

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Newberg Public Safety Building - Newberg, Oregon
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2001 AT 7 P.M.

Approved at the November 8, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting

I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

Steve Hannum	Matson Haug	Louis Larson
Warren Parrish	Bart Rierson, Chair	Lon Wall, Vice Chair
Vacant Position (was Rob Molhzan)		

Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, City Planner
David Beam, Economic Development Coordinator/Planner
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 September 13, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
2. Approval of amendment to the record of the July 12, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion #1:	Wall/Hannum and Hannum/Larson voted to approve the consent calendar items, approving the September 13, 2001 minutes and the amendment to the July 12, 2001 Meeting minutes.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #1:	The Motion carried (6 Yes/1 Vacant).
---------------------------	---------------------------------------

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

None.

OPEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING:

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

V. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

Continued from the September 13, 2001 Meeting

1. **APPLICANT:** City of Newberg
REQUEST: Adopt Newberg Riverfront Master Plan
FILE NO.: GR-20-99 **RESOLUTION NO.:** 2001-144
CRITERIA: Newberg Development Code 10.20.030

Abstentions, conflicts of interest or objection to jurisdiction - None.

Staff Report: Mr. David Beam, Planning Department, worked with the School District and other persons interested in the Riverfront Master Plan. He reviewed the changes contained in the staff report.

Mr. Beam said that Exhibit B showed graphics of various options. They have received a letter from CDA Consultants responding to SP Newsprint's concerns. A representative from Boora Architects representing the School District, Mr. Heinz Rudolf, Paul Frankenberger and Dr. Paula Radich were in attendance. Mr. Beam introduced the alternatives suggested by the School District. They were asked by the School District to look at the former Renne School site and arrive at options in order to build a school facility which was needed. He said that they have conferred with City staff and presented four options. Mr. Rudolf presented a Power Point presentation addressing the proposed pedestrian crossings through the subject site. He discussed how the School District needed at least 26 acres for the Edwards School and the new middle school project. He said that space is precious on the site to accommodate the School District's requirements. Mr. Rudolf addressed how the track and field areas are a valuable asset to the neighborhood and are present on the property. Discussion was held concerning transporting students to and from school and activities, providing pedestrian access and wider boulevards around the school area. Mr. Rudolf presented the following testimony:

1. Option 1. Mr. Rudolf said that this option has real merit. It locates the proposed 96,000 sq. ft. building along the northerly portion of Sixth Street. It lay outs the building in a north/south direction. Mr. Rudolf addressed the mutual food preparation/dining facility operation and how students and faculty from Edwards and the new middle school could both use this facility. Mr. Rudolf also addressed bussing and staff parking. By eroding the sidewalk and creating a walk pattern, it could accommodate the pedestrian walk-way. Safety is guaranteed and provides an opportunity for safe passage. Accessibility is good, parking is separated and the building would be located in a prominent location.
2. Option 2. The paths would still go along the perimeter as in No. 1. There would be a connection with open gates allowing entrance onto the school property. When pedestrians arrive at the gate, but it is closed, they would have to return to the perimeter to access the other side of the property. Mr. Rudolf addressed handicap access and safety concerns **before and after** school hours. He did not feel this option would work as well as No. 1.
3. Option 3. Similar to No. 1 - but in general, this works with exception of the passage way and perimeter.
4. Option 4. Mr. Rudolf said that they did not recommend this scheme as it shortens the boundaries of the site and the building would be located in the rear of the property. The parking would not be nearly as accessible for bus loading and unloading. The access would be on 9th Street which causes a lot more congestion.

Mr. Rudolf suggested Options 1 or 3 which would circumvent the pathway.

Commissioner Wall addressed the direction of the pathway and asked what the reason was for doubling back in the opposite direction which is in response to the Riverfront Master Plan's direction of going through the property.

