



MEETING MINUTES

**CITY OF NEWBERG / YAMHILL COUNTY
NEWBERG URBAN AREA MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
Hoover Academic Building
June 11, 2007, 7:00 PM**

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE JULY 11, 2007 NUAMC MEETING

I. ROLL CALL - Call to order at 7:03 pm

Sally Dallas	Leslie Lewis	Alan Halstead
Michael Sherwood	Mat Haug	Robert Soppe

Absent:

Warren Parrish

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, City of Newberg Planning and Building Director
Elaine Taylor, Associate Planner
Ken Friday, Yamhill County Planning
Jessica Nunley, Assistant Planner (Acting Recording Secretary)

II. CONSENT CALENDAR (items are considered routine and are not discussed unless requested by the commissioners)

MOTION #1: Commissioner Halstead/Commissioner Soppe to approve the NUAMC minutes from May 31, 2007 (Unanimous voice vote) Motion carried.

III. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR (5 minute maximum per person)

Fifteen to twenty citizens were present at the beginning of the meeting, and they were offered the chance to speak on issues not on the agenda. No additional items were brought forth.

IV. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING (A continuation from April 25, 2007)

APPLICANT:	City of Newberg
REQUEST:	Recommend approval of Newberg Southeast Land Use and Transportation Plan
LOCATION:	Area south of 99W, west of Corral Creek Rd and Renne Rd, North of Wilsonville Rd, east of Newberg UGB/URA
FILE:	UGB 05-015

Chair Haug discussed how this meeting is a continuation of the April 25, 2007 meeting and discussed whether public testimony would be reopened for the issue tonight. Tonight we are trying to get through

deliberation on the SE Transportation Plan and then we will also go through the URA expansion hearing, starting at 9 pm.

Commissioner Sherwood/Commissioner Lewis to open the issue up for public testimony, all agreed.

Declare Ex parte contact, abstentions, etc:

None declared.

Staff Report:

Barton Brierley gave a brief presentation giving an overview of the SE Transportation Plan. He has given the staff report in more detail in past presentations. The staff recommendation is to open public testimony and adopt the plan.

Ken Friday thinks that the report needs to go the local road advisory committee and also to make sure that there are no budget line items stating that the county will fund any of the improvements proposed.

Questions for Staff:

No questions

PUBLIC COMMENT

Keith Nakayama, 5390 SE Byron Dr, Portland, OR 97267 – Because this is a legislative procedure, the questions you are asking about transportation are inappropriate. There should be a set of plans that incorporate the development of the SE area regardless of whether the bypass is built. It needs to be in a logical way, and it can't be logical if these properties aren't brought into the URA/UGB. SE area has lots of reasons for this to happen, the school is planned in the area, and the property owners are willing to invest in development in the area. If there is a transportation plan identified and the properties all come in, development won't be piecemeal. ODOT has placed a lot of burden on the city to solve the problems, when all the traffic doesn't originate in Newberg.

Commissioner Sherwood wondered if he was saying that there shouldn't be a contingency for the transportation plan whether or not the bypass is built.

Keith Nakayama – no, but there is too much detail being focused on right now. We have to move forward with confidence that we can develop a transportation plan that works.

Larry Bowe, 1001 Providence Dr, Newberg – Chief Administrator, Providence Hospital – Has been an administrator at many Providence hospitals, and two of them had a busy thoroughfare across from the hospital. Many people at the hospital are old and frail and have difficulty crossing the street. He is opposed to anything that would increase traffic on Providence Dr. Providence will be building offices across the street and they are concerned about safety. He doesn't want anything that would cause traffic to cut through to Providence Dr to 99W.

Commissioner Soppe – this is a public road, correct?

Larry Bowe – yes and it will connect with Hayes St in the future.

Commissioner Soppe – why do you think there won't be proper safety measures?

Larry Bowe - a stoplight would be appropriate if there were a connection.

Commissioner Soppe – if we can do proper safety measures, what is the issue of having extra cars?

Larry Bowe – we would rather have them go around us.

Commissioner Sherwood – your future medical centers, are you planning parking over there? Larry Bowe – yes. **Commissioner Sherwood** – then why would patients cross the road? Larry Bowe – patients would often be there doing different things and visiting offices in both areas. **Commissioner Sherwood** – Haven't you seen the plan showing Providence Dr connecting with Trails End only around a ½ block from 99W? Larry Bowe – I can't recall. **Commissioner Sherwood** – I believe that it's a short distance and your new medical center will be further south from that. **Commissioner Haug** – you won't get a traffic light unless it's warranted.

