

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Newberg Public Library - Newberg, Oregon
THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1998 AT 7 P.M.

Approved at the April 9, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting

I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

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

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, Planning Manager
Barbara Mingay, Planning Technician
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. Approval of February 12 and February 26, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Motion #1:	Hannum/Ashby voted to approve the consent calendar items, approving the minutes of the February 12 and February 26, 1998 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #1:	The Motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Commissioner Haug requested an amendment to the agenda to add the Gail annexation under Old Business.

Discussion occurred concerning the background information on the Gail annexation. Commissioner Haug presented a hand-out six questions.

Commissioner Hannum stated concerns about discussion if potential future Planning Commission decisions might be required on this site. Commissioner Haug thought it would be good public policy to have an open discussion. Commissioner Hannum questioned whether the proponents should attend and be involved in the discussion.

Chair Miller stated the Planning Commission previously reviewed the matter and the City Council had already decided to place the annexation request before the voters.

Chair Miller said she would place it before the Commission at the appropriate time for further discussion.

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

Jim Morrison, 717 E. Sheridan Street, Newberg, Oregon, presented information concerning the City's development process, and in particular, the Northwest Newberg Specific Plan (Specific Plan). He stated

quite a few changes have been made (R-2, Commercial zones, etc. are changed). He felt discussion should occur concerning the Gail property and the proposed donation of park land was held. Mr. Morrison said that as a citizen, it appears that someone needs to be accountable to see that the Specific Plan is adhered to.

Commissioner Haug asked Mr. Morrison to enumerate the items that are changed in the Specific Plan. Mr. Morrison stated the street widths have been reduced especially where the trees are finally being planted. The area that was designated to be commercial now has single family residential housing. Development previously set out in the Specific Plan no longer exist.

Commissioner Wall asked if these were a result of the Commission being misled by the applicant, or requirements have been placed on them, but are ignored. Commissioner Wall stated he was concerned about the Commission or the Council giving approval and then things are changed.

V. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. APPLICANT:	Greg Becker
REQUEST:	Amendment to Planning Commission Resolution No. 97-62 (Creekside Planned Unit Development) to allow a 5' year yard setback where a 15' minimum is now required and to reduce the minimum lot size for single family detached homes to 3000 square feet.
LOCATION:	W. of Main, S. of Pinehurst Ct.
TAX LOT:	3218-AC-1700, -1800, -1900, -2000
FILE NO.:	PUD-3-97
CRITERIA:	Newberg Development Code Section 10.20.030

OPEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING.

Chair Miller entered ORS 197.763, relating to the Public Hearing process into the record, and opened the Public Hearing.

Abstentions/ex-parte contact:

Commissioner Parrish noted that Johann May drove him to the site for site review. Commissioner Parrish reviewed some of the items he and Mr. May discussed but felt that the discussion would not influence his vote. Commissioner Parrish further stated he talked with Mr. Sam Holtz (Midget Motors) expressed he was pretty upset about the construction project adjacent to his property (the Creekside Planned Unit Development (PUD). Commissioner Parrish further clarified his site review:

- No noticing on the project site. Notified the Planning Director, could not see anything on the property for this hearing. He commented that in the staff report, there were six lots under construction. During his site visit, he noted that Lot 10 just had a foundation; Lots 23 and 28 were still bare land; the northwest street (Creekside Court) appeared to be a private street and quite narrow; front lawns on Lots 11 and 12 might be 15 feet; no parking on one side of the private street but appeared narrow but he did not actually measure the street.

- Lots 24 and 25 (Creekside Lane) also appear to be only 4 feet apart.

- He would like the applicant to explain where the large tract is dedicated as open space and which contains the stream corridor.

Commissioner Haug also made a site visit today and noted there was a foundation at Lot 10, a house at Lots 8, 9 and 25 and noticed the lower boundary fence. He noticed there were small trees were planted

almost adjacent to the curb. He was also concerned about how big the trees would get because it seemed so close (planting strip). Noticed the private street, got the appearance of a friendly neighborhood, close to walkway, front porch friendly, does create a very good neighborhood. Was not able to check the creek corridor. Houses were close, but appeared to be consistent with the development.

Commissioner Parrish said his ex parte contact with Johann May and discussed the close proximity of the houses, one house only having a foundation and the sign for the public hearing was facing down on the ground. The sign was in front of the property today, however.

