

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - SPECIAL MEETING**  
**Newberg Public Library - Newberg, Oregon**  
**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1998 AT 7 P.M.**

**Approved at the March 12, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting**

---

**I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL**

**Planning Commission Members Present:**

Stephen Ashby	Steve Hannum	Myrna Miller
Lon Wall	Warren Parrish	Paula Fowler

**Absent:**

Matson Haug

**Staff Present:**

Barton Brierley, Planning Manager  
Barbara Mingay, Planning Technician  
Larry Anderson, Engineering Supervisor  
Peggy Hall, Recording Secretary

**II. OPEN MEETING**

Chair Miller opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. She announced the procedure of testimony. Citizens must fill out a public comment registration form to speak at the meeting.

**III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. No scheduled items.

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

**Mr. Sid Friedman, 31909 NE Corral Creek Road, Newberg,** requested that his previous testimony be considered and he was in attendance to observe or answer questions.

**V. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

**LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS (#1)**

1. **APPLICANT:** City of Newberg (*CONTINUED FROM 12-11-97, 1-8-98, & 2-12-98 MEETINGS*)  
**REQUEST:** Approval of an ordinance amending the Newberg Comprehensive Plan policies and Comprehensive Plan Map, and amending the Newberg Development Code and Zoning Map relating to residential needs.  
**LOCATION:** City wide  
**FILE NO:** GR-2-95 **RESOLUTION NO.:** 97-80; 98-87 (deletes portions)  
**CRITERIA:** Newberg Development Code, Section 10.20.030

**OPEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING.**

**Chair Miller** announced this was a continuation from the February 12, 1998 meeting, entered ORS 197, relating to the Public Hearing process into the record, and opened the Public Hearing.

**Abstentions/ex-parte contact:** None.

**Objections:** None.

**Staff Report:** Ms. Mingay provided a copy of an e-mail message from Commissioner Haug. Ms. Mingay also asked for approval of Resolution No. 98-87. Discussion was held concerning the findings for approval and the potential restrictions on lot size. Commissioner Parrish stated he was not comfortable with Findings No. 1 and 2. Commissioner Parrish asked that the motion be amended to remove Findings 1 & 2 with only Finding 3 remaining.

<b>Motion #1:</b>	<b>Hannum/Parrish</b> to approve Resolution No. 98-87.
<b>(Amendment)</b>	<b>Parrish/Hannum</b> to amend the Findings attached to Resolution No. 98-87 by removing Findings 1 & 2 with only Finding 3 remaining.
<b>Vote on Motion #1 as Amended:</b>	(4 Yes/2 No (Fowler/Miller)/1 Absent [Haug]). The Motion carried.

Discussion was held concerning the City's boundaries and its UGB (urban growth boundary).

**Chair Miller** stated there would be a 20 minute time limit on each issue.

**Ms. Mingay** noted that any reference to the R-0 zone designation would be removed. The R-4 designation was tabled until next meeting until a full Commission is present (Commissioner Haug is absent). Ms. Mingay continued with the remaining amendments.

**1. Maximum Lot Standard.**

**Ms. Mingay** presented the staff recommendation concerning R-2 designations (single family with minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. ft.). Ms. Mingay also noted that developers tend to build out to the allowed density. Ms. Mingay provided the Commission with options:

1. Approve the amendments as proposed;
2. Approve the maximum lot size - approve variance procedure.
3. Revise the maximum lot size
4. Delete consideration of maximum lot size similar to amendments.

Discussion was held concerning deleting all reference to lot size in all zones and allow the market to make the appropriate changes. To allow any lot size, there would be a mix of housing (single, duplex, multifamily, town homes, etc.) which may allow for more density than an R-1.

**Commissioner Ashby** stated that by leaving the market as a relevant factor, it would provide for the most amount of latitude in determining the lot sizes. Commissioner Fowler also noted she was an advocate of letting the market rule in most instances.

**Commissioner Wall** expressed concern in allowing the market to rule which would require the City to provide water and sewer and related services to anyone wanting such services.

Discussion was held concerning maximum and minimum lot sizes (table V-2). Currently, R-1 low density residential allows for a maximum of 4.4 dwelling units per gross acre (7500 sq. ft. lot sizes after 25% allowance for street standards and rights-of-way). Ms. Mingay noted there are 43,560 sq. ft. in one acre.

Additional discussion was held concerning R-2 minimum density (5,000 sq. ft.). Ms. Mingay stated that if the development was for a duplex it would be 3750 sq. ft. per unit (7500 sq. ft total). Ms. Mingay also noted

that staff has concerns on limiting the ability for service of the duplex because it would defeat the purpose of the R-2 zone. Staff recommends that the minimum amount of 3750 sq. ft. be increased. Mr. Brierley agreed that it is staff's recommendation to eliminate the minimum size and go with the maximum amount. Currently, the R-3 zone allows for maximum density of 21.8 units (w/1500 sq. ft.). Commissioner Parrish mentioned that Commissioner Haug wanted to be present when the Commission discussed R-3 and R-4.