Commissioner Parrish asked for clarification about continuity of the fence from the elementary school to the baseball fields. He said that it appeared that the request was that the entire site be secure. Discussion was held concerning how the gates would allow access to the baseball fields.

Commissioner Hannum reviewed the continuation of the pathways along the perimeter of Blaine Street and other possible alternates.

Commissioner Larson addressed statements made by Mr. Rudolf concerning the trolley and asked him if the population in Newberg justified a trolley? Mr. Rudolf said he was not sure but the concept would be good but would be dependent upon the activities occurring on the Riverfront and the downtown areas.

Dr. Paula Radich said the regulations for bussing requirements by the State do not require bussing for students within a one mile radius of the school but they students with disabilities are afforded bussing. She added that most kids attending Edwards Elementary either walk, skateboard, bicycle or get transportation from others. Discussion was held concerning the trolley concept and the likelihood of students and School District staff using the trolley.

David Beam presented additional language amending the staff report recommendation regarding pedestrian/bike paths and the school site.

Commissioner Haug asked if staff had a recommendation as to Options 1-4. Mr. Brierley said that they are conceptual plans which are subject to change. Mr. Rudolf showed the positives and negatives to each option.

Chair Rierson stated that he appreciated the safety concerns addressed by the School District. Mr. Beam said that given the constraints, option No. 1 had the advantage of aligning both buildings along Sixth Street.

Commissioner Parrish said the amendment provided by Mr. Beam would be made to amend page 82 of the Riverfront Plan. Mr. Beam said the changes were guidelines. Discussion was held concerning the School District's concern about dividing the property and how it will affect the Riverfront Plan attainable within a thirty year period. The amendment does not divide the middle school and elementary sites and the pedestrian pathway goes along the periphery of the property.

Commissioner Wall asked if the Commission had the ability to remove a section of the Riverfront Plan from the public hearing record. The information would be part of the public hearing process, but did not necessarily have to be adopted and approved as part of the Plan.

Commissioner Parrish reviewed the letter from SP Newsprint (09/12/01). He had a concern about the last paragraph: safety of the public and employees and industrial environment, railroad right-of-way and public access, pedestrian and vehicular traffic. SP Newsprint does not support any mixing of their private rail use and public use. Mr. Beam said that his presentation would address the rail traffic at a later point.

Mr. Beam reviewed the Riverfront Plan changes:

1. Sewage Treatment Plant may be a candidate for redevelopment (identified as lot 12).

Commissioner Parrish asked for clarification of the exclusion of the stream corridor.

Tape 1 - Side 2:

Commissioner Haug reviewed the option of reconsideration of the old sewage plant site for development not necessarily acting on the merits of the Riverfront Master Plan. He said that the question was about the re-evaluation of the stream corridor and the public process involved. Mr. Brierley said it would be a Type III process to amend the boundary. He said Figure 11 shows the stream corridor boundary to include the upper bank of the sewage treatment plant. He also discussed the following: pedestrian/bicycle plans, changes to Section 10.44.060 (design standards of the Code) and transportation amendments involving Goal 12 requirements (minimizing the negative impacts of a Highway 99W bypass upon the Newberg community).

Mr. Beam addressed the additional proposed changes:

1. Expand the list of amenities which could be in the setbacks of commercial developments adding "similar pedestrian scale amenities" (page 27)
2. Roof structures adding to the property
3. Delete proposed section 10.44.630(10)(C) on page 97 of the Plan requiring massing to be "vertical". Discussion was held concerning maximum square footage requirements (7400 sq. ft.)
4. Exhibit B has a graphic design showing the option of an esplanade
5. Option A: (pg. 44) lists pro's and con's
6. Option B: (pg. 44) lists pro's and con's

Discussion was held concerning the width of the esplanade, security concerns, access and loading options.

1. **If the Commission went with Option A:** recommend Public facilities -provide pedestrian access and a door facing esplanade on building adjacent to the esplanade.
2. **If Choose Option B** - staff would have to make changes to the map, design, etc.