Staff Report: Barton Brierly, Planning Manager presented the staff report. Additional handouts were presented to the Commission (over-heads). The PUD was approved by the Commission in March, 1997. **Original Plan:** Smaller lots in some areas, have also allowed for open space (3 areas). The applicant proposed specific standards for the development which included lot sizes, lot frontage, lot depth and front setbacks.

Two changes have been previously approved by the Planning Commission: original maximum lot coverage from 30% to 40% and a revision which allowed detached single family homes. The applicant applied for setback adjustments for six lots. After construction began, the homes were less than 15 feet from the rear property line. The requirement for the 15 foot setback originally approved is proposed to be amended to allow for a five foot setback. The five foot rear yard setback are consistent with R-1 zone. Recommendation that the Planning Commission approve the change for the six lots only. Will allow the existing homes partially constructed to be completed.

Commissioner Haug reviewed the current status of tract and access to open space, no homes. Mr. Brierly stated it was dedicated as open space and will not be constructed. The development gives an appearance of open space and asked that the applicant be able to address this during their opening statements. Width of the boundaries. Mr. Brierly provided information concerning the boundaries.

Commissioner Ashby inquired whether construction has been completed. Mr. Brierly reviewed the status of the construction for the respective lots.

Commissioner Wall said and Mr. Brierly agreed that it was quite typical to start many houses at one time and the builder/developers can choose to build on any lot.

Discussion was held concerning objections staff had concerning this request. Staff indicated it was consistent with R-1 designations.

Commissioner Parrish clarified the previous statements made concerning various lots. Mr. Brierly noted that Lot 1 contains a pre-existing home (older house). Discussion was held concerning fencing, in particular the property adjacent to Lot 2. Commissioner Parrish complimented staff for having the original and updated versions of the proposed development. Mr. Brierly further addressed and clarified the description "began construction" in which framing had begun.

Mr. Brierly provided information concerning the discrepancy involving attached and detached proposals. Each lot is less than 4,000 sq. ft. Standards should have been changed for the lots. Should have also cleaned up the standard and dropped it down. The lots are already approved. At this point having a minimum lot standard is not applicable. Will not be able to create new ones, it is basically moot.

Commissioner Haug discussed 4 ft. widths (not 10 feet) as previously required (five feet from each house). Mr. Brierly stated he did not see any houses that were not in compliance.

Commissioner Wall asked for clarification of Mr. Brierly's comments concerning "respect for the house already built". Mr. Brierly stated that the applicant had the PUD approved with the required standards. He

submitted building plans and a plot plan which showed less than 15 feet. The building plan got signed off by the City in which they missed the 15 requirement and the applicant started construction. With respect to the work that has already been done by the applicant, staff suggest that the approval be granted.

Commissioner Fowler questioned how this could have happened. Mr. Brierly said that corrections in the procedure have been revised to not allow this to happen again.

Commissioner Haug asked how much of responsibility of staff (0-100%) or applicant's fault. Mr. Brierly stated that he would not answer. Mike Soderquist said that in his opinion, the applicant is to follow the dictates of the Planning Commission's decision. The City's new plans examiner apparently had missed it and the City has instituted new controls.

Commissioner Haug did anyone inspect the creek to see if there is any disturbance of the creek (mud and rain) and is there an issue of disruption.

Commissioner Fowler asked whether Creekside Court and Parkside Court are private and who is responsible for maintenance (similar to a situation in the City of Tigard). Mr. Brierly said it would be reviewed by the City to accept it as a right-of-way but doubted whether the City would accept the street if it was to maintain it. Mr. Soderquist said the City does not maintain private streets.

Mr. Soderquist stated that technically the "streets" are actually driveways, not all of which access the same street.

Mr. Brierly asked that the Commission review the 15 ft. setback revision request as the matter at hand.

Chair Miller set a five minute time and asked that the Commission members hold their questions of the applicant until the end of their testimony.

Proponent: **Greg Becker, PO Box 3009, Newberg, Oregon**, presented information concerning the R-1 zoning. Mr. Becker also stated that he is not the original applicant for the development and this is his first application. He is a builder who came in and purchased lots in which they received wrong information as far as the set backs were concerned. Mr. Becker said he noted that the plans were signed off and had no reason to question this and proceeded with construction. In response to the statements that the houses are closer than the 5 feet is not correct.