John Bridges, 515 E First St, Newberg, OR 97132 – I'm here mainly for an opportunity to answer questions, I don't want to be repetitive from the earlier hearings. Wanted to make sure everyone had the Lancaster memos discussing the new traffic numbers with different connections.

Commissioner Haug – This was just put in front of us tonight, so if there is anything of substance, you should go ahead and say it now.

John Bridges – one thing that was attached to the letter was the acreage of the Providence site. It's about 2.8 acres, right up next to 99W, there's a lot that can be done with that area and it will be used in the future. I also gave you some Providence layouts that are today and some St Vincent's layouts that are today. I know we don't like to think that we are like Portland, but both of those facilities started with one facility. Now there are significant structures throughout the whole area and they are tearing down old buildings to build new ones. The reason that they spent so much time trying to rework the bypass route is because this is all the land that Providence has and they need to make the most of it. They are planning for a 50-year window for this regional medical center. They will use all that land to the east of Providence Drive and probably have buildings up to 99W. We had to do a comparison between this site and the old site on Villa Rd for traffic counts. You're right that Providence Dr is a public road, but you'll see from my letter that we've always had an issue with it being used for that and for connectivity purposes. A doctor got hit by a car at the Villa site (one of reasons that Providence moved from there was because of traffic). There are going to be too many vehicles there, and a lot of trips will go south on Providence Dr without ever having to go on 99W to get to Fred Meyer. The Lancaster memo gives traffic counts for the scenario using the assumption that people will turn left on 99W to get through to Fred Meyer.

Commissioner Sherwood – were you inferring 1100 cars at peak hour? As I recall, you were saying Fernwood could handle 3000 cars? John Bridges – no, there's a difference between the capacities on roadways vs intersections. A road by itself has a tremendous amount of capacity. Providence is one of the main institutions of this community and sometimes institutions need to be treated differently. One reason you should do that is because you have safety involved here. The comprehensive plan says you locate schools in other places for safety reasons – showing that you should treat institutions differently than other uses.

Commissioner Soppe – The second page of your letter says that if the road were placed where Mr Ard says it should be, it would still be significant number of trips through the campus. Are you referring to the 1800 trips as significant? John Bridges – essentially what he's saying, 80-100 additional would turn south on that road. So 1/7 of the trips turning south is significant. **Commissioner Soppe** – with the east west connection, he says 1527 during the evening peak hour, where does the extra 800 come from? John Bridges – I'm remembering approximately 1100 w/out the east west connection and 1700 with the connection. John Bridges asked **Barton Brierley** for clarification on the number in the report - 1527. **Commissioner Soppe** – the point is 430 total vehicles to be added. John Bridges – he's measuring the 1527 number at Providence and 99W, the 80-100 go south so they aren't added in that number. **Commissioner Soppe** – 80-100 is 10% of the traffic, I don't see that 10% being a safety issue. South of the road, 80-100 doesn't seem significant. As far as north of the intersection, we have some measure of control over safety. If we have a traffic signal it seems like it should be a fairly safe environment. John Bridges – what do we want to make it? Schools are in areas where pedestrians are king. I'm suggesting

that in order for pedestrians to be king for this institution, we shouldn't have public roads through the campus.

Commissioner Soppe – In showing the maps of the other campuses, none of them have public through streets? John Bridges – that's correct, the public roads terminate at the campus.

Commissioner Soppe – I'm concerned with the discussion that cars will want to take this route to Fred Meyer. One of my concerns with not implementing this is the short term solution of not having the east west connector. These same cars that would turn south would instead be routed out on a longer route.

John Bridges – That route would be a designed collector street and I don't think it would be the same cars that would be using Providence Dr to cut south.

Commissioner Haug – I'm concerned that the concept of the top quality medical complex that we envisioned is being nitpicked away. I'm remembering that we would have a protected enclave with a service road. John Bridges – when Providence annexed the land, there was an original east west connection planned. We advocated that even connecting with Hayes St to the south would be a big mistake. Only later did this east west connector get moved north up to the property line (although the Springbrook Oaks master plan wasn't amended). Providence didn't want any part of the connector, but wasn't willing to push it for the hearing. They got assurances that whatever was built would be mitigated. All Providence wanted was a closed campus.