**Commissioner Parrish** stated he would recommend changing the maximum lot size to 7500 sq. ft.

**Chair Miller** stated an amendment to change the single family lot size to 5,000 sq. ft. which would leave a maximum lot size change with no minimum. Further discussion was held concerning variances and minor allowed adjustments of 5%. Ms. Mingay also added that applications for zone changes or lot line adjustments could be considered. Mr. Brierley stated that if a developer wanted to underbid, they would need to apply for a zone change.

**Commissioner Wall** stated there should be a minimum and maximum lot size on R-3 and R-4 but was open to suggestions on R-2. There should not be a maximum lot size for R-1.

**Commissioner Parrish** noted the need for consistency and structure and would recommend an increase to 7500 sq. ft. on R-2 and to keep the maximum lot size.

**Ms. Mingay** reviewed the information contained in Table V-2 with the changes noted:

- Information concerning R-0 would be eliminated.
- R-1 maximum lot size would be eliminated.
- Minimum density (lot size of 5,000 sq. ft)
- Minimum of 8 units per acre.

<b>Motion #2:</b>	<b>Wall</b> to table the discussion upon Commissioner Haug's return. Motion failed for a lack of a second.
-------------------	--

<b>Motion #3:</b>	<b>Hannum/Fowler</b> to approve the recommendation of minimum density in R-2 of 4.5 dwelling units per acre.
-------------------	--

<b>Vote on Motion #3:</b>	(3 Yes [Fowler/Hannum/Miller]/3 No [Ashby/Parrish/Wall]/1 Absent [Haug]). The motion failed.
---------------------------	--

**Chair Miller** announced the matter would be continued to next month. Staff to review concerns addressed and return a summation to the Commission next month.

**Chair Miller** called for a five minute break at 8:07 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 8:13 p.m.

<b>Motion #4:</b>	<b>Hannum/Ashby</b> to continue the public hearing on GR-2-95.
-------------------	--

<b>Vote on Motion #4:</b>	( 6 Yes / 1 Absent [Haug]). Motion carried.
---------------------------	---

**PUBLIC HEARING (#2)**

**APPLICANT:** City of Newberg (CONTINUED FROM 12-11-97, 1-8-98, & 2-12-98 MEETINGS)  
**REQUEST:** Approval of an ordinance amending the Newberg Comprehensive Plan and Newberg

Development Code relating to street standards, as required for compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule.

**LOCATION:** City wide

**FILE NO:** GR-4-95

**RESOLUTION NO.:** 97-83, 98-88

**CRITERIA:** Newberg Development Code, Section 10.20.030

**Abstentions/ex-parte contact:** None.

**Objections:** None.

**Staff Report:**

**Planning Manager Barton Brierley** presented the staff report adopting Resolution No. 98-88 concerning the items agreed upon by the Commission at the previous meeting(s). Mr. Brierley continued the review of the sidewalk, pedestrian and bike traffic issues (Figure 5). Mr. Brierley discussed street parking and street width.

**Commissioner Wall** stated he did not support the Resolution.

<b>Motion #5:</b>	<b>Fowler/Ashby</b> to approve Resolution No. 98-88 with the findings as noted.
-------------------	---

<b>Vote on Motion #5:</b>	(5 Yes/1 No [Wall]/1 Absent [Haug]). Motion carried.
---------------------------	--

Discussion was held concerning planters placed between the street and the sidewalk which are not in compliance with the City's code/ordinances. Some property/business owners are being cited.

#### 1. Intersection Curb Returns.

**Mr. Brierley** provided the staff report identifying minimum radius status in accordance with street classifications (Figure 6). Mr. Brierley stated staff would request that the Commission review and approve the amendment with a resolution. Mr. Anderson reviewed the stop line for the various intersection and curb returns: at the crosswalk (if provided), or stop at the curb line.

**Commissioner Hannum** identified a problem at the corner of Aquarius and Vittoria Streets. Mr. Anderson noted a 20 ft. radius is standard but 15 ft. is better in residential areas.

<b>Motion #6:</b>	<b>Hannum/Fowler</b> to have staff prepare the appropriate resolution adopting the recommendations of staff as outlined.
-------------------	--

<b>Vote on Motion #6:</b>	(6 Yes / 1 Absent [Haug]). Motion carried.
---------------------------	--

#### 2. Traffic Calming Measures

**Mr. Anderson** provided the staff report on traffic calming measures to handle high traffic areas:

- Serpentine alignment - drivers tend to slow down because visibility is limited.
- Curb extensions (Figure 8), as outlined in the Transportation Planning Rule which extend the curb out at the intersections.
- Raised medians.
- Speed humps (not speed bumps) - also called speed tables which are wide enough for the entire vehicle to on the hump before it goes down.
- Stop signs should be placed judiciously and not over-used.

