintenance Facilities			P		
Publicly Owned Recreational Vehicle Parks			C		
Public Museums			P		
Public Restrooms			P		
Recreation Equipment			P		
Post Office			P		
Parking Lots			P		
Public Hospitals			P		
Water Storage Facilities			P		
Public Libraries					
Fire Stations					



Applicable regulations	C-1	C-3	P-1	R-1	R-4
Police Stations					
Accessory Structures for Any of the Above [Public Uses]					



# City Center Revitalization Plan Adoption Phase Schedule



# Tentative Planning Commission Work Program

*(Scheduling and timing of agenda items is subject to change)*



March 24, 2025 Work Session

- Review and Discuss FY 25-26 Council – Commission Goals
- Online Survey Questions for April 3<sup>rd</sup> City Center Revitalization Plan Public Event

March 24, 2025 Regular Session

- Public Hearing on File No. 1-CP-25/1-Z-25: Comprehensive Plan and Zone Change for 1.48 acres at 840 NE Iler Street

April 14, 2025 Work Session

- City Center Revitalization Plan – Public Investments, Incentives & Public-Private Partnerships Memos
- Update on State of Oregon Land Use Related Legislation
- Review Draft Planning Commission FY 25-26 Goals
- Distribute New “Municode” Municipal Code Review Proof

April 14, 2025 Regular Session

- Potential Adoption of Planning Commission FY 25-26 Goals

April 28, 2025 Work Session

- Discuss New “Municode” Framework
- Potential Partnership with UO Sustainable City Program
- Draft Amendments to Geologic Hazards Code Regarding Parties Qualified to Prepare Reports

April 28, 2025 Regular Session

- Initiate Amendments to Geologic Hazards Code Regarding Parties Qualified to Prepare Reports
- 

May 12, 2025 Work Session

- City Center Revitalization Plan – Public Event #2 Summary and Introduce Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Concepts

May 12, 2025 Regular Session

- Public Hearing on File #1-CUP-25, Use of Foursquare Church as Private JR/Senior High School

May 27, 2025 Work Session

- Review and Provide Feedback on City Center Revitalization Plan – Draft Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments (Project Consultant to Attend)

May 27, 2025 Regular Session

- Final Order File #1-CUP-25, Use of Foursquare Church as Private JR/Senior High School

June 9, 2025 Work Session

- Status Update on the South Beach Island Annexation Project
- Update on Comprehensive Plan Streamlining Project (Beth Young)

June 9, 2025 Regular Session

- Hearing on Changes to Geologic Hazards Code Regarding Parties Qualified to Prepare Reports
- Placeholder for Toyota of Newport Amended Conditional Use Permit