Commissioner Lewis – why would you have Providence Dr as a public road? Is it a city street? John Bridges – yes. **Commissioner Lewis** – why wasn't it just kept as a private road? **Barton Brierley** – it is a city street. **Commissioner Lewis** – why was it dedicated instead of just keeping it as a private road? **Barton Brierley** – because it was a requirement of the UGB and annexation and part of the traffic study for the hospital showed some of the trips going south. Part of the solution was to provide access to the south so that all the traffic wouldn't have to use 99W. John Bridges - Respectfully disagrees with **Barton Brierley**. Part of the property was in the city zoned commercial, when we looked to annex the rest of it, answer to the TPR question was that we'd agree to a trip cap so the hospital would be a net neutral impact to 99W. **Commissioner Lewis** – bottom line though is that during annexation you agreed to Providence Dr being a public street. John Bridges – that was a condition that was apparent we weren't going to get around.

Michael Cerbone, 5415 SW Westgate Dr, Portland, OR 97221 – submitted written testimony. Concur with staff's findings and thinks SE Transportation Plan should be approved.

Ellyn L Stouffer, 31755 NE Corral Creek Rd, Newberg, OR 97132 (PO Box 220, Lafayette, OR 97127) – On April 13, 2007, there was an accident between Schaad Rd and my driveway involving me as a pedestrian and a Mazda pickup truck. It came around the corner about 60 mph and hit me as I was walking home toward the driveway. I feel that there needs to be something done about the traffic issue in that area. Cars drive by at insane speeds and there are times when I'm worried I'll be clipped by a car getting the mail.

Commissioner Soppe – Asked for clarification on where the accident happened. Ellen Stouffer – it happened south of Schaad Rd.

Grace Schaad, 31525 NE Schaad Rd, Newberg, OR 97132 – In listening to John Bridges talk about the traffic impact at Providence, where are those cars going to go? On Corral Creek and Veritas, etc. The only acceptable solution is to take traffic off Corral Creek Rd at a controlled intersection. Traffic must be kept off Schaad Rd and Renne Rd – Schaad Rd must not be allowed to become the new N1. Grace Schaad handed out data about accidents in the area. There has never been a traffic count done on Fernwood/Corral Creek Rd, and requests that NUAMC require staff to do this count from 6-8 am and again from 4-6 pm weekdays and be counted by a neutral party and not by Lancaster. Should be done by someone who has no vested interest in what happens in this area. Because she drives lower Corral Creek road most days I know that there has been an increase in traffic due to the Greens development.

Commissioner Sherwood – have you noticed an increase in traffic on Schaad after the Greens development? Grace Schaad – yes, and I know there has been a request by the school district for the road to be improved.

Commissioner Soppe - I like the idea of closing Renne, and doesn't that address some of the info you've handed out? Grace Schaad – it certainly does address some of them. **Commissioner Soppe** – 99W at old Parrett Mt, tell me how that's relevant. Grace Schaad – it's a very dangerous intersection because there's no line of sight. It's an easy option for people coming south on 99W to cut in on those roads to get home to the Greens. **Commissioner Soppe** – what can we do in our transportation plan to stop people from using old Parrett Mt road? Grace Schaad – continue on from the roundabout at Fernwood, straight down to the connection so that the roads stay within the developed area. **Commissioner Soppe** – do you have any other objections to what we're looking at tonight? Grace Schaad – no, I don't.

Dorothy Roholt 31150 NE Schaad Rd, Newberg, OR 97132 (corner of Corral Creek Rd and Schaad Rd) – since the most recent meeting, we've had two accidents there. The big culprit seems to be speed and that there's no visibility at that corner. Aligning a road south of that and not taking the hill into account would just exacerbate the problem. Cars are traveling faster and faster and it seems that straight lines would make them go even faster. The area seems to be a playground for vehicles, people are pushing the speeds and young people are chasing each other up and down the roads in their cars.

Commissioner Soppe – Don't you see NS1 as taking away some of the traffic and mitigating the problem? Dorothy Roholt – it would take traffic away from Schaad Rd, but improving the roads would make the people go even faster.

Dorothy Roholt – Renne and Wilsonville connection would work well. All of the issues come with additional trips, and anytime developers are agreeing with this, it makes me worry.

Final Staff Recommendation – No additional comments and we recommend that the Commission go through each area one by one.

Commissioner Haug closed public testimony at 8:14 pm.

