

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Newberg Public Safety Building - Newberg, Oregon

THURSDAY, JULY 12, 2001 AT 7 P.M.

Approved at the August 9, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting

I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

Steve Hannum	Louis Larson	Rob Molzahn
Warren Parrish	Bart Rierson, Chair	Lon Wall, Vice Chair

Absent: Matson Haug

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, City Planner
Barbara Mingay, Planning Technician
Peggy Hall, Recording Secretary

II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Rierson 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.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of May 10, 2001, Planning Commission Minutes.

Motion #1:	Wall/Hannum voted to approve the consent calendar items, approving the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting.
-------------------	---

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

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

None.

V. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING(S)

OPEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING:

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

1. **APPLICANT:** Alvin Elbert by John Bridges
LOCATION: City wide
REQUEST: Amend NDC 10.60.115 relating to temporary street improvements. The proposed amendment would require that a temporary street could only be constructed if all the abutting property owners agree.
FILE NO: CPA-17-01
CRITERIA: NDC 10.20.030
RESOLUTION NO.: 2001-139

The Planning Commission has closed the public testimony portion of this hearing.

Motion #2 :	Wall/Parrish to approve Resolution No. 2001-139 amending NDC 10.60.115 relating to temporary street improvements.
--------------------	--

Vote on Motion #2 :	The motion carried (6 Yes/1 Absent [Haug]).
----------------------------	---

VI. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARING(s)

- APPLICANT:** Ronald Dyches
REQUEST: Historic landmark designation removal
LOCATION: 4020 Portland Road
TAX LOT: 3216-1912
FILE NO.: H-12-01 (historic review) **RESOLUTION NO.:** 2001-142
CRITERIA: NDC 10.44.255 (4)
ZONE: C-2

Staff Report and Preliminary Staff Recommendation: Ms. Barbara Mingay presented the staff report and that staff recommended adoption of Resolution 2001-142, approving the request. Ms. Mingay said the designation should be removed because the criteria designating the site historic is no longer met.

Commissioner Hannum questioned the ways to remove a historic designation. Ms. Mingay said that when the site was originally designated as a landmark, adequate notice was provided. Mr. Brierley said that the applicant contends that both 1 and 2 of the removal criteria are met.

Proponent: Attorney John Bridges, 515 E. First Street, Newberg, stated that he represented Mr. Ronald Dyches. Mr. Dyches was the registered owner of the property at the time of the application. The Sisters of Providence hospital organization was in negotiation with the property owners concerning the purchase of the property. Mr. Bridges addressed the criteria and the "imposed" argument. Mr. Bridges said that he was able to contact the prior owners of the property who owned the property in 1990-92 by looking through the City's file. The owner at the time was sent notice at an "odd" address which listed First Interstate Bank as the recipient of the notice. He tracked down Larry Lee, Loyce Lee and Mr. and Mrs. Stroupe. He subsequently obtained an affidavit from Larry Lee which has been submitted to City staff 2-3 days prior to this hearing. Mr. Bridges read the affidavit into the record. Mr. Bridges said that Mr. and Mrs. Lee and Mr. and Mrs. Stroupe had indicated to him they did not receive notification by the City as to the historic preservation designation in the early 1990's. Mr. Bridges also noted that the property does not currently meet the historic designation criteria and the application should be considered based on that information. The property would not have met the criteria in 1990-91 either. Mr. Bridges reviewed the "scoring" sheet which was used in determining the applicability of certain properties for the historic designation. Mr. Bridges said that the subject site was designated as historic based on the location of the site only and it is the applicant's position that the City only designated the property historic because of the site originally belonging to Mr. Brutscher, the City's first postmaster and that the buildings did not meet the criteria. In reviewing the City's file, the information contained brief notes describing the buildings. Discussion was held concerning how the properties were scored (buildings and site location). Mr. Bridges added that the property originally was a dairy farm and compound with the current home on the property being built in 1931. The site is the location of the City's first post office by Postmaster Brutscher. Mr. Bridges said that his clients are civic minded and they want to recognize the historic nature of the site in future development. They proposed a protective covenant to bind future owners of the property if the Sisters of Providence organization decides not to purchase the property. Mr. Bridges said that one of the options was to save the house (approximately 1 acre), but that option was not feasible to do in connection with the future hospital site.