Commissioner Haug asked about the status of Tract A (donated open space - corridor to the creek) as it appeared on the original diagram presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Becker stated he was under the impression that the property was designated as a sewage pump station that is under construction (screened fence, locked gate with driveway for access by the City, electric panel about 4 ft. high, and will be landscaped). Further discussion was held concerning the plans for the sewage pump station.

Commissioner Wall asked how the situation rose to this point. Mr. Becker said he received a call from the City in which he had several other permits pending. The plans examiner told him he could not process those plans because of problems.

Discussion was held concerning the boundaries for Lots 36-41 which were part of Phase II. Mr. Becker said that he did not purchase lots from Phase II. Mr. Brierly stated that Phase II has the required 15 ft. setbacks. Additional discussion was held concerning the proposed park in which the original developers would be constructing.

Commissioner Haug asked for information concerning the condition and quality of the stream. Discussion was held concerning a filtration system. Chair Miller said the purpose of the discussion should be on the 15 ft. setback.

Mr. Side Friedman, 31909 NE Corral Creek Road, Newberg, Oregon, addressed problems dealing with responsibility and the difficulty to assess where responsibility lays in situations such as this. Cannot speak on the specifics, but spoke on the appropriateness of the request given the conditions noted. The City is moving to higher densities within the City with smaller setbacks for certain developments. Mr. Friedman said that even though the setbacks were close it did not seem to be out of line in keeping with the over-all character of the neighborhood. Mr. Friedman suggested that a part of the review of the residential needs analysis, it may be appropriate to look at this issue. During his site visit he did have concerns about encroachment into the stream corridor and activities occurring within the 50 ft. setback. Mr. Friedman concurred with staff to work with the developer and the applicant in future dealings. Mr. Friedman also noted he did not get out of his car to view the stream, but it appeared to be somewhat disturbed.

Mr. Johann May, 312 N. Edwards, Newberg, Oregon, indicated he was on the same side as Mr. Friedman:

- Function of the Planning Commission is to represent the planning business of the City.
- City ordinances approved by the Planning Commission and the City Council should be followed and enforced.
- This was one of the first voter approved annexations (R-1). R-1 has a minimum 7500 sq. ft. lot size designation and questioned with the number of houses planned, how could it remain R-1.
- After 40% lot coverage, the distance to the edge will change and asked why the City is wasting time to allow the change when it is clear that the PUD does not support 54 homes.

Mr. May also stated that the PUD does not conform to what was sold and approved by the voters. This should be addressed by the City Council. If a person receives a fine for \$1000 for a crack in a sidewalk, what should happen to a developer if the foundation is placed in the wrong spot?

Chair Miller closed the public hearing.

Commission Deliberation:

Commissioner Haug discussed the following: trees being too close - may have to be replanted; the Creekside has been affected and the landscaping should be done correctly. Commissioner Haug noted he puts substantially less blame on the builder than what was thought and was impressed at what he saw at this stage of development. Commissioner Haug discussed a point system, aesthetics and livability. Commissioner Haug stated he agreed that the development should continue but the staff should continue to monitor developments for requirements to prevent similar situations from occurring.

Commissioner Fowler agreed with Commissioner Haug's concept on staff errors. Believe if the applicant was at one time within the requirement, the Commission should go ahead and let the correction proceed.

Commissioner Hannum also agreed that it seems a reasonable adjustment that is in existence for the moment. Would not want to take this approval to suggest that the other properties can be treated this way.

Commissioner Ashby voted for the development because it met with the criteria for the PUD. Still thinks it meets the criteria even with the changes.

Commissioner Wall stated he was concerned about mistakes made and, at some point, questioned when do the rules not mean something and become a standard? Commissioner Wall said he was bothered that decisions were made because of mistakes which were made but realizes things can get out of hand. Commissioner Wall said he was inclined to vote against the request but also sympathized with the applicant. This appears to send a strong statement to the public in general about dealing with professional surveyors, builders and developers. Commissioner Wall also stated that people needed to be accountable for what they do and the Commission should be concerned about setting precedence and showing consistency.

Commissioner Parrish agreed that a problem exists because some of the houses are already up and are adjoining. Commissioner Parrish agreed with the statements made concerning compliance with the Specific Plan and would like to see the next phase (Phase II) be required to be in compliance.