Barton Brierley showed each area individually with issues and recommendations and the commissioners deliberated on each one:

1. Renne Road – After construction of north/south road, prohibit access on Renne Rd. There are a number of options and we don't have to decide tonight, but basically we want to control traffic there and keep it to local traffic.

Commissioner Soppe clarified whether what we were asking was if we were just looking for a yes/no answer to shutting off Renne Rd access. **Barton Brierley** – yes.

Commissioner Halstead – how would through traffic be prohibited? **Barton Brierley** – probably by using removable bollards or a locked gate. Maybe some sort of turnaround if there wasn't a way to turn around at that point. **Commissioner Halstead** – would we shut it at one point or at both ends? **Barton Brierley** – probably at the end, but it could really be anywhere. There's also the possibility of internal connections, there are several options and we don't have to settle on one now.

MOTION #2: Soppe/Lewis to accept Renne Rd alternative A (eliminating through traffic). Motion passed 6-0.

2. Schaad Rd – Discourage large volumes of traffic; place gate(s) if necessary.

Commissioner Soppe asked for clarification on the alternative legs of the possible configuration. Of the three the first one sounds the most practical. He discussed the different transportation alternatives for the people who live near Schaad Rd.

Commissioner Haug – I don't want any new traffic going up Schaad Rd. I'm not satisfied with this alternative.

Commissioner Lewis asked for clarification on **Commissioner Haug's** position.

Commissioner Haug – we need to come up with more creative traffic control for the area. **Commissioner Halstead** – we could add speed bumps to the washboards.

Commissioner Soppe – I'm assuming that if NS1 were in place the local folks would be in favor of this. How about saying that as soon as NS1 were built, we'd put a gate on Schaad. To me this has merit. I think having NS1 as the trigger for traffic counts makes sense.

Discussion about where the traffic would be coming from if there was a north south road and you could also go east and west off it.

Commissioner Haug would like to postpone decision on this until we know where this north south road will go.

MOTION #3: Sherwood/Halstead to table discussion on Schaad Road –, voice vote, passed
--

Commissioner Lewis – When we get back to this decision, I don't want the trigger to be just the north south portion of the connector; we need to plan for the development of the area.

3. Location of the north/south road – NS1/A, NS1/B, NS1/C – **Barton Brierley** showed each of the options coming off the roundabout on Fernwood.

Commissioner Soppe – With alternate B, it sounds like the big motivation is to discourage traffic on Schaad. If we blocked off Schaad, doesn't that make options A and B unnecessary? **Barton Brierley** – yes.

Commissioner Sherwood – why does option C curve like that off the roundabout? **Barton Brierley** – we were trying to follow topography along the slopes. The location is still pretty flexible, they are just conceptual.

Commissioner Haug – **Commissioner Sherwood**, are you suggesting a different design? **Commissioner Sherwood** – yes, to the east a little bit and a little straighter.

Commissioner Soppe – to clarify, for option C, is it just to give a direct route from the roundabout to 99W? **Barton Brierley** – yes.

Commissioner Halstead – can we change the route from hilliest to most scenic?

Commissioner Lewis – I'd like NS1 to not connect to Corral Creek. I'd like it to be alternative C or something similar. I'd like it not to connect to Corral Creek because of the issues we already know with bad roads and bad driving. I don't know how improved Corral Creek would be, what would the city do? **Barton Brierley** - it depends on the choice you make. If you choose C, there would be little modifications to Corral Creek. **Commissioner Lewis** – but what if it went onto Corral Creek? **Barton Brierley** – everywhere the road took Corral Creek, it would be fully improved at least on the west side. **Commissioner Lewis** – because you'll still have rural uses on the east side and farm machinery, it'll still be used for agricultural use and I don't think city traffic is compatible with that. I prefer alternative C.

Commissioner Halstead – There is a difference in perception between hilly and scenic. I like alternative C and I don't want to see any connection to Corral Creek. We need a buffer between rural uses in the east and urban uses in the west.

Commissioner Sherwood – Alternative C is my preference. The other two alternatives don't solve the sight and speed problems. Even the curve on alternative C looks dangerous just north of the roundabout. Straightening it out would help the problem.

Commissioner Soppe – I've been a fan of alternative C all along. Two negatives are the steepness of the road and the cost. Cost is more than dollars; the cost of C is borne by SDCs and also by the development of the properties in the area. One of the problems with A and B is the amount of non-developer money that would have to go into them.

Commissioner Haug – Agrees with everyone and especially with **Commissioner Halstead** about finding creative ways to keep traffic off Corral Creek and Schaad. I think it's pretty clear that C is the best alternative.