Commissioner Parrish said he did not check the City's Development Code concerning the historic designation language. Discussion was held concerning whether or not the applicant had to give a reason. Mr. Bridges said that they would not have to, but they could just apply to have it removed. Commissioner Parrish questioned the ongoing purchase negotiations with the Sisters of Providence organization and the offer and acceptance involving the Mustard Seed property. Mr. Bridges said the Hospital is going through due diligence regarding environmental studies, etc. The Hospital has an arrangement dealing with the purchase of the Yost property. The Yost property is partly in the URA and partly outside. The part inside the URA is about 24 acres. The Mustard Seed is approximately 8 acres. The Hospital will be asking to bring the Yost property into the City. Commissioner Parrish reviewed how George Fox University had similar situations dealing with existing houses and structures when they purchased property. Commissioner Parrish referenced the ODOT bypass and whether or not there was a concrete decision involving the location of the bypass.

Mr. Bridges addressed the following questions:

1. Why isn't it feasible for the house to remain on the property? The current hospital site is approximately 5 acres. The hospital's commitment to the City is to keep a hospital type facility for at least 25 years. In looking at developing projects for hospitals, financial impacts have caused some concern for a regional facility (Newberg, Sherwood and Wilsonville). The studies included a land requirement of approximately 8-9 acres and a medical office building. There are two additional construction phases in the next 7 years after completing the first phase. The last phase will involve a total acreage of about 22 acres. Discussion was held concerning transportation issues.
2. Bypass location. The bypass committee has continued to study the southern route which appears to be the most feasible and probable. They are, are however, addressing 6-7 orientations of different routes. The City and property owners on the east side of town are providing input as to the development of the bypass. It is the applicant's decision to request that the bypass be built at the far eastern portion of the URA as possible.
3. Mr. Bridges said that the route ODOT is studying has changed in the past 4 weeks. There is no final decision at this time, but it is the intention to purchase property soon.

Commissioner Wall addressed the comments made by the prior property owners who indicated that they did not realize that their property was designated as historic. They stated they were not able to either "consent" or "object". Discussion was held about state case law concerning rights of property owners in relation to historic preservation. Commissioner Wall said that the applicants want to remove the historic preservation designation from the property as outlined by the City staff report.

Commissioner Wall asked if any of the prior property owners received any type of benefit from being designated "historic". Discussion was held concerning "convenience" or "benefits" of being listed.

Commissioner Wall asked what would be the benefit to the City for doing such a wholesale designation of the properties listed as historic in 1991? Mr. Bridges said that the City had to make such a designation as a task from LCDC to do the historic preservation process.

Commissioner Parrish addressed compensation in relation to benefits at the City level. Staff confirmed no compensation was received for being placed on the City's historic register; State or Federal designation may or may not provide such benefits.

Commissioner Parrish reviewed the covenant and restriction agreement which would run with the land.

Opponent: Mrs. Stevens, 4505 E. Portland Road, Newberg, Oregon said there is a landmark designation on the property (fact). She is speaking in opposition to releasing the designation. She noted

that concerns about a bypass originally began in 1938. It is a portion of the original Donation Land Claim and is the site of the City's first post office. The historic designation had been placed on the site for several years in compliance with land use issues at the time. The current house was built in the early 30's (over 70 years old). The architecture and design is important and should be considered being saved. In return for removing the designation, the covenant offer is a vehicle that could be removed later. Discussion was held concerning a memorial garden to be placed on the property. Ms. Stevens said that she had heard that the Hospital is trying to lock in about 50 acres. It should be locked in concretely in order for the covenants to remain with the property and should not be so vague.

Commissioner Parrish asked Mrs. Stevens if she felt that Mr. Brutscher's property was an important historical piece of property for the community. Mrs. Stevens said the original Brutscher home was very sound, but primitive and the same site was used in building the newer home in the 1930's.

Commissioner Wall discussed the outbuildings which were added for restroom facilities. Discussion was held concerning the historic designation not being removed and what the future would be for the property. Mrs. Stevens said it was a fairly good farm. She said the property does not have a value for a small farm and has limited commercial value and some residential value. Discussion was held concerning only reserving one acre out of 8 for the Brutscher house.