Mr. Beam addressed the concerns of SP Newsprint (attachment D) and the letter from CD Consulting Group, Inc. CD Consulting came up with recommendations concerning the conflicts between SP Newsprint's plan and the other commercial areas. Mr. Beam reviewed alternative concepts for an east side buffer. Discussion was held concerning conflicts between pedestrian, bicycle, vehicular and rail traffic (pg. 53). Mr. Beam said that the goal was to separate the various types of traffic.

Mr. Brierley said the street plan width on the esplanade was 18-24 feet.

Commissioner Parrish reviewed the buffering alternatives and who would be paying for the cost of such buffering. Mr. Beam said that one option would be through the Urban Renewal Program to pay for the improvements. Commissioner Parrish also said that he pays attention to the public's involvement and the letter from private property owners addressing separating the rail traffic and the extension of Blaine Street (adjacent to 9th through 14th Streets.) SP Newsprint has a franchise on the railroad utilizing Blaine Street. Mr. Brierley said the point is that when going across the property (south past 9th Street along the Blaine Street route) at the point where the rail line crosses the canyon, there must be provisions to separate rail and pedestrian traffic and create a widening section where needed or build a fence so there was no mixture of the cars, bikes, people and rail traffic.

Commissioner Parrish asked for identification of any easements along the rail lines. Discussion was held concerning SP Newsprint's concerns.

Commissioner Wall said the SP Newsprint letter seems to imply that they did not want anything to do with a trolley, Blaine street access and crossing SP property. Discussion was held concerning not making changes to the existing rail line.

Commissioner Parrish addressed the SP Newsprint letter noting the public access to the Mill property along the St. Paul bridge not being practical and CD Consulting's alternative proposal. Mr. Beam noted the options on the bluff or along the Riverfront area still has possibilities to be explored without conflict and safety issues. Discussion was held concerning public right-of-way.

Commissioner Larson addressed concerns involving the southern bypass route and how the bypass should not bisect the medium or low density zones in the Riverfront District. Mr. Brierley said it would be recommended to move it to the north of the plan area and have more developable property one side.

Chair Rierson asked for clarification of item (g) involving upgrading intersections and ODOT's preference, how it would tie into the Dundee/Newberg route and how it would affect traffic and promote congestion. Mr. Brierley said that they have looked at how the bypass could be compatible with the Riverfront area. An intersection at the Riverfront area would provide some opportunities to allow the Riverfront to be a focus for Newberg. It is not saying that there has to be an intersection, but the plan wants ODOT to consider the option and possibly include an intersection. Mr. Beam said that there would be more economic opportunities with an intersection and if we don't ask for it, we won't get it.

Chair Rierson called for a break at 8:30 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

Chair Rierson thanked Mr. Frankenburger for the School District's input.

Paul Frankenburger, Newberg School District said they appreciate working with the staff and are happy with the amendments as presented and they want it included in the plan.

Commissioner Haug said that of the options presented, which option does the School District prefer? Mr. Frankenburger said it was the School's preference for Option 1 with the additional language presented by Mr. Beam. He said that Option 2 would not be feasible. Discussion was held concerning Option 2 and to either remove it or keep it with the other options for final design review. Commissioner Wall said that at sometime, someone will look at the options and may even like Option 2 better.

Public Testimony:

Mr. Frankenburger said that the final decision of Option 2 would be a concern to the School District. Further discussion was held concerning downplaying Option 2. Mr. Frankenburger said that Option 2 is an unacceptable option.

Dr. Paula Radich, Newberg School District, said that she is also concerned with Option 2 and would like to remove Option 2. The District has the commitment to work with the Plan. In the long run, it is hoped that the future middle school and cafeteria site would be developed before the Riverfront development. She appreciated the courtesies provided by the City in working out a fair resolution.

Staff Recommendation: Mr. Beam said that staff recommended that the commission adopt Resolution #2001-144 with the change in the language presented and further recommendations by letter from CDA Consulting.