Commissioner Dallas – I like alternative C and think it could be developed safely and keep traffic off the other roads. C makes sense to me.

MOTION #3: Halstead/Sherwood. Motion to recommend NS1 alternative C (west alignment avoiding Corral Creek Rd.

MOTION #3A: Haug/Sherwood to amend the motion to specify that staff pick the safest alignment of alternate C.

Commissioner Soppe – I don't think we need to be that specific at this point. On the other hand, like Mr. Bridges brought up about the potential alignment of the east west connection, I don't want to see the road alignment change and have it not get built. **Commissioner Haug** – that's what my motion is meant to accomplish, a little bit of certainty.

VOTE ON MOTION #3A (Amendment – safe alignment) 5 yes, 1 no (Soppe) . Motion passed

MOTION #3B Lewis/Sherwood Move to amend the motion to say that any development in the southeast would not have access to Corral Creek Road

Commissioner Soppe – I have a problem saying that at this point. I support the general concept of the idea, but we're doing a URA amendment right now, not a specific plan. **Commissioner Haug** – I agree with **Commissioner Lewis** that I don't want any driveways.

Commissioner Lewis – at some point someone talked about how the Mountainview extension was done. There's a development there that doesn't face Mountainview, all the houses face the internal roads. That's what I'm talking about.

VOTE ON MOTION #3B (No access to Corral Creek Rd. 3 yes (Haug/Lewis/Sherwood), 3 no (Dallas/Halstead/Soppe). Motion failed.

Commissioner Soppe states that what we've approved as C stays in the SE area and does not connect to Corral Creek Road anywhere else with the exception of the connection to the north

VOTE ON MOTION #3 (Accept west NS alignment C as amended #3A, safe alignment). 6 yes, 0 no. Motion passes.

Discussion was held regarding whether we should postpone this hearing now and go onto the next hearing.

MOTION #4: Soppe/Dallas Motion to return to this hearing on the SE Transportation Plan after the hearing on the URA expansion, which may be at the next public meeting. – voice vote passed unanimously.

APPLICANT:	City of Newberg
REQUEST:	Recommend approval of 2007 URA Expansion
LOCATION:	Various
FILE:	URA-05-010

Chair Haug opened the hearing for this item at 9:05 pm and turned it over to staff for the staff report.

Declare ex parte contact, abstentions, etc.
None declared.

Staff Report

Elaine Taylor gave a presentation regarding the URA expansion. She reiterated that this is a continuation of the May 31, 2007 meeting and tonight's staff report will especially focus on issues raised at that meeting as well as being an overview of the issues. Priorities are to add exception lands to the URA.

The staff report for tonight is composed of the previous report as well as a new memorandum based on issues raised at the last meeting. Elaine reviewed the decisions to date that NUAMC has made on the various URA issues and areas. She also presented new information to NUAMC based on their requests at the last meeting (Putnam & Benjamin Rd info and statistics; South St Paul Highway area and the Jensen property inclusion; Southwest area analysis)

Questions for staff

Commissioner Lewis asked for clarification on the tax lot of the property that we added in the South St Paul Hwy area because we received a letter from a Kilgore and she wanted to determine where she is located.

Commissioner Haug – what is definition of improved land? **Elaine Taylor** – how much of the value of the property is in the buildings vs. in the land itself.

Commissioner Soppe wanted a rough idea of what land is worth inside the city. **Barton Brierley** – developed land in the city is around \$400,000 an acre (improved land with utilities, streets, etc.), as a guess.

Public Testimony

David Jensen, 14791 David Ct, Newberg, OR 97132 – has concerns about the way the boundary change is being improved. The polling of the residents is incomplete because it doesn't take into account the rest of the community besides just those people that live on Benjamin Rd. The NE community has strongly demonstrated that they don't want the city to grow in their direction. I want my representatives to respect our desire to not have the city grow into our part of the county.

Commissioner Soppe wanted clarification on why the polling of the residents was incomplete. David Jensen said that the impacts of the growth impact the people that are a couple rings outside of the immediate properties and he wants those people to be considered.

Vicki Shepherd, 30230 NE Benjamin Rd, Newberg, OR 97132 – Concerned that the original paper she got didn't have the polling of neighbors that she did. She clarified that the people that weren't able to be contacted by the city's polling were the ones that we already said couldn't be served by utilities. Said that the 30 acres of Benjamin Rd won't make a big difference in land area, and wanted the commission to take into account the will of the neighbors/owners.