Discussion was held concerning installation and judging impact before installation to see whether or not the measures work in a specific area. Mr. Anderson described how the streets are classified and what would be appropriate for such area. Traffic volume assessments are made as well as how much pedestrian and alternative traffic is used. Mr. Brierley stated that temporary measures (cones) are also used for a number of weeks in assessing what would best be served in the area.

**Commissioner Parrish** stated he was opposed to having them inserted. Commissioner Parrish provided a history and background information concerning his experience in traffic calming measures while employed with St. Vincent's Hospital. Further discussion was held concerning calming effect on the drivers which essentially force them to slow down. Mr. Anderson addressed medians as being an access control rather than a traffic calming issue. The location must meet certain criteria before a speed bump/hump is installed. Surveys of the street and surrounding neighborhood are completed prior to the installation of any device. Commissioner Fowler noted that in some instances the traffic calming devices were installed only to be later removed due to increased traffic problems. Mr. Anderson further noted that the police and fire personnel will sign off on all proposals before action is taken.

**Commissioner Ashby** inquired about the process for handling the requests for calming devices and the criteria used. Mr. Anderson stated he believed it would be handled through the Traffic Safety Committee, hold neighborhood meetings and provide survey information. Discussion was also held concerning maintenance of these devices and traffic circles. Mr. Anderson noted that they would be maintained by the local homeowner's association such as the Oak Knoll Subdivision which has a traffic circle installed. The cost of one traffic circle is approximately \$5,000 which includes the design, staff time in preparing and compiling the survey, construction costs, etc.

The Commission discussed the various alternatives and problems associated with them. Mr. Anderson also noted that the cost would be borne by the developer in the instance of a subdivision.

**Chair Miller** stated that it appears that the Commission could use additional information and requested staff to provide such information. Chair Miller asked the Commissioners for input concerning the traffic calming measures.

<b>Motion #7:</b>	<b>Hannum/Ashby</b> to direct staff to provide more background and statistics in order for the Commission to make a more knowledgeable conclusion.
-------------------	--

<b>Vote on Motion #7:</b>	(5 Yes/1 No [Parrish]/1 Absent [Haug]). Motion carried.
---------------------------	---

<b>Motion #8:</b>	<b>Hannum/Fowler</b> to continue the public hearing to March 12, 1998.
-------------------	--

<b>Vote on Motion #8:</b>	(6 Yes/1 Absent [Haug]). Motion carried.
---------------------------	--

**VI. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**VIII. STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS**

1. Update on Council Items
2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence

**Mr. Brierley** asked the Commission if they would provide a list of priorities to forward to the City Council to consider (from most important to least important).

3. Next Planning Commission Meeting, March 12, 1998.

**Commissioner Parrish** stated he gave testimony about the City's water supply. He wrote a letter to Duane Cole, City Manager, asking for information. He received a quick response, and will share the information with the Commission next month. Commissioner Parrish asked to be excused for the March 26<sup>th</sup> meeting as he will be in Los Angeles. Chair Miller granted Commissioner Parrish's absence.

**Chair Miller** asked that City Attorney Terry Mahr provide the Commission an over-view of legal/ethical issues that may come before the Commission or individually as members of the Planning Commission. Chair Miller asked that this presentation be available next month. Mr. Brierley noted he would forward the request to Mr. Mahr.

**Commissioner Fowler** stated a presentation on the City's water situation will be addressed with the Citizens Rate Review Committee. Chair Miller stated the presentation will be held on April 6<sup>th</sup>.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

<b>Motion #9:</b>	Hannum/Fowler to adjourn at 9:35 p.m.
-------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Vote on Motion #9:</b>	(6 Yes/1 Absent [Haug]. Motion carried.
---------------------------	---

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 1998.

AYES: 7      NO: 0      ABSTAIN:      ABSENT:  
(list names)

ATTEST:

Peggy R. Hall  
Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature

Peggy R. Hall      \_\_\_\_\_  
Print Name      Date

**INFORMATION RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD  
AT THE FEBRUARY 26, 1998 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
THIS INFORMATION IS ON FILE AT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICE  
ATTACHED TO THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING AND IN THE PROJECT FILE IT  
PERTAINS TO.**

PROJECT FILE # N/A

1. Collaborative Problem Solving - Training Conference
2. Goals and Objectives Newberg Planning Commission

PROJECT FILE GR-2-95

E-Mail to Mike Soderquist from Matson Haug regarding Residential Needs

PROJECT FILE # N/A

Letter to Duane Cole from Warren Parrish regarding City Water Issues

LABELS FROM THE 2/26/98  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
FROM THOSE WHO GAVE PUBLIC  
TESTIMONY/REGISTR. CARD

None