Hearing Closed.

Commission Deliberation:

Motion #2:	Haug/Larson moved to recommend to the City Council the adoption of the Riverfront Master Plan on Exhibit A as modified and changes in staff report, new language presented at the meeting regarding the school path issue and Attachment C addressing SP Newsprint's concern and adopt suggested changes to the Newberg Comprehensive Plan and Comp Plan Map.
-------------------	--

Commissioner Parrish asked that the Commission address the Newberg School District issues.

Commissioner Wall discussed the statement regarding Exhibit Maps 0-4 (School District exhibits) and that the Planning Commission strongly opposed Option 2.

Motion #3	Wall/Haug to amend the motion by including the statement regarding exhibit maps 0-4 submitted by the School District, that the Planning Commission strongly opposes Option 2 for consideration.
------------------	--

Motion #4	Haug/Wall to amend the motion by including the statement that as a Planning Commission, they do not feel access through the property adds that much to the Riverfront Plan and alternative routes could be provided.
------------------	---

Commissioner Larson called for the question.

Vote on Motion #4	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.
--------------------------	--

Commissioner Haug called for the question on **Motion 3**.

Vote on Motion #3	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.
--------------------------	--

Motion #5	Parrish/Haug noting that the insert language (page 2) will not be revisited.
------------------	---

Vote on Motion #5	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.
--------------------------	--

Deliberation:

Commissioner Haug addressed the following:

1. Overlay zone issues. Commissioner Haug said that he did not have a site visit and was concerned about the stream corridor. If appropriate, we should allow the re-evaluation of the stream corridor and it may be a good idea to remove from the stream corridor and support the language because it does not bypass the hearing process. Discussion was held concerning advantages.

Motion #6	Haug to accept the language on pages 25-26 on the stream corridor overlay and allow re-evaluation in the future.
------------------	---

Discussion was held concerning the stream corridor overlay.

Vote on Motion #6	Commissioner Haug withdrew his motion.
--------------------------	---

2. Stream Corridor. Discussion was held concerning the reason for bringing forth the sewer treatment area (pg. 69 of the Plan). Mr. Brierley said that staff wanted to re-evaluate the possibility of redeveloping the site.
3. Residential designs. Mr. Beam said it is a housekeeping measure. It clarifies that the design

standards are not the only standards which must be met in the Riverfront Overlay.

4. Transportation. Goal 12 concerns.

Motion #7	Parrish/Hannum noting that in section (c), it should say that the crossway across the southern bypass had to be safe for children. Trails connecting across the bypass should be welcoming and pedestrian friendly, should provide a reasonably direct route, and be safe for unescorted children to cross and that the insert language will not be revisited.
Vote on Motion #7	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.

Commissioner Parrish said that he has questions concerning the road definitions involving the word “across”. Discussion was held concerning the location of the bypass and the need for safety.

Commissioner Wall said that things in this document appear to be right and good, if this is what we need. He noted that there have been three (3) sets of vision meetings which had consistently ruled out a northern route. Discussion was held concerning reconciling the adoption of the language of paragraph (c)(i) and it seems that will be setting up road blocks to the southern route to where, at some point, ODOT might say “this is not an attractive route and will have to go another route, even though the northern route is not an option.” Discussion was held concerning asking for guarantees in light of the difficulties which may arise. Chair Rierson addressed the concessions the City must make in allowing the bypass to go through.

Commissioner Wall noted that at least one grade level access was an absolute deal breaker in the eyes of the supporters of the bypass.

Commissioner Haug addressed comments made by decision makers making reference to multiple grade access and the ultimate commercial success of the Riverfront district and the bypass route.

Commissioner Larson said he would like Dave Bishop of ODOT come to a Planning Commission meeting and explain the various routing options. He said that he would like to see what bypass routes are being considered and that this information must be made available before making any Planning Commission recommendations. He would like to see other committee members of the bypass to have the Planning Commission and City staff arrange such a meeting.