Commissioner Soppe thanked her for her research and then questioned the statement that because it's only 30 acres, it's not important. He reiterated that we need to make a legal argument for why we don't include certain lands. As he understands it, consent of the owners is not a criterion for non-inclusion.

John C. Jensen, Jr., 8630 NE St Paul Hwy, Newberg, OR 97132 – wrote a letter and wanted it added to the minutes. Is willing to answer any questions the Commissioners had on his written testimony.

Commissioner Soppe wanted clarification on the location and use of the Jensen property. John Jensen – not currently doing much with crops, some cattle and things like that. **Commissioner Soppe** clarified his (Jensen's) fear about development constraining his ability to farm. John Jensen – it's just the facts that people don't like the noise and smells of farming and cattle and things like that.

Dorothy Roholt, 31150 NE Schaad Rd, Newberg, OR 97132 – Has concerns about bringing in the SE corner because it extends down further than she would think of as a possibility. It extends into areas being used for agricultural uses and seems unnecessary. Would like to see agriculture land used for agriculture as long as possible. **Commissioner Soppe** clarified that she's mainly concerned about the properties south of Wilsonville Rd and not north. Dorothy Roholt said that she is more concerned about the properties south of Wilsonville Rd because it starts extending so far.

Jon Mangis, 920 Sahalee Ct SE, Salem, OR 97306 – Is here only to answer any questions the Commissioners might have regarding bringing the Mangis property into the URA. (No questions – the Commissioners already approved bringing the property in at the May 31, 2007 meeting).

Late Correspondence

Barton Brierley read aloud a letter from Warren Parrish regarding bringing his property into the URA.

Elaine Taylor read aloud a letter from Dave Halsey to consider extending the URA boundary to at least the length of the future high school site so that the area would be considered for future transportation planning.

Elaine Taylor read aloud a letter from Ruth Kilgore regarding her property on St Paul Hwy.

Commissioner Lewis said that she spoke with a woman that lives on Roedel Rd who would like to be in the URA and wanted clarification on where that was located. **Barton Brierley** showed the area on the map. (it was located outside the study area)

Deliberation -- Barton Brierley showed each area individually with issues and recommendations and the commissioners deliberated on each one:

Benjamin Rd area

Commissioner Lewis said that she drove out to the area and wanted to discuss her observations. Didn't realize that the five properties west of Lakeshore Dr weren't part of Oxberg Rd (clarified that with Dick Patrone). If we only bring in the east side of Lakeshore Dr, we'd have a strange configuration of parcels in the URA. She would not like to bring in any parcels west of Benjamin Rd. Everything west of Benjamin should just stay with Oxberg and not come in.

Commissioner Halstead – The properties to the west of Benjamin all the way through Oxberg are already committed to development and they should all be brought into the city.

Commissioner Lewis – I understand **Commissioner Halstead's** point that it's already developed property, but it's not buildable land and it's not supposed to just increase the city's tax base. Why else bring property in unless you have a redevelopment potential?

Commissioner Sherwood agrees with **Commissioner Halstead** and wanted to address Mr. Jensen's comments about the neighbors. He wanted to clarify that the Commission takes the neighbor's wishes into account but makes their own decisions. He is in favor of bringing in the properties because he saw a lot of manufactured homes and a big opportunity for redevelopment.

Commissioner Soppe – I'm confused by **Commissioner Lewis'** statement about having city on one side of the road and county on the other side. He likes her idea from an earlier meeting of moving the boundaries to property lines. He doesn't have a problem with bringing in one side of Lakeshore. Seems like a lot of redevelopable property in this area. We have a legal authority to annex, but I've never heard of somebody being annexed that didn't want to. On the other hand, I have a hard time pushing people into the URA that don't want to come in. How much of an obstacle is it to justify not including these properties?

Commissioner Haug – this is URA that goes out 30+ years. Assuming the McClure property gets developed with city services, there will be utilities in this area. According to the criteria, this is prime property to bring in. The only problem is bringing people in that don't want to come in. He disagrees with **Commissioner Lewis'** earlier statements that these big parcels with big houses aren't appropriate for the city. There are different options to develop the properties that don't have to mean 10 houses per acre. There are ways to solve development along two sides of the same road (brick walls, etc.) to deal with the Lakeshore Rd problem. The property owners don't have to ever develop, but if we follow the rules we should bring this in.