Opponent: Don Stevens, 4505 E. Portland Road, Newberg, said he is the owner of the last piece of the original Brutscher property which remains in the family. Discussion was held concerning the ODOT bypass and how the regional bypass had been tabled. Mr. Stevens said he works for the Oregon Salmon Commission and is knowledgeable about endangered species. Discussion was held concerning developing the property prior to the institution of the bypass development plan. The Newberg Dundee transportation Plan encourages urban type development within the urban growth boundary. The subject property has had no industrial or commercial sprays on the property since 1850. He feels that the property should be left alone.

Commissioner Parrish confirmed the location of Mr. Stevens' property (across the road and further down from the Mustard Seed property - next to the veterinary clinic).

Opponent: David Brown, owner and operator of Mustard Seed Farms, **4020 Portland Road, Newberg**, said they have a deep interest in history and conservation and noted that they have lived on the site for 22 years. They had a desire to save it as a non-profit group farm. He stated, that on the other hand, he is not opposed to the removal of the historic designation, and believes that both entities can exist. He added that he believes the Hospital has been open with their intent and he respected what they intend to do, but felt that there are still some options which should be considered. As a matter of correction, the tax lot in question is noted as **1912**, but it is actually **1902**. He said that he has received the historic preservation notices. He also added that the farm is certified organic (year round). The property last was a dairy in 1978 and have continued the farming operation since that time. They are actively working with FISH and other community agencies. Mr. Brown said that when people come up to the house, they comment on how beautiful it is. Mr. Brutscher originally had over 600 acres. As far as the buildings, a fire destroyed the barn and part of another building. The property is listed as farm deferral and most of the property is used for farm use. The buildings are typical of a farm (former dairy) and are in moderate to good condition. As far as the historic designation, the original owner of the property, Mr. Brutscher, was the person who named the City "Newberg". He cannot see the designation on the inventory not referring to buildings (building is "unique"). It does contribute to the immediate environment and neighborhood of the City. He encouraged the Commission to view the property and the buildings and the surrounding trees, etc. The site is too beautiful and significant to not be saved in its entirety. Mr. Brown said that 150 years ago (in August, 2001) Sebastian Brutscher moved into the site in 1851. Mr. Brown said he is a tenant on the property and is not a registered owner.

Commissioner Parrish discussed keeping the farm concept with a proposed hospital/medical development (removing the farm land). He believed that the house and trees around the property should

be preserved. Discussion was also held concerning removing the landmark designation from only portions of the property, to preserve the site and make a commemorative area recognizing Mr. Brutscher. Mr. Brown said that he feels that it would enhance the Hospital's property in keeping the house and trees.

Opponent: Kimberly Dunn, 4505 Portland Road, Newberg, said she is a descendant of Mr. Brutscher and works for the Historic Preservation Department for the State of Oregon. Ms. Dunn said Mr. Brutscher named "Newberg" after a Bavarian town. Mr. Brutscher was a Yamhill County School District Clerk, the first postmaster and a Yamhill County Commissioner for 3 terms. Mr. Brutscher came across the Oregon Trail with the Rifleman from the Oregon Trail. Ms. Dunn stated that she regrets that the notice about the historic preservation was not adequately done. Ms. Dunn also stated that her boss has written about legal issues addressing items the City should be concerned with. She spoke in support of Mustard Seed Farms and was saddened because their property is in the line of change. She addressed the state tax benefit and noted the nationally registered properties are given a tax credit through the County. The application does not state how the commemorative facility would be handled. Should the UGB be moved to access the Yost property, she would like to be included in the notice.

Commissioner Wall addressed the legislature's interpretation of issues dealing with recourse options to challenges involving Goal 5 issues. Discussion was held concerning prior case law similar to this particular instance. Ms. Dunn said the local designations do not have state legislation protection when it comes to historic preservation.

Commissioner Hannum reviewed how the inventory included the house and outbuildings and properties maintaining a historic listing and whether in this particular instance, the outbuildings could be removed without problems.

Mr. Brierley said one of the main questions is what designates "historic"? Mr. Brierley reviewed the file documentation which included buildings and structures. Staff is of the opinion that the "site" is what makes it historic, not the house and buildings. Mr. Hannum addressed the site and many of the buildings that are part of the contributing value to the historic site. What would be the process, assuming the historic designation is maintained, for demolishing any or all of the buildings? Mr. Brierley said it would come back to the Planning Commission for a hearing at the time the property is developed. Altering does not necessarily take away the complete historic nature.

