

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Newberg Public Safety Building - Newberg, Oregon
THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1999 AT 7 P.M.

Approved at the July 8, 1999 Planning Commission Meeting

I. ELECT TEMPORARY CHAIRPERSON

Parliamentarian Steve Ashby discussed the procedure for the election of the temporary Chairman and the appointment of the Vice Chair. Further discussion was held concerning the election of a Vice Chair.

Nominations for Vice Chair:

Commissioner Warren Parrish/Lon Wall nominated Lon Wall (4 Yes/2 Absent [Molzahn/Hannum/1 Vacant [Fowler]). Motion carried.

Vice Chair Lon Wall proceeded with the regular business of the meeting.

II. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

Stephen Ashby	Matson Haug	Warren Parrish
Lon Wall	Rob Molzahn	
Vacant Position		

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, City Planner
David Beam, Economic Development Coordinator/Planner
Peggy Nicholas, Recording Secretary

III. OPEN MEETING

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

IV. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of May 13, 1999 Planning Commission Minutes.

Commissioner Parrish asked for clarification of a statement made by staff (page 3 of the Minutes noting Mr. Beam's statements, concerning the total acreage and the central plaza to be planned somewhere near Brutscher Road. He asked about the 27 hole golf course and how much information was available. Mr. Beam replied that it was 200 acres and not 260 with 18 holes on the property and 9 holes located on the south of the Werth property along the stream corridor and R-1 area).

Mr. Brierley said the staff reviewed the plans. The area south of Fernwood Road is not being approved through this process. Mr. Beam said that particular land is outside the City limits. Fernwood Road is the UGB.

Motion #1:	Ashby/Haug voted to approve the consent calendar items, approving the minutes of the May 13, 1999, Planning Commission Meeting, as amended.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #1:	The Motion carried (3 Yes; 2 Absent (Molzahn & Hannum); 1 Vacant
---------------------------	--

V. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR (five minute maximum per person)

None.

Commissioner Molzahn arrived at the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

Continued from the May 13, 1999 Planning Commission Meeting

1. **APPLICANT:** Mike Gougler for Werth Joint Ventures
REQUEST: Adoption of the Springbrook Oaks Specific Plan. The plan would create areas for industrial, commercial, office, multiple dwelling, and single family dwelling uses. It includes plans for open space, utilities, transportation, and so forth. It would amend the Newberg Comprehensive Plan, Development Code, Comprehensive Plan map and Zoning map.
LOCATION: A tract of land generally located south of Highway 99W, east of Springbrook Road, north of Fernwood Road, and west of the Urban Growth Boundary
TAX LOT: 3216-2001 and 3216-2010
FILE NO.: CPA-14/Z-14-99
CRITERIA: NDC 10.20.030
RESOLUTION NO.: 99-117

OPEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING:

Vice Chair Wall entered ORS 197, relating to the Public Hearing process into the record, and opened the Public Hearing.

Abstentions/ex-parte contact: Commissioner Parrish said he attended several meetings of the ad hoc steering committee but he did not answer or entertain questions. He attended about 6 -7- meetings and does not feel this contact would bias his decision.

Commissioner Haug said he met with David Beam and Barbara Mingay to review the project. He studied the report extensively and brought in materials to be entered into the record for the Commission and the applicant: saving trees, increasing density, small town America subdivisions, materials from the Audubon Society, maintenance and preservation of the natural habitat in connection with building golf course projects. He would later discuss the materials during the Commission's deliberation.

Commissioner Molzahn said he was on the ad hoc steering committee prior to his appointment to the Planning Commission and is familiar with the information to be presented.

Objections: None.

Staff Report and Preliminary Staff Recommendation: **Mr. David Beam** presented the staff report and provided information on issues in which the Commission previously requested further documentation. He further reviewed areas referenced in the staff report:

1. Access to Springbrook - He said the access has to do with the physical layout of the land. The land next to Springbrook is limited in depth due to the location of the stream corridor.
2. Land Use Inventory in Newberg and how the plan would affect the inventory (industrial land). There were three different analysis from the City's Comprehensive Plan (annual consumption rate was different).

Staff reviewed the information and found reasons it was too high. There was a mistake in the calculations. He was not sure where the number came from. Staff reviewed the assumptions based upon the usage rate. The assumption was that industrial land would increase at the rate of 5.1% per year. Staff felt it was unrealistically high, even though economy has done well.