Commissioner Dallas – Still somewhat mixed on this area. She has mixed feelings because of its proximity to Oxberg. Her main objection is because the owners don't want to come in.

Commissioner Lewis wanted to clarify her position on the Lakeshore Rd issue. She said that the area feels like a neighborhood and the two sides of the road go together.

Commissioner Soppe started a discussion about the McClure development and its ramifications for development without city services.

Commissioner Soppe – if we're just talking about bringing the parcels west of Lakeshore into the URA, what's the damage with that? **Commissioner Lewis** and **Ken Friday** – being in the URA puts restrictions on their uses and adds more process per the city/county agreement. Discussion was held regarding county development and zoning rules (i.e. Goal 14 restrictions, M37, etc.).

Commissioner Lewis discussed possible annexations of the properties in the future, and wondered if the city would let a property become an island. **Commissioner Soppe** said he didn't know of the city forcing

someone to annex, it's very unusual for that to happen. **Commissioner Halstead** recalled the city annexing various islands in the city several years ago.

Commissioner Soppe – at what point do taxation rates change? **Commissioner Lewis** – the rates only change upon annexation because property in the UGB/URA is county land. **Barton Brierley** – if the zoning changes the county assessor can reassess the tax rate.

Commissioner Soppe – what kind of a difficulty does it create to include these properties with relation to others? **Barton Brierley** – you have to take properties in order, you can't stop and leapfrog. You have to include all the exception land within a quarter mile unless you can show that it can't be reasonably served with utilities. **Commissioner Soppe** wanted to know what the justification was for excluding Oxberg. **Barton Brierley** – topographic and practical difficulties with extending utilities because it's already developed, lines would have to be extended throughout the development.

Commissioner Soppe likes **Commissioner Haug's** argument that properties in the URA don't have to develop anytime soon.

MOTION #5 Sherwood/Soppe Motion to include all six properties in the Benjamin Rd area (west of Benjamin Road) into the URA — 5 yes, 1 no (Lewis). Motion passed

Putnam Rd Area

Commissioner Soppe wanted clarification on where utilities would be in relation to these properties. **Barton Brierley** – the property to the west of Putnam is in the city limits. We anticipate a sewer line crossing the creek to serve the property and it would most likely be extended in Putnam to serve the area, same as the water line. We can't serve the property at the very south because of topography.

Commissioner Lewis – Definitely opposed to bringing this area in. It's an area of very nice homes on large lots. **Commissioner Haug** discussed the idea of doing a zone with large lots in the city, maybe R-0, to maintain large minimum lot sizes. **Commissioner Lewis** – Is disturbed by the idea that you shouldn't have rural residential because we do have a lot of it. **Commissioner Haug** is for large lots but against the lots adding to the traffic, noise, etc while benefiting from the city. **Commissioner Lewis** discussed the rural infrastructure and maintained that rural residents pay dearly for their own infrastructure.

Commissioner Soppe – We aren't requiring the properties to come into the city, only the URA, so what's the damage to bring them in? **Commissioner Lewis** – there are restrictions, even though they really aren't that onerous. The main thing is that they don't want to come into the city and don't want their property to be redeveloped. The point of this exercise is to bring in buildable land and if these people are never going to develop, what's the point of bringing them in? **Commissioner Halstead** – we don't know what people will want in 10-15 years. Maybe they will want to develop at that point.

Commissioner Soppe – Can you really say what you see happening with your property in 20-25 years from now? We're just giving the people options by bringing them in. **Commissioner Lewis** voiced fears that at some point a future city council might force the people to annex. **Commissioner Soppe** said that although forced annexations can happen, it's unlikely.

MOTION #6: Lewis/Halstead Motion to not bring in the Putnam Rd area. — 2 yes(Halstead/Lewis) -4 no. Motion failed.

MOTION #7: Soppe/Dallas: Motion to include all of the properties except the two at the bottom that are unserviceable. 5 yes -1 no (Lewis). Motion passed

Wilsonville Rd SE

Barton Brierley reiterated that there was testimony regarding this area, and went through the options available.

Commissioner Haug said he spoke with Warren Parrish and said that Parrish feels that he's being forced to develop because of the development planned for the area. It's an unfair market position to put him in because it would be hard to sell if he weren't brought in. He said that his land is no different from the land across the street that is being included.

Commissioner Dallas – Discussed the fact that Parrish said that 10-15 acres isn't a viable area to farm. Thinks that if we bring it in, we bring it in complete.