Commissioner Hannum reviewed the numeric values and noting the fact that the first Post Office was built on the site. He also saw that the historic inventory was also very important because it originally was an active farm. Would it be a historic farm if it had not been owned by Mr. Brutscher? Commissioner Hannum noted that the street going into the Fred Meyer area was called "Brutscher Street".

Commissioner Parrish reviewed the staff report which involved a legal interpretation that the property no longer meets the criteria. If the landmark still meets the criteria, then it should not be removed. Discussion was held concerning conflicting statements from Mrs. Dunn's boss and his office (State of Oregon Historic Preservation), those of City staff and the applicant themselves. Ms. Dunn noted "significance" of the site (what is important?); the house is unique in style. Commissioner Parrish asked Ms. Dunn why the neighbors did not make comments concerning the historic designation until now. Ms. Dunn said part of the State's office requires a survey and public notice be given to all surrounding property owners. Discussion was held concerning possible inadequate public notice and how possibly the City placed designations on properties without the property owner's approval. Further discussion was held concerning other historic designated properties off Portland Road. Ms. Dunn said the Nut Farm is on the national historic register.

Discussion was held concerning the current ownership of the Brutscher house.

A break was called at 8:30 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

Tape 2 - Side 1:

Proponent Rebuttal: Mr. John Bridges addressed the historic preservation criteria worksheet and the information added to the form involving the buildings. Mr. Bridges said that his position is that the evaluator went beyond the evaluation of the property. They designated the site only and not the buildings. Discussion was held about other homes in the Newberg area which do not have historic designations even though they were built around the same time or even earlier. Mr. Bridges reviewed the Hospital's 30 year plan for the proposed development of the property with certain limitations. He said that added to that, even if the Hospital could construct a 2 story hospital in the area and leave the house, it would have to be ADA accessible which could require an elevator. The Hospital is civic minded and a part of the community. They intend to develop the property with a display in the entry way that reflects the history of the hospital and also reflect Mr. Brutscher's contribution (as well as other historic values). The correction of the tax lot number is reflected in the applicant's attachments.

Chair Rierson closed the public hearing.

Ms. Mingay provided the staff summary on the testimony and stated that no new written testimony has been received. The tax lot number in Resolution 32-16 has been corrected. Ms. Mingay stated that staff continued to recommend adoption of the Resolution, removing the historic land mark designation with the modifications proposed by the applicant.

Commission Deliberation: **Commissioner Parrish** said he had a couple of problems with the proposal. Discussion was held concerning notification to the property owners at the time the historic designation was made and why did it take the applicant 10 years to realize that there was a historic designation on the property? Mr. Brierley said it resulted in the Hospital's desire to purchase the property. The designation was not an issue because of the existing operation, and because there were no plans for future development. The applicants would not have any motivation to pursue removal of the historic preservation. Commissioner Parrish addressed ADA compliance issues in relation to historic properties. Mr. Brierley said that there are many older homes that have uses other than what have been in compliance with ADA accessibility laws. There are a variety of ADA requirements dependent upon the usage of the property and the amount of remodeling.

Commissioner Wall asked staff if the Commission did not take the subject property out of the historic register, was there anything more that could be done without having to go through the Planning Commission? Discussion was held concerning the primary benefit of removing the property from the register. Mr. Brierley said it would provide an assurance for planning for development.

Commissioner Wall discussed the City criteria for historic preservation of the site. It says that potentially the property may not be removed. Discussion was held concerning City Council review and consideration on the historic significance of the property. Commissioner Wall addressed the historic preservation document and criteria checklist form which appeared to not be complete but contained other vital information about the buildings located on the property. Commissioner Wall said that he is not inclined to remove the property from the historic preservation listing.

Commissioner Molzahn expressed concerns over restricting property owners from doing what they wanted to do with their properties.

Commissioner Parrish said the Commission was to base their decision on the criteria and that all the facts be considered, but he had concerns over the concept of the removal of the house and the hospital being a regional facility in that area. Discussion was held concerning the testimony of the surrounding neighbors. Secondly, he said the State of Oregon Historic Office of Preservation wrote a letter which, in essence, did not agree with City staff that the property did not meet the criteria. He does not agree with the applicant's position that it is a "site" only issue. Discussion was held concerning problems with the applicant not taking the matter into consideration 10 years ago and questioned the delay. He added that

the preservation of the home could be integrated in future development and he too, was not inclined to approve the application.