Commissioner Parrish discussed Westlake Consultant representative's statement at the last City Council meeting made on another annexation noting that the industrial land was needed. Mr. Brierley responded by saying there is a lot of industrial land in the UGB, but little of it has services next to it.

Commissioner Haug asked how many acres EFTC requested. Mr. Beam said they asked for 20 and received 12 acres.

Commissioner Parrish asked about the information contained in the Commission meeting minutes of May 13, 1999 involving:

1. Sewer on Fernwood Road and how it would affect the subject project. Does Chehalem Park & Recreation District (CPRD) or the tax payers have to pay for this service?

Mr. Beam said the sewer portion would be paid by the Oregon Economic Development Department (OEDD) to encourage economic development.

2. The reservoir (water issue). He said he is confused on how it all would happen.

Mr. Brierley said the reservoir would be paid by system development charges. The Citizens Rate Review Committee approved this procedure. The main source would be from system development charges which have not yet been collected. The reservoir would be built within about two years. Discussion was held concerning the strategic plan on improving the City's water system.

3. Emergency vehicle access (more than one access)?

Mr. Beam said it would be determined by the fire and police departments. He discussed the population estimates: built-out, the development could accommodate 3300 people.

Proponent: Mr. Mike Gougler, developer for the Springbrook Oaks property, provided a brief over-view of the status. **Mr. Brierley** said the traffic engineer from Kittleson is also present to answer any questions which may arise. Discussion was held concerning opening the testimony for the Commission to ask questions of the proponents after they have presented their testimony. Mr. Gougler said the questions that Commission Haug had were addressed in the specific plan. He said that EFTC is the second serious purchaser that they have had in 30 years since the property was zoned by the Comprehensive Plan for industrial use. They originally looked at 20 acres. It was speculative, they did not know what they were going to do with that amount of land. They settled on 12 acres. It is not new industry, not a new increase, but a move from one area of the City to another. Mr. Gougler said they have deferred their safety and access concerns with the fire marshal (addressed cul-de-sacs, etc.). Concerning the water tower, the owners of Springbrook Oaks has offered property and right-of-way access for the location of a reservoir. The traffic engineer was present to answer any questions regarding the traffic impact of the proposed development (Chris Stanley from Kittleson & Associates).

Commissioner Parrish questioned the following statements contained in the May 13, 1999, meeting minutes:

1. Easement granted to CPRD. Mr. Gougler stated that an easement was gifted for the stream corridor. The golf course is separate.

Tape 1 - Side 2:

Mr. Gougler said that the transfer of the stream corridor property was done to preserve the natural area. The golf course will not occur in the stream corridor. It is not to be used as a fishing pond or walking park. It is a separate issue than the golf course project.

2. Hospital or medical facility. **Mr. Gougler** reviewed the map designating the various zones (M-1, R-1, etc.). He said that a plan is good, but to plan may be difficult (obligated to build a plan and to follow, regardless of changes that may occur in the community, they may be unnecessarily restricted. They anticipated that they wanted to make the master plan as flexible as possible, but still establish criteria which must be followed by the developers within the project. They noticed that the M-1 property was restricted and what could be placed in that area. If restrictions were made, it may have restricted medical or hospital facilities. The current hospital (Providence Newberg Hospital) has not made any commitment to relocate on the subject property. If the hospital or medical facility does relocate, it will change the other industrial possibilities.

Commissioner Haug asked where the golf course would be located. **Mr. Gougler** said it is anticipated that it would require crossing Fernwood Road to get to the other side. Discussion was held concerning the golf course dissecting the R-1 zone and other access issues. **Mr. Gougler** said there are issues dealing with off-site improvements (they have access to Corral Creek). Ideally, there would be an east-west road to connect (by going north) to the subject development.

Vice Chair Lon Wall asked why there has only been two qualified applicants for the property. Discussion was held concerning EFTC purchasing as much property as they wanted. **Mr. Gougler** said that the property is unique because it requires a special kind of industry to place itself on a piece of property which is difficult, at best, to get to and from the property. Discussion was held concerning the particular issues for M-1 properties and the types of industry in which M-1 would be suitable (software or medical industry), with jobs and residents in Newberg (limited need of transportation).

