

**City of Newport  
Planning Commission Work Session Minutes  
June 23, 2025**

<b>LOCATION:</b> CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NEWPORT CITY HALL, 169 SW COAST HIGHWAY, NEWPORT	
<b>Time Start:</b> 6:00 P.M.	<b>Time End:</b> 7:02 P.M.

**ATTENDANCE LOG/ROLLCALL**

COMMISSIONER/ ADVISORY MEMBER	STAFF
Chair Bill Branigan	Derrick Tokos, Community Development Director
Commissioner Bob Berman	Sherri Marineau, Community Development Dept.
Commissioner Jim Hanselman	Beth Young, Associate Planner
Commissioner Gary East	
Commissioner Braulio Escobar	PUBLIC
Commissioner John Updike (by video)	Jim Hencke, David Evans and Associates
Commissioner Robert Bare	
Citizen Advisory Member Dustin Capri	

AGENDA ITEM	ACTIONS
<b>WORK SESSION MEETING</b>	
<b>CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL</b>	
a. Roll Call	None.
<b>UPDATE ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STREAMLINING PROJECT (BETH YOUNG).</b>	<p>Beth Young presented the draft summary of the Comprehensive Plan to the Commission.</p> <p>The Commission discussed how to ensure the Comprehensive Plan and the summary document would be kept in sync over time. They requested that the stormwater chapter be included in the summary and expressed support for incorporating photos to enhance the document's visual appeal.</p> <p>Commissioners noted that some goals appeared to be missing from the summary and discussed how the document would be presented on the city's website. They suggested adding hyperlinks in the summary to direct readers to the corresponding chapters in the full Comprehensive Plan. They also discussed whether a citizen advisory committee would be necessary to make significant changes to the Comprehensive Plan, and whether linking the summary to the full document could present any legal or procedural liabilities.</p>
<b>CITY CENTER REVITALIZATION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS.</b>	Jim Hencke, with David Evans and Associates, presented on the draft set of Comprehensive Plan amendments.

	<p>The Commission discussed several aspects of the City Center district zones. They questioned if the Deco District would continue to exist and potentially form a neighborhood association, and what the timeline was for when a recommendation might be forwarded to the City Council. Commissioners also brought up concerns about inconsistencies in the level of detail across different sections of the document.</p> <p>Additional questions were raised about the implications of including the couplet project in the City Center Revitalization Plan, and whether its inclusion would obligate the city to pursue it. The Commission discussed if there would be further public input opportunities regarding the couplet and considered adding language to the document to clarify that the couplet was actively being pursued. They also reviewed proposed changes to the US 101 and Highway 20 intersections.</p> <p>There was a request to clarify that references to adjacent properties should be based on the figures in the document, not the narrative, to determine whether properties fall within the City Center district.</p> <p>Commissioners asked whether property owners within the City Center boundary would receive notifications for upcoming hearings. They also questioned why city-acquired and city-owned properties were listed separately in the action plan, and how the items outlined in the action plan would be processed through the supplemental budget.</p>
<p><b>PLANNING COMMISSION WORK PROGRAM UPDATE.</b></p>	<p>Tokos reported the State was updating their hazard maps, which would be part of a discussion in a future work session.</p>

Submitted by: Sherri Marineau  
 Sherri Marineau, Executive Assistant