Commissioner Haug said when he is making a judgment on an item, he does not believe in a protest vote. Commissioner Haug agreed there were mistakes made which may include disruption of the stream corridor and trees being planted in the wrong place, but he does not feel they were misled. Commissioner Haug noted that in the past the City has been short-staffed in some areas. Discussion was held concerning potential lawsuits due to the City requiring the destruction of any of the existing construction. Commissioner Haug said he would like to see possible negotiations entered into with the builder and developer to work with staff for additional "extra's" that could be provided.

Commissioner Hannum discussed the pump station and the open space calculations. The City purchased Tract A as an open space and not for a pump station. It appears that the open space has now been converted into a pump station. The Developer was to provide this pump station from other property and not from what the City was given as indicated in the original plans. Somehow it became a "non open space". How does that happen?

Chair Miller consider what is before the Commission to vote on and then ask staff to report to the Commission.

Commissioner Haug should have the community discuss this. Suggest approve setbacks condition upon landscape plans for Tract A and tree planting revisions and look at another month or so. See if the developer would be willing to buy into this plan.

Commissioner Fowler appears we are punishing this developer (Becker) for the sake of the other developer.

Commissioner Haug said the visual aesthetics and compensation could be negotiated to make sure that livability is there. Commissioner Haug said he would approve the setback revision upon final approval of all other conditions, including landscaping.

Commissioner Wall feels that the builder does not appear to be the sole responsible party. Critical decisions before the Commission have been heard and sometimes the Commission's hands are tied. Do not completely disagree with the concept that the Commission must be unanimous in their decisions. Commissioner Wall said he intended to change his vote in favor of the request.

Commissioner Parrish said that when he sees the Council people discuss their vote, he too does not believe in a unanimous vote. Discussion about additional information not included in the staff report (details are crucial).

Commissioner Ashby said he was reluctant to put the squeeze on the builder and it is not relevant to discuss the Tract A open space land issue.

Commissioner Haug emphasized that it was the responsibility of the developer to submit plans according to the PUD requirements.

Chair Miller said that R-1 designations allow for this type of development. It appears that the builder has been a victim due to circumstances. By allowing the 5 ft setback, the Commission is not giving anything that is not otherwise out of the norm. Between lots 17 and 18 would be open space. Chair Miller said she would ask staff that this requirement be enforced as originally approved last year. Commissioner Haug said there is a 15 ft setback requirement in the PUD.

Commissioner Wall stated that there are serious concerns and objections dealing accountability. Chair Miller asked that the Commission separate the issues relating to the development and stay on task (approval or denial of the request).

Motion #2:	Haug/Hannum to adopt Resolution 98-89.
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #2:	The motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Motion #3:	Haug/Wall to make sure that enforcement policies are followed in particular with the stream corridor and the staff to pay attention to the development relative to the enforcement.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #3:	The motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Commissioner Fowler asked what would happen to the parties if they do not follow the policies? The City can ask only to follow the rules and policies. Staff responded by stating a citation will be issued at a fine of \$500 per day with each day not cured, as an additional violation.

Ms. Mingay said that letters are sent out addressing violations and most people react to the letters prior to citations being issued or fines imposed.

Amendment to Motion #3/ Motion #4:	Haug/Ashby requested that staff report to the Commission on the activities of this development.
---	--

Vote on Motion #4:	The motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Commissioner Wall said that every member of the Commission should have a direct interest on these types of issues.

Commissioner Haug said the Commission is a policy body. Commissioner Fowler agreed with Commissioner Wall and Haug statements. Discussion was held concerning imposing time limits on builders and developers and how they apply to the remaining Phase I construction projects as well as Phase II construction.

Discussion was held concerning amending the resolution to clarify the attached and de-detached dwellings. Mr. Brierly stated he would make the necessary corrections to the Resolution dealing with attached and detached criteria.

PUBLIC HEARING (#2)

- APPLICANT:** City of Newberg (*CONTINUED FROM 12-11-97, 1-8, 2-12, & 2-26-98 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 NOS.:** 97-80, 98-87 (deletes portions)

CRITERIA: Newberg Development Code, Section 10.20.030

Motion #5:	Parrish/Fowler to postpone the discussion on GR-2-95 to the Commission's next meeting and to continue with old and new business.
-------------------	---

Commissioner Haug asked if there was any urgency from the staff if this was delayed. Mr. Brierly said that nothing was time sensitive at this point, but staff was prepared to discuss the issues. Commissioner Haug asked if there was anyone present in the audience who wished to present testimony or respond to the Commission postponing the matter to March 26th.