Vice Chair Lon Wall asked what has prevented this property from being previously annexed and used for development. **Mr. Gougler** said the property must be used in accordance with what is already on the plans (industrial). They have not turned anyone down who has shown serious interest involving the purchase of the property.

Vice Chair Lon Wall said that if the entire project had commercial or industrial property, he understands why it may have a problem, but he also feels there is too little industrial and commercial designations. He asked for the argument of why so much industrial or commercial? Is it saleable, or what does the applicant want to do with the property? **Mr. Gougler** said it really is the market and what can conceivably be done and what is going on around the immediate area. Concerning the rezoning, it is not easy to come up with a continuation program.

Commissioner Haug said he agreed with the comments made by **Mr. Gougler**. He asked about the proposed southern bypass and what impact it would have on the need for industrial land for the City's industrial growth.

Mr. Gougler said there is a need for industrial land. He has not received any direction on the bypass. We cannot hold up growth in Newberg dependent upon the possibility of a bypass. **Mr. Gougler** said that there has been some discussion (old plans) on the bypass being near the vicinity of the proposed development.

Commissioner Haug asked that the traffic engineer walk through the executive summary of the Kittleson & Associates report.

Vice Chair Lon Wall called for a break at 8:10 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Mike Wallace, 1532 E. Third Street, Newberg, said he was a Specific Plan Steering Committee. He

said the Committee discussed the transportation and fire safety routes. All safety issues were met and he does not see any problem with the statements made in the staff report and requested that the Commission approve the report.

Mr. Andrew Poole, 1113 E. 4th, Newberg, said he also served on the ad hoc steering committee. There is nothing in the plan that goes against the policy and nothing is controversial. As a citizen, he would like to see the matter addressed at this meeting and not continue the deliberation. He is puzzled why the decision would be delayed for another month. Discussion was held concerning delaying the finalization of the approval.

Vice Chair Lon Wall said it is a large project and is controversial in some areas. The Commission and staff wants to fully disclose and complete the deliberation process.

Mr. Chris Stanley, Kittleson & Associates, provided testimony and reviewed the information contained in the traffic study (executive summary) and assessing the impact of the development. He said they went with the City's transportation plan (2012). They assumed very dense and highest traffic uses. He continued with reviewing the executive summary conclusions. Mr. Stanley also reviewed alternative "roundabouts". Mr. Stanley said the determination of the east-west road should be done through environmental and connectivity analysis.

Mr. Curt Landis, 212 Springbrook Road, Newberg, said he is a property owner adjacent to and which surrounds the subject property. He read a statement concerning zoning changes and the inquired what the impact would be to the surrounding residences? Will the improvements to Springbrook Road and the access, and the extra lane come down to their homes and lose lane access? In addition, with all the improvements, will the residents on Springbrook Road be required to hook up to City services? He is not against it and they are trying to think of everything, but he is looking out for his own interests.

Mr. Brierley responded to Mr. Landis' concerns. The zoning change would not affect the surrounding properties. Most of the properties are outside the City limits (medium density residential district) and when annexed, they would be designated R-2 (unless property owners request a different designation). As far as Springbrook Road is concerned, it is substandard and it is planned for widening (three lane with center turn lane). Some right-of-way rights may need to be acquired. City ordinances say that if they are within 300 feet of the sewer line and they are within the City limits, they would be required to connect to City sewer services. Discussion was held concerning who would pay for the improvements (LID, collected SDC's)? Mr. Brierley said it would be decided at the time the road is completed. It could be done by the City, or through an LID if a sufficient number of property owners agree. The City could choose to initiate an LID but the abutting property owners could be charged for their respective portions of the road. Discussion was held concerning the time frames for improvements (within 5-10 years). The improvements will occur whether the property is developed or not.

Commissioner Haug asked what determines whether the signal lights go in? Mr. Brierley said that the decisions would be made at a later time, at least when the traffic impacts reach the respective points and when funds are available (it would be determined what share the property owner would have to pay).

Commissioner Haug said he was concerned about the routes: how close does it come to the buffer zone and the greenway? Mr. Stanley said he was not sure.

Commissioner Parrish said that in the course of the study, did they have contact with City staff concerning City staff and businesses that may impact Springbrook Road? Mr. Stanley said that they reviewed other specific development uses near the site; Valley Bank is looking at relocating along Brutscher. Commissioner Parrish reviewed the study (page 9 - existing conditions, 2nd paragraph: traffic volume and peak hour operations). Discussion was held concerning Adec and Ushio traffic impacting the study which apparently were not addressed in the study time frames.