Commissioner Haug said that he thinks that the Planning Commission was tasked with creating the document and the recommended ordinance language which would make a Riverfront district safe to use, the economic value and livability of the Riverfront area. It seemed to him that the concept to go below grade, along with his feeling that the Commission was tasked with providing the most viable option, that the below grade option was to transport people across, over or from one side to the other, and it should be considered a high priority. Discussion was held concerning meeting with ODOT.

Commissioner Parrish asked that City staff arrange for a discussion meeting at the November Planning Commission meeting with a fairly high ranking official at ODOT who is familiar with the bypass routing options. Commissioner Parrish said that he is bothered by the uncertain bypass issue which is hanging over all of us. Discussion was held concerning the priority that was given to the bypass and how it was imperative that we get a realistic answer from ODOT to know if this is a realistic proposal. He said that the City has done a good job in working out the Plan and creating a vision for the Riverfront area. He thinks that we need to think about the big picture and the projected ODOT bypass/transportation plans.

Commissioner Larson said that it was important to discuss concerns and then have the Commission make a realistic plan.

Commissioner Haug addressed the amended language to make the project viable in connection with the southern bypass. As far as Riverfront livability, the Riverfront project and enchainning the life of the City, we need to be clear in our intentions. Discussion was held concerning having an at-grade bypass

that would ruin the Riverfront plan area. Commission Haug addressed how the northern or southern bypass routes and watering down the concept of the Riverfront area viability.

Commissioner Wall said he could not consider the document in a vacuum. If we accept it as it is presented, without direction from ODOT, we may be essentially saying, that ODOT can come along and kill the southern bypass project in favor of the Riverfront. What he wants to find out is what the feasibility is of a below grade bypass and various other access routes? He said he wanted to get some kind of feeling from ODOT on whether the City is placing unreasonable obstacles.

Commissioner Haug said he would like to get Dave Bishop from ODOT to come in and address the issues and have Barton Brierley and David Beam work with ODOT to schedule the meeting for November.

Commissioner Parrish discussed changing the Development Code through the acceptance of the Riverfront Master Plan.

Commissioner Haug said that Barton Brierley and David Bishop should extract the information provided at the hearing and present it to the Commission. The Commission said that they would like to address the questions from ODOT. Mr. Brierley said that Mr. Bishop has offered to come to the Planning Commission and talk about the bypass route alternatives.

Discussion was held concerning holding a special meeting if Mr. Bishop could not attend the next Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Haug said that traditionally, it is the fourth Thursday of the month for special meetings.

Motion #8	Haug/Parrish moved to ask that staff request that Dave Bishop from ODOT and an environmental consultant attend the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, or in the alternative, a special meeting to discuss the impact of the southern bypass on the Riverfront development project, entertaining an open discussion on the bypass route alternatives.
------------------	--

Vote on Motion #8	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.
--------------------------	--

Commissioner Haug said that as far as the adoption of the Riverfront project, he would recommend Option A and to toss Option B, as there is not much of an esplanade with Option B.

Commissioner Parrish asked about studies that have been prepared concerning the embankment and potential development. Mr. Brierley said that no studies have been done. Discussion was held concerning the stability of the riverbank. Mr. Beam said that it is assumed that studies will be done on stability prior to building development. Further discussion was held concerning the flood plain (above the 100 year plain).

Motion #9	Haug/Larson moved to recommend to the City Council that relating to the esplanade, the City do a satisfactory stability and environmental study before any development could occur in connection with the development and the adoption of the commercial area of the Riverfront master plan and flood plain.
------------------	---

Vote on Motion #9	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.
--------------------------	--

Mr. Beam said that they would make sure the esplanade Option A amendments get included in the final plan adoption. Mr. Beam said that all the changes will be incorporated into Exhibit A except for the transportation options which will be discussed at the meeting with ODOT.