Commissioner Larson said that he read the proposal and quickly came to a decision which had not changed. The house and structures are not the original structure of Mr. Brutscher. Commissioner Larson said he has lived in Newberg for two years and did not realize there was a historic site at the location. Even public access and awareness is negligible at its best. There is no longer the original post office. The house was built in the 1930's. He addressed the issues relating to notifying the property owners in the 1990's. The reality of the situation is that the property is on the historic register. He is in support of the application and the City's contention to do away with the designation.

Commissioner Hannum noted the primary significance of the site was the location of the original post office. The existing farm is significant, but how the historic resource inventory process was applied makes it difficult, if not impossible, to now have the property meet the criteria. The major component of the value that is placed on the property comes out with consideration as to the buildings. It almost seems to him that the inventory was done to place some historic significance on the property and was pushed through the process due to Mr. Brutscher originally owning the property. A 1930's house is not significant enough to justify placing the historic designation on the property. The original post office was removed to build the house and therefore, he believes the values given to the house were incorrect.

Chair Rierson said the testimony of the people providing testimony weighs heavy on his decision as well as the historic significance. The house and the barn is a beautiful site and appears to be a real asset to the City, but the site would not have been placed without the property being owned by the Brutschers. The barn and the house do not have the same significance as the site. He also noted that there are probably many people who are not aware of the historic nature of the property. Chair Rierson said he takes some satisfaction with the proposed covenants, knowing that the property was built on the Brutscher property. He sees some positive benefit of the proposed covenants, but the true significance was the original structure and he is leaning toward removing the historic designation.

Commissioner Wall said the Commission is to use the criteria. The main argument notes that the property does not meet the historic preservation criteria. Discussion was held concerning how a "site" could hold historic value such as Champoege Park, the salt processing area at Seaside and Ft. Clatsop where no original structures exist, but the property is still cited as historic. The staff has not made the point that the subject property is no longer of historic significance and even the State has expressed some concerns about its historic value.

Commissioner Parrish requested that part of the stipulation with covenants and restrictions could be that the surrounding property owners and Brutscher family descendants be involved and consulted. Commissioner Parrish addressed the letter from James Hamrick from the State of Oregon Historic Preservation Department referencing that the property should remain on the historic preservation inventory.

Chair Rierson addressed consideration of tabling the matter until a more substantial covenant agreement is proposed.

Commissioner Parrish re-addressed Mr. Hamrick's letter (State of Oregon) and his concerns over the property still being of historical significance. Mr. Hamrick disagreed with Mr. Bridges' interpretation.

Commissioner Hannum said that based on the material that the evaluators had to work with (numeric value system), the form and the rules which were given by DLCD, made it difficult to say that the site alone was significant. As he understood what staff was telling the Commission, the fact that it is a historic site says that someone wanting to develop the property would have to come back and convince the City that removal of any one of the buildings does not significantly the historical value of the site in order to remove that building.

Commissioner Molzahn discussed the Hospital proceeding with the development and how the existing buildings do not really tie into the Hospital's development. The development could have some historic ties with the Brutscher family ("Brutscher Memorial Hospital")?

Tape 2 - Side 2

Motion #3:	Wall/Parrish to table the matter to the next meeting.
Vote on Motion #3:	The motion failed for lack of majority. (3 Yes [Wall/Parrish/Rierson]/3 No [Hannum/Larson/Molzahn]/1 Absent [Haug])

Discussion was held concerning fulfilling the covenant and restriction and who would be the beneficiary of the covenant (general public?). At the time of the design review, the covenants would be reviewed and considered. The Commission would not further review the matter.

Commissioner Larson noted that if the matter was approved, who would oversee compliance of the compliance if the hospital didn't develop the site? Mr. Brierley said that City staff through possibly design review or civil lawsuit (if necessary) would take such action as required. Discussion was held concerning restrictions/covenants not being adhered to and the potential lawsuits which could ensue. Mr. Brierley said that the proposed covenant does not give discretion on how the commemorative recognition would occur. A plaque or photo in lobby, display and/or recreation of the post office would meet the covenant requirement. Discussion was held concerning the strength of the covenant relying on the good will of the person implementing it.