TAPE 2 - SIDE 1:

Mr. Stanley said the "window" of the study would be between 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. and the noon hour. The traffic volumes on Springbrook Road, although they may peak at a different amount themselves, the traffic study on Hwy. 99W was used. Commissioner Parrish said he lives on Wilsonville Road and he has seen traffic backed up to the south because of the intersection at Wilsonville and Fernwood Roads. Discussion was held concerning Corral Creek Road statistics. Mr. Stanley reviewed the five minute increment statistical reporting.

Mr. Wallace commented on the timing of the lights which determines the amount of congestion. Mr. Stanley said when looking at the placement of a signal (significant distance), signal warrants would be conducted, which is a tool to determine when to install a signal.

Mr. Bob Andrews, 1103 N. Sitka, Newberg, said he chaired the Springbrook Oaks Steering Committee. They looked at the over-view to concern themselves with the transportation analysis (it is, without objection, consistent with the report and findings of the steering committee).

Vice Chair Lon Wall said the City Attorney told two members of the Planning Commission that it would be a conflict of interest if they served on the steering committee. Discussion was held concerning the appropriateness of who was and was not on the committee.

Frank Dittman, 1217 Klimek Lane, Newberg, said the Committee was selected by Mayor Donna Proctor. He said that everyone was given the opportunity to serve on the committee.

Staff Recommendation: Mr. Beam said it was staff's recommendation to approve the Resolution.

Hearing Closed. Vice Chair Lon Wall closed the public hearing.

Discussion was held concerning whether or not to continue the deliberation and hearing.

Commission Deliberation:

Commissioner Haug suggested that the Commission members comment on their feelings on the project.

Commissioner Molzahn said that he is also a former member of the Steering Committee. The only thing that they had as a contingent was to review the traffic study in its entirety. He is ready to approve and move it on to the City Council.

Commissioner Haug said he would like to review the available alternatives, the golf course affecting the local habitat, and how he would suggest more protection on the stream corridor, tree protection (where practical), industrial land loss (satisfy future industrial needs), R-1 design standards, density issues and brief discussion on increasing density (consistency). Other issues would be: who would pay for stop lights relative to who was putting the burden on the need? He would like to discuss the problem with the home builders association who were wanting to cut the SDC's in half. He is uncomfortable in paying for the project through capital improvements.

Commissioner Parrish said he is in favor of the project but is concerned with two areas:

1. History of how water is dealt with within the two year time frame established. Discussion was held concerning Wells 7 and 8 and how it ties into the project.
2. He is not satisfied with the traffic report especially with the east-west issues and the bottle-necks which occur. He would like to see the light at Springbrook and Fernwood Roads go in when the residential portion is developed.

Commissioner Ashby said he feels the project is “a go” and should be adopted.

Vice Chair Lon Wall said that in reviewing the conclusions page of the traffic study, his opinion would be that there are issues in certain areas. He said this is the largest development ever suggested in the community. As a business owner, he realizes that government does not work as private enterprise. He cannot see how this cannot be continued to another meeting.

Commissioner Haug said that there are issues to be resolved which could be discussed briefly at this meeting, but could really be fully deliberated at a subsequent meeting. Discussion was held concerning further deliberation.

Commissioner Molzahn said that some issues are outside the scope of the plan. The rates issue is also outside the scope the project. It may affect the funding, but is not part of the issue.

Commissioner Haug reviewed the staff report which included the specific plan (page VI-2-49 through VI-2-50). He is concerned with the project guidelines and the acreage appropriated for parks. He would propose no less than **two** acres in size and change the wording. Discussion was held concerning the possibility of losing valuable park space. He would like a choice and asked staff to put in pages 17-19, some choices for discussion. He would suggest that a choice be “some” or “none.”

Commissioner Parrish said he is aware of the NW Specific Plan and what did not get done. There are promises made for a soccer field in other areas and trees to be placed, but they have yet to be seen.

Commissioner Ashby said he is not sure of the validity of the concerns. Discussion was held concerning the reasoning for recommended sizes for parks (including neighborhood parks). Mr. Beam said the maximum density would be 2.5 parks per 2,000 people. The specific plan does specify one acre.