Commissioner Parrish addressed the height regulations for aesthetic purposes which were primarily for

aesthetics and general densities.

Motion #10	Haug/Larson moved to close deliberation now and reopen the public hearing to allow for a question and answer session with ODOT. Discussion was held concerning allowing public input. Discussion was held concerning whether to re-open the public hearing if ODOT did not show.
Vote on Motion #10	(6 Yes/1 Vacant). Motion carried.

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items

Mr. Brierley reviewed the Council's deliberation on the Mustard Seed property historic designation. The Council decided to keep the site as historic and upheld the Planning Commission's decision. Mr. Brierley said he has been reviewing the drainage master plan presented by staff which will be addressed at the November 5, 2001 meeting. An application for a cell tower on Alice Way located in the unincorporated city limits of Newberg will be reviewed. It is a Yamhill County application in which the property is located in a residential area. The application is for a 150 ft. tower in the existing residential neighborhood. The property is located in the City's comprehensive plan as industrial which notes that a 100 ft. tower would be permitted and over 100 feet, it would be processed as a conditional use permit. The proposed site is between Hess Creek and the Ushio property. Discussion was held concerning the application not meeting the comprehensive plan requirements which also must meet residential code requirements. Discussion was also held concerning zoning issues. Discussion was held whether or not the Planning Commission would hear the matter as a quasi-judicial hearing process. For all intent and purposes, this is a residential area and any cell tower should meet the city's residential standards. Mr. Brierley said staff recommends denial. Discussion was held concerning changing the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Brierley said at the next City Council meeting a new Planning Commission member may be appointed. Mr. Nick Tri is the only applicant.

Mr. Brierley said that last month at the NUAMC hearing on an UGB amendment for property south of Crater Elementary (approximately 46 acres), NUAMC voted to approve and it will go to the City Council and Yamhill County for review. Discussion was held concerning the northerly corridors of the property.

Mr. Brierley said that he asked about an interpretation on private streets - acceptable or not acceptable. Their focus on that centered around residential development. There have been inquiries in industrial areas for shared driveways. The location is located off Elliott Road (tax lots 1100 and 1200) vacant properties zoned industrial (old current electronics building). The application has been approved for a veterinarian clinic. They are proposing to build a shared driveway so that when sometime in the future they can use the driveway for industrial truck use. The Development Code says that a private drive is a private way for two or three lots and a private street provides access for three (3) or more lots. The Code prohibits private streets creating any new private streets but it allows as a conditional use modification. They can build one driveway to serve two lots and build another driveway to serve another 2 lots (2 adjacent driveways serving two lots - narrow driveways). Or they could do one common driveway, and then the code would say they could not do it because it would be a private street. Discussion was held concerning creating a public street and applying for a conditional use permit (CUP) and have the street be different (cul-de-sac), etc. He said the Planning Commission has strong objections to private streets, discussions were focused on residential areas, but wanted to know the Planning Commission's thoughts on an industrial area.

Commissioner Haug asked about a required public street and what standards could be negotiated to remove it or allow for a 3/4 width private street which would not set a precedence. Discussion was held concerning providing for a conditional use permit involving public streets (without requiring full width and

eliminating requirements of sidewalks on both sides of the street.)

Commissioner Wall asked if the matter would come before the Planning Commission as a quasi-judicial hearing. Mr. Brierley said that it could. Commissioner Wall said that it could be a problem. Discussion was held concerning the general discussion involving a full size public street, and that the next option down would be to keep it a public street with less right of way, limited sidewalk and/or paving option issues. Commissioner Wall said that his suggestion on private streets is that unless we go ahead with exceptions, we should look at the existing Code. The Code provides a conditional use for a public street and does not allow for a private street. Discussion was held concerning submission of proper applications.