Commissioner Haug – I also agree that we bring the whole thing in.

Commissioner Soppe – big concerns with bringing the property in its entirety. He had questions about the property's current use. **Commissioner Haug** said there are llamas and sheep, some crops, used to be plum trees. **Commissioner Soppe** – if we don't bring this in, how will the development of the adjacent areas impact his ability to farm/raise animals and wheat? **Commissioner Haug** said the argument that the other people were making were that farms don't go well next to residential areas. **Commissioner Lewis** clarified that people don't like the noise, dust, sprays, etc. **Commissioner Soppe** – So if we brought this property in, we'd be pushing that exact problem off on the neighboring properties.

Commissioner Sherwood is in favor of bringing in the property in its entirety.

Commissioner Halstead – The property to the west of Parrish Rd is relatively committed farms and won't be impacted by farming practices. There's a barrier of Wilsonville Rd between this property and development and he doesn't see the use of bringing it in.

Commissioner Lewis – agrees with Warren Parrish that the golf course is going on an old filbert orchard and the land is really not different than his. However, she agrees with **Commissioner Soppe** that it would just push the issue onto neighboring properties and then they'd want to come in also.

Commissioner Soppe – Discussed the argument that CPRD made when they annexed the land to the north, that it's still preserving agriculture for the future – could still be planted with crops if need be.

Commissioner Haug – what is the exception for bringing this in? If he wants in and we need the land, I'll vote to bring it in.

MOTION #8 Sherwood/Dallas Motion to bring in the Wilsonville Rd SE/Parrish property into the URA – 6 yes, 0 no. Motion passed.

Jensen Property

MOTION #9 Lewis/Sherwood Motion to bring in the Jensen property and Kriger property to the north.

Commissioner Soppe – If residential is inappropriate between agricultural and industrial, what is appropriate? **Elaine Taylor** – agricultural next to industrial is a better fit. **Barton Brierley** – we recommend that the entire area be industrial, and his property remain agricultural and outside of URA. **Commissioner Soppe** – could we bring this property in as industrial? **Barton Brierley** – yes. **Commissioner Soppe** – Can we make the argument for this one to come in as industrial with the 10% slope? **Barton Brierley** – That's why we recommended denial. To make the argument for inclusion, you'd have to say that it was close enough to 10% to be useful for industrial. **Commissioner Soppe** – will the legal system challenge this one and then what would happen? **Barton Brierley** – they usually either accept it or re-

Z:\WP5FILES\NUAMC\MINUTES\Minutes 2007\Backup of 061107 NUAMC min.wbk

mand it. **Commissioner Soppe** – I'm concerned that they'd throw out or remand the whole industrial area because of this one property.

Commissioner Haug – It upsets me that we have to bring in agricultural land for any reason but to accommodate expansion of the city it's necessary. This property is unused now for row crops so I say we should bring it in.

VOTE ON MOTION #9 (Jensen, Krieger properties) Yes 5, no 1 (Soppe). Motion passed.

SW Area Analysis

Barton Brierley recommends that NUAMC have staff go out and poll these people to see if they want in.

Commissioner Soppe – this is the six pieces that I was thinking of so I like how you split it up.

MOTION #10 Commissioner Soppe/Commissioner Sherwood Motion to ask staff to poll the property owners in the southwest area as shown on staff's map.

Commissioner Lewis – the Home Acres area doesn't look like it has much possibility so I would have left out area 2.

VOTE ON MOTION #10 (SW poll) Yes 6, no 0. Motion passed.

Commissioner Haug reminded everyone that the next meeting would be on July 11, 2007. **Commissioner Lewis** wanted to know why they would possibly be hearing another quasi-judicial URA hearing at the same time as they are having these legislative hearings. **Commissioner Lewis** wanted to know whether staff counseled the applicants to not follow up based on the history of the past few applications.

Commissioner Soppe raised concerns that the URA hearing not be heard at the next meeting due to having to continue these two hearings. Discussion was held on appropriate scheduling of the hearings. The Commission does not want to hear the Maerz on the same night as other deliberations.

V. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

No items.

VI. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

No items.

VII. ADJOURN

Chair Haug adjourned the meeting at 11:13 PM.

Passed by the Newberg Urban Area Management Commission this 11th day of July, 2007.

AYES: 7

NO: 0

ABSTAIN: 0
(list names)

ABSENT: 0

ATTEST:


Recording Secretary Signature


Print Name Date