Motion #2 :	Haug/Ashby approve the Plan.
--------------------	-------------------------------------

Amendment to Motion #2: Motion: 3	Haug/Ashby to amend the Motion to change the wording on page 17 and 18 so that the total acreage for parks shall be a minimum of five acres, with each park not less than two acres in size. Change the wording that “no park requirements may be fulfilled through future school facilities”.
--	---

Commissioner Ashby said he was in favor of the amendment.

Commissioner Haug responded by commenting on the livability in satisfying the park requirement (further enhances the area).

TAPE 2 - SIDE 2:

Commissioner Ashby said that the Plan provides for placement of schools and parks on adjacent sites.

Vote on Motion #3 :	The motion carried (5 yes; 1 Absent (Hannum); 1 Vacant).
----------------------------	--

Motion #4 :	<p>Haug/Wall moved to amend the Motion: Streams corridors should be protected during development in the following way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of trash and general clean-up. 2. Removal of non-native species (blackberry plants). 3. Enhancement of planting native trees and bushes as recommended by staff".
--------------------	--

Commissioner Haug discussed his concerns about the greenway and river front and volunteer groups cleaning up the corridor by developers who do not clean up (protection of stream corridor).

Commissioner Parrish said Mr. Gougler addressed the stream corridor issues in that the owner was very concerned about the stream corridors.

Commissioner Molzahn said the issues raised are not part of the scope of development. They have addressed their intention of making the developer plant native plants. He is in favor of the language as originally presented.

Commissioner Haug said he is trying to make sure the stream corridor will add economic and habitual value to the area.

Commissioner Ashby asked for clarification of removal of native and non-native plants. Commissioner Haug addressed "noxious" plants such as blackberries, etc. Discussion was held concerning the standards for planting native plants. Commissioner Ashby said Mr. Gougler presented testimony concerning the stream corridor protection and he thinks we are taking a hard case of abuse and trying to make rules apply to everyone, when it may not involve "everyone". He does not see any reason to amend as referenced by Commissioner Haug.

Commissioner Parrish said he feels that Mr. Gougler and Mr. Dean Werth have established a good pattern of taking care of the property.

Commissioner Haug said he has concerns for on-going development, not necessarily with Mr. Gougler or Mr. Werth, but he is concerned with the stream corridor.

Commissioner Molzahn called for the question.

Vice Chair Lon Wall said there is no question as to Mr. Werth's being a good steward for the land.

Vote on Motion #4:	The motion failed.
---------------------------	--------------------

Motion #5:	<p>Haug/Ashby To amend the language on page 5 of the report, formerly: "Wooded areas of the property should be retained as much as is practical", with the following language:</p> <p>"Tree removal shall be approved by staff".</p>
-------------------	---

Discussion was held concerning the types and sizes of trees for review (12" in diameter).

Commissioner Molzahn said putting tighter restraints on the developer which is already dedicated and committed to keeping the trees.

Mr. Beam reviewed the plan which provided language concerning a tree plan (page 27 of the staff report)

Commissioner Parrish reminded the Commission that the project is entitled "Springbrook Oaks". He is intended to vote against the motion.

Vice Chair Lon Wall said the Commission is laboring under certain assumptions, but the general concept brought up by Commissioner Haug, it is a big project.

Commissioner Parrish discussed "may, shall, or will" language on page 27 which is also a part of the Development Code language.

Commissioner Haug said he is concerned about the indiscriminate removal of trees for various purposes. He would like to have staff determine these types of issues. It is inappropriate for the Commission to accept the plan without reviewing concerns.

Commissioner Parrish called for the question.

Vote on Motion #5:	The motion failed.
---------------------------	--------------------

Motion #6:	Parrish to continue the hearing to July 8 1999.
-------------------	--

Vice Chair Lon Wall noted that Mr. Gougler wanted to make a final statement.