Motion #4:	Hannum/Larson moved to reaffirm the historic designation of the site based on the testimony received at the meeting (the historic value of the site) and suggested that the buildings on the site were not of historic value that the Commission should be interested in.
-------------------	---

Commissioner Wall said the City should be receptive from any developer on how they would develop the site while still maintaining a statement of how they would deal with clarifying and considering its historic value. Commissioner Wall said that the City Attorney should review any proposed language for such covenants and restrictions. He believed that the motion made was a good compromise.

Vote on Motion #4:	The motion carried. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Haug]). Motion carried.
---------------------------	--

Mr. Brierley proposes that staff prepare a resolution for the next meeting outlining the intent of the motion. The matter would be addressed at the August 9, 2001 meeting. The Commission unanimously agreed. Mr. Brierley said that an appeal would be to the City Council.

Chair Rierson thanked the participants who attended the meeting and who provided testimony.

VII. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. **Update on Council items.** Mr. Brierley said the Council approved the contract for an urban renewal plan for downtown. They hired a consultant to develop the plan. The Council created an urban renewal task force comprised of 12 members and that Commissioner Larson was a member. The task force will begin meeting August 1, 2001 at 7:00 p.m. and will subsequently be meeting bi-weekly until October, 2001. The task force will review what areas should be included in the City's urban renewal district, what improvements should be done, create a program to renovate individual buildings, review

transportation needs, pedestrian enhancements, and develop methods of financing.

Mr. Brierley also noted that the bypass project is still moving forward. The next City Council meeting will receive a status report on the progress. A few public meetings have been held and the project over-sight committee has reduced the options. There was a wide variety of alternative routes where the southern bypass would or could go and with what conditions, but it was nevertheless moving forward.

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence - None.
3. Joint Planning Commission/NUAMC Meeting - July 19, 2001 - to discuss the riverfront master plan. The consultant will be available. The public is welcome to come. It is not a public hearing, but will give the Commission a chance to become familiar with the Riverfront Master Plan.
4. Next Planning Commission Meeting: August 9, 2001.

Commissioner Wall asked about the northern route being the route that actually never dies. Mr. Brierley said that there were some environmental issues (riverfront) which kept bringing the northern route back on the table. The further options that will be studied will be the southern bypass options. The northern option will only be studied for comparison purposes.

VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Larson discussed changing the zoning in the downtown core area. Mr. Brierley said it has not been placed before the City Council for review and consideration. There has, however, been a lot of discussion and the matter will be scheduled in the near future (issues involving Measure 7, etc.).

Commissioner Larson addressed College Street (coming off Chehalem Mountain) and how the developments are not cleaning up the attached landscaping. Mr. Brierley said he has followed up with the developer and they are intending to clean it up. It is in the public right away and the City can do it and charge the developer. Commissioner Larson said that he would like to see improvements extend down College Street. He said that he recently traveled the back roads from Scholls/Sherwood to Newberg (Hwy 219). He would like to see the City take some action and make a statement to the newcomers to the community that we clean up the area. He noted that there were elderly people pulling weeds across College Street during the heat of the day.

Commissioner Parrish addressed the City's south "welcome" sign not being completed.

Commissioner Parrish addressed the NUAMC issues regarding the Springbrook Road UGB Amendment not going to the Yamhill County Board of Commissioners. Mr. Brierley said that Yamhill County said they were not going to schedule it because it was denied at the City Council level. Ms. Mingay said that the County said it was not worth the time and expense to have a hearing when other governmental bodies denied it. Mr. Brierley said that the applicant had requested a continuance.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:55 p.m.

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this 9th day of August, 2001.

AYES: C NO: Ø ABSTAIN: Ø ABSENT: 1 (Haug)

(list names)

ATTEST:

Peggy R. Hall
Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature

Peggy R. Hall 8-9-01
Print Name Date

**INFORMATION RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD
AT THE July 12, 2001 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 #

LABELS FROM THE 7/12/01
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FROM THOSE WHO GAVE PUBLIC
TESTIMONY/REGISTRATION CARD

***Be sure to add file number by
name*** on each label

Elton Brutscher
3459 Pringle Road SE
Salem, Oregon 97302-2649

H-12-01

H-12-01

H-12-01

Kimberly Dunn
4505 SE Portland Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132

David Brown
4020 Portland Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132

Don Stevens
4505 E. Portland Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132

H-12-01

Gloria Brothers
1321 Newall Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132

H-12-01
John Bridges
Attorney-at-Law
515 E. First Street
Newberg, Oregon 97132