Mr. Johann May reviewed the particulars of the attached and detached housing. Mr. Brierly stated there was an error in the report.

Commissioner Haug said the lots were approved and lots against fence and will have smaller than average lots - clearance and setbacks would have to be met. Mr. Brierly stated they would approve as amended.

Vote on Motion #5:	The motion carried (6 Yes / 1 No (Haug)). Motion carried.
---------------------------	---

Chair Miller stated the matter would be continued to the March 26th meeting.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS (#3)

2. **APPLICANT:** City of Newberg (*CONTINUED FROM 12-11-97, 1-8, 2-12, & 2-26-98 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 NOS.:** 97-83, 98-88 (adopts portions)
CRITERIA: Newberg Development Code, Section 10.20.030

Chair Miller stated that this matter would also be continued to the March 26th meeting.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Commissioner Haug presented the following information and requested the Commission's consideration on the following issues:

1. Water policy and shortage (quantify impacts and land to be develop in the city).
2. Specific Plan park area calls for five acres. How big will the "Gail" park be?
3. The Gail park status. If the voters reject the annexation, what would happen to park land? if the annexation fails. Chehalem Park & Recreation District (CPRD) has indicated that they may then have to purchase the property for \$250,000.
4. The Specific Plan is not evolving into the direction of the original expectations. Commissioner Haug suggested that discussions concerning mistakes that have occurred, but allow PUD's to take advantage of these in the future.
5. Discuss technical issues as they apply to annexation.
6. Islands surrounded by the City. Developing mandatory policies which require the vote of the people.

Commissioner Haug asked that staff review and respond to the issues presented.

Commissioner Haug further discussed issues relating to the Gail park and how it applies or does not

apply to the City's Specific Plan. The discussion also addressed whether or not there was any obligations to donate any property to CPRD. Commissioner Parrish said that if the voters decided to deny the annexation the project would die.

Commissioner Wall introduced the discussion of a governmental entity assisting in private land annexation issues. Commissioner Wall further noted he did not feel it was appropriate for CPRD to be involved in this type land issue.

Mr. Brierly briefly responded to a few of Commissioner Haug's concerns:

1. The property to be donated as a park is part of the Specific Plan as adopted by City ordinance. If the property is approved for annexation, the property will be developed. The applicant can also apply for a Comprehensive Plan amendment to delete the park (which probably would not happen). Dr. Gail owns the property. Additional discussion was held concerning guarantees.

Ms. Mingay said the property owners in the Specific Plan area were brought into the discussion of how the area would be developed. There were at least two areas which were designated for parks. Changes can be made through Comprehensive Plan amendments. 25% of the total gross area will be tied up in streets. The actual park space is 3.8 acres which is a reduction of about 25% (roadway).

Discussion was held concerning the Dolan v. City of Tigard case.

Mr. Soderquist reviewed the discussions held at the City Council meeting dealing with the City's water supply, curtailment policies, conservation and storage. The curtailment policy will start with major agricultural irrigators and then go on with residential odd/even watering. A new reservoir on the north side of town should be on line before 1999. The City is progressively pursuing Well #7 and the water rights in Marion County. Should have resolution to this within two years (will still have to drill wells). Also exploring the Gearin's Ferry site and the possibility of transferring water rights (could be as long as 4 years). Expand the water treatment plant facility. The City's water sometimes is high in iron and is treated with chlorine. Discussion was held concerning the Planning Commission being involved in the capital improvement projects of the City. The second meeting in April is scheduled to have Utility Manager Randy Naef make a presentation to the Commission in conjunction with the Citizens Rate Review Committee. Discussion concerning a savings and investments program to accommodate the need for these reserve funds in funding projects.

Chair Miller said that the Citizens Rate Review Committee suggested that a reserve fund of \$5 million be set aside (rainy day).