Vote on Motion #6:	The motion failed for a lack of a second.
---------------------------	---

Motion #6	Haug/ to direct staff to generate a list of R-1 design standards from the materials previously accumulated over the last year for possible inclusion on page 18 under residential building design standards for purpose of evaluating and deliberating at the next meeting.
------------------	--

Vote on Motion #7:	The motion failed for lack of second.
---------------------------	---------------------------------------

Motion #8:	Molzahn/Haug to close the Commission's deliberation in order to have Mr. Gougler address the issues raised by the Commission (not to exceed 10 minutes).
-------------------	---

Vote on Motion #8:	The motion carried: 4 Yes; 1 Absent (Hannum); 1 Vacant
---------------------------	--

Mr. Gougler said that he would recommend continuing the discussion, but feels that the information the Commission wants to do is included in the staff report and the testimony presented.

Commissioner Haug offered a work session format to exchange ideas (open discussion) to resolve the remaining issues. Discussion was held concerning the quasi-judicial procedure and not being able to proceed with a work session format. Mr. Brierley said the Commission needs to make sure that the deliberations are open to the audience, although less formal than a typical hearing, and that at some point, the Commission stops the public input, and then proceeds.

Vice Chairman Lon Wall said the Commission and staff should consult with the City Attorney which is out of the ordinary quasi-judicial hearing procedure.

Commissioner Molzahn said the Commission needs to address specific issues which were part of the

original discussions held by the ad hoc steering committee. Further discussion was held concerning additional concerns in which some Commission members may have which have not yet been resolved.

Commissioner Ashby said it is not clear what issues those are.

TAPE 3 - SIDE 1:

Mr. Brierley said there is some flexibility on the format. Mr. Gougler could provide input and address the Commission's concerns. The Commission should make sure that both the proponents and opponents are allowed to comment, and then at the end, the Commission could close the public comments and deliberate.

Discussion was held concerning providing sufficient input to evaluate the issues and arrive at a good decision. Mr. Gougler said he is not attempting to accelerate the discussion, but is offering his assistance. He said he will provide truthful and accurate information, but would request that the Commission and the City provide the rules.

Vice Chair Lon Wall said the Commission members could not participate in the steering committee process due to legal issues in hearing the matter at the Commission level.

Commissioner Ashby requested that the Commission come up with a process.

Motion #9:	Parrish/Ashby to continue the hearing until the July 8, 1999 meeting.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #9:	The motion carried (unanimously).
---------------------------	-----------------------------------

NOTE: THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO APPROVE THE PLAN IS PENDING.

VII. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items

Mr. Brierley noted that the Waterbury annexation has been approved by the Council and will be sent to the voters at the September 21, 1999 meeting. A decision on the alignment of the Crestview issue will be forthcoming.

The City and the Newberg Area Chamber of Commerce are co-hosting a meeting to discuss how to build streets and revision of the City's transportation plan (scheduled for June 19, 1999).

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence - None.
3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: **July 8, 1999.**

VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Parrish inquired about the Commission not taking the Type II subdivisions. Mr. Brierley said the Council wished to have the Commission develop and review policy issues. He said there is citizen input into the process, if they so choose. The Council felt that if there are issues with development that are appropriate, they should be addressed through the legislative and not the quasi-judicial process. Staff recommended that the Council adopt the proposals. Discussion was held concerning housing subdivision issues dealing with stream corridor issues.

Commissioner Parrish said the NUAMC agreement said the Planning Commission member is to be selected be on the NUAMC Committee. Commissioner Haug said he would like to apply. Mr. Brierley said the document that creates the body is the NUAMC agreement between the City and Yamhill County. That agreement runs on a yearly (July 1 to June 30 basis), which is automatically extended unless terminated. The Council notified the County to terminate and that they participate in the process to re-write the agreement to satisfy both parties. The County Commissioners have turned down a proposal for a facilitator to coordinate negotiations. After July 1, 1999, the NUAMC agreement may not be in effect. The County said the agreement is 20 years old and it is time to review the issues which are before the City.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Motion #10:	Parrish/Ashby to adjourn at 10:55 p.m.
--------------------	---

Vote on Motion #10:	The motion carried.
----------------------------	---------------------

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this 8th day of July, 1999.

AYES: 7 NO: 0 ABSTAIN: ABSENT: 0 VACANT: 0

ATTEST:

<u>Peggy R. Nicholas</u>	<u>Peggy R. Nicholas</u>	
Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature	Print Name	Date

**INFORMATION RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD
AT THE JUNE 10, 1999 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 # CPA-14/Z-14-99: (Resolution No. 99-117):

Kittleson & Associates, Inc. Springbrook Oaks Mixed-Use Development, dated June, 1999.