Commissioner Parrish said that he is concerned with accountability and maintenance of private streets. Discussion was held concerning requiring specific conditions being placed upon the application. Mr. Brierley said that there was a possibility that a driveway could serve 3-4 different lots. Discussion was held concerning the Planning Commission identifying a private street and do they apply to a public street. Does the Planning Commission consider a commercial situation in other aspects rather than a residential situation? Commissioner Wall said he does not see a difference. Some issues may not be as severe, but in some areas it could be worse in a commercial areas.

Commissioner Parrish reviewed the North Main area by Jaquith Park that had a private street about nine feet wide and he saw vehicles that were not being adhered to and the police were not monitoring. Discussion was held concerning the issue being the same for residential and commercial.

Mr. Brierley noted that the Urban Renewal Task Force was meeting on October 30, 2001 at 7:00 p.m. at the Library. Commissioner Larson is a member of the Task Force and encouraged other Planning Commission members to attend. They are attempting to have the Task Force plan adopted by the end of the year. The Planning Commission will see it at the December meeting. Also, the City Council will be attending a presentation on the urban renewal plan on October 15, 2001.

Mr. Brierley said that the City appointed a Transportation Task Force Committee to look at how we get funded, what do we build, creating local street connections in order to improve the local transportation system. Commissioner Haug is on the task force. They have had four (4) public meetings to get ideas on lists of projects. They have concluded meetings with a lot of input and they have a list of projects and make a presentation on 11/19/01 with recommendations. Mr. Brierley said that at the next meeting, the Planning Commission will consider an annexation of a small parcel.

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence - None.
3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: November 8, 2001

VII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Parrish addressed motor accidents and asked for recommendations about how to proceed with obtaining information about Springbrook Road as a city street. Commissioner Parrish said that Wilsonville Road is a county road and St. Paul Highway is a state highway; Wynooski Street is partly County and partly City road. Commissioner Parrish said that he understands that traffic lights being installed are way into the future (2006), but he talked with the Newberg Fire Chief and he said that he was in support of the installation of a traffic control device and they are requesting information on where to start.

Commissioner Haug said that the Transportation Task Force has discussed the intersection and they are all concerned about safety, capacity and maintenance issues. Discussion was held concerning funding issues and system development charges. Commissioner Parrish said he wanted to have flashing lights with "caution" signals at those intersections. Commissioner Haug said that they have addressed funding these transportation projects as they relate to safety. Commissioner Haug said that it would be advisable to attend the October 22, 2001 meeting but he would make the requests known to the Committee. Mr. Brierley said that he could talk with Dave Bishop from ODOT and ask for his recommendations.

Commissioner Parrish thanked the Commissioners for their input. He would like to have a get together with the Planning Commission members and Planning Staff. Discussion was held concerning the location, possibly the new Thai restaurant in town. Discussion was held concerning the dinner to be held after the tree lighting event at the library. Mr. Parrish said that he would take care of the reservations. Mr. Brierley said that the City would pay for the Commission members but that the Commission members would have to pay for their spouses or significant others.

Tape 3 -

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 p.m.

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this 8th day of November, 2001.

AYES:

NO:

ABSTAIN:
(list names)

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Peggy R. Hall
Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature

Peggy R. Hall 11-8-01
Print Name Date

**INFORMATION RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD
AT THE OCTOBER 11, 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 #

1. GR-20-99 Power Point Presentation (hard copy) from Mr. Rudolf (Boora Architects)
2. GR-20-99 Additional language contained in memo provided by David Beam

ABELS FROM THE 10/11/01
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FROM THOSE WHO GAVE PUBLIC
TESTIMONY/ REGISTRATION CARD

GR-20-99
Dr. Paula Radich
Newberg School District
714 E. Sixth Street
Newberg, OR 97132

Be sure to add file number by name
on each label

GR-20-99
Paul Frankenburger
Newberg School District
714 E. Sixth Street
Newberg, OR 97132

GR-20-99
Heinz K. Rudolf AIA
Boora Architects
720 SW Washington St., #800
Portland, OR 97205