Commissioner Fowler reviewed issues the Citizens Rate Review Committee addressed some time ago. The Committee provided "vehicles" to resolve the situation. Commissioner Fowler said the Committee was disappointed what the City Council has done and would like to see that the Citizens Rate Review Committee be allowed to help correct the situation that is occurring.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Parrish proposed a revision to the City's Development Code wherein the word "Application" would be changed to "Owner of the Property" where "Applicant" is used in annexation issues. Commissioner Parrish said he foresees danger down the road with the possibly of a big corporation coming in and taking over the application for the owner. Mr. Brierly said the Commission could direct staff to prepare a staff report on the implications and proposed changes which then need to be considered under a public hearing format. Additional discussion was held concerning triple majority (majority of property owners requesting annexation).

Commissioner Parrish said he was concerned about setting up the City for future problems. Mr. Brierly referred the Commission to page 9 of the Development Code (definition - "applicant or their agent").

Commissioner Haug said he was philosophically opposed to the request by Commissioner Parrish. Commissioner Parrish questioned mixing public tax money with private parties. Discussion was held concerning the board members of these entities approving these issues. Commissioner Haug said it is up to the citizens to vote on the merits of annexation. The Commission or the City should not limit who can or cannot apply for annexation.

Commissioner Wall said he was not sure if it was appropriate for the Commission to address these changes, but agreed with Commissioner Parrish's stations concerning CPRD's involvement in the Gail annexation.

Chair Miller said the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to the City Council and suggested that Commissioner Parrish contact the City Attorney to see if an amendment can be done.

Commissioner Parrish said he appreciated the discussion among the Commission members. Chair Miller agreed to not let the negative input slight his intentions.

Ms. Mingay said that it would not cost to do the annexation when the Gail annexation was first presented. It may, however, change in the future.

VIII. STAFF AND COMMISSION REPORTS

1. Update on Council Items.

Community Development Director Mike Soderquist reviewed the City Council meeting:

- The Gail annexation was approved to be placed before the voters.
- The Council approved the Community Development Block Grant.
- The management of the City's EDRLF fund was tabled.
- The Mayor was authorized to enter into a memorandum of understanding concerning Chehalem Drive (the area behind Crater School) with respect to the ownership of the road after it was brought up to City standards, would be transferred from the County to the City (ultimate annexation to use city water).

Commissioner Haug discussed how irate citizens testified at the City Council meeting concerning the City's code enforcement of the sign ordinance. Discussion was held by the Council relating to revising the sign ordinance to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Haug mentioned how people could take a walking tour for a good understanding of what the issues are before it comes to the Planning Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Wall questioned whether the sign ordinance is retroactive as it pertains to existing signs what were in place prior to the sign ordinance. Mr. Brierly defined portable and permanent signs and how the code provides for their placement.

Commissioner Parrish said there was also an issue with the actions of the Code Enforcement Officer handling the violations and how she approached the citizens. Discussion was held concerning how the enforcement of the sign ordinance had not been very active until recently. The Commission members also discussed issues dealing with the Commission having a quorum if they participated in the walking tour and whether or not it would impose a conflict.

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence

Mr. Brierly stated that a Downtown Development Committee has been formed. They will be meeting on the

second Monday of each month. The Council has requested that the Planning Commission provide a list of goals (top 3) the Commission wished to cover. Mr. Brierly asked that the Commission consider this request and bring their ideas to the next meeting. Mr. Brierly also noted he asked the City Attorney to meet with the Planning Commission at the first meeting in April. He indicated the topics of discussion should consider addressing new Commissioners, legal requirements, "do's and don'ts" in conducting meetings and various ethical issues.

3. Next Planning Commission Meeting, April 9, 1998

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 p.m.

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this 9th day of April, 1998.

AYES:

7

NO:

0

ABSTAIN:

0

ABSENT:

0

(list names)

ATTEST:

Peggy R. Hall

Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature

Peggy R. Hall

Print Name

Date

**INFORMATION RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD
AT THE MARCH 12, 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 #

PROJECT FILE #

LABELS FROM THE 3/12/98
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FROM THOSE WHO GAVE PUBLIC
TESTIMONY/REG. CARD

Greg Becker (PUD-3-97)
PO Box 3009
Newberg, Oregon 97132

Mr. Side Friedman (PUD-3-97)
31909 NE Corral Creek Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132

Jim Morrison
717 E. Sheridan Street
Newberg, Oregon 97132

Mr. Johann May (PUD-3-97)
312 N. Edwards
Newberg, Oregon 97132