

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

Approved at the February 8, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting

I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

Planning Commission Members Present:

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

Staff Present:

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

II. OPEN MEETING

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.

1. Election of Officers.

Motion #1 :	Haug/Larson to nominate Bart Rierson as Chair.
--------------------	---

Vote on Motion #1 :	The motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent (Parrish/Molzahn).
----------------------------	--

Motion #2:	Haug/Hannum to appoint Lon Wall as Vice Chairman.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #2:	The Motion carried (5 Yes/2 Absent (Parrish/Molzahn)
---------------------------	--

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of December 14, 2001, Planning Commission Minutes and continuance of the GR-18-99 hearing regarding amendments to standards in C2/C3 zones.

Commissioner Molzahn appeared at the meeting on 7:05 p.m.

Motion #3 :	Haug/Hannum to approve the consent calendar.
--------------------	---

Vote on Motion #3 :	The motion carried (6 Yes/1 Absent)).
----------------------------	---------------------------------------

Commissioner Parrish appeared at the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

Discussion was held concerning the adjournment of the hearing from December 14, 2000.

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

None.

V. QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS

CONTINUED FROM THE 12/14/00 MEETING

1. **APPLICANT:** Willamette Landing Development
OWNER: Springbrook Estates LP
John & Margaret Hickert
REQUEST: Approval of an urban growth boundary amendment, comprehensive plan amendment, annexation and zone change of 28 acres. The proposed zoning and uses would include a mix of R-2 Medium Density Residential and R-3 High Density Residential, together with a dedication of 5-6 acres for park and open space purposes
LOCATION: East of Springbrook Road and North of Wilsonville Road
TAX LOT: 3221-3200, 3400
FILE NO.: UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00 **RESOLUTION NO.:** 2000-136
CRITERIA: NUAMC Agreement, NDC 10.20.030, NDC 10.36.030, NDC 10.36.080
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/ZONE: Yamhill County VLDR (Very Low Density Residential) with current zoning of EF-40 (Exclusive Farm Use).

OPEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Abstentions/ex-parte contact:

Commissioner Haug said he recognized that the sign was up during the past week. He said that he drives the road every day for work.

Objections: None.

Staff Report and Preliminary Staff Recommendation: **Barton Brierley** presented the staff report. He reviewed the procedures: hold hearing, hear testimony presented, close public hearing and then deliberate to approve, deny, or recommend approval with stipulations as discussed by the Planning Commission. The supplemental staff report contained information from the last meeting from the discussions of the Commissioners, written and oral testimony from the applicant and the public.

1. **Procedural Issues.** The applicant has again re-posted the sign that had fallen down. The applicant re-mailed notices to the property owners. He explained why the UGB, annexation and URA applications were processed as a consolidated procedure. He addressed involvement with Yamhill County Commissioners, NUAMC and the Newberg City Council. A separate hearing will be held by the City Council for the purposes of the annexation which will be forwarded to the voters for approval. The consolidated procedure eliminates some of the numerous hearings which must be held.

2. **Why is the matter heard before the City and not Yamhill County?** Mr. Brierley said that it is a joint application with separate issues. The applicant paid fees on both applications.

3. DLCD letter (Jim Hinman letter that came in the day of the last hearing). Mr. Brierley said that he talked with Mr. Hinman about the letter and discussed his concerns with the application. Mr. Hinman noted that it appeared that he did not have the applicant's complete findings and information when he sent the letter. The City provided a copy to him for his review and further consideration. Mr. Hinman said that he will review the information and provide an updated recommendation.

Mr. Brierley reviewed Goal 14 (urbanization) which was addressed in the findings. The criteria for exceptions for agricultural land have been addressed in the applicant's findings and the staff's findings. Mr. Hinman's letter addressed ORS 197.296 which relates to periodic review. Mr. Brierley noted that the present matter is a quasi-judicial review (not a full review of the UGB) and ORS 197.296 does not apply.

Mr. Brierley said that ORS 197.298 sets priority for lands which should be included in the UGB. In summary, the DLCD issues raised in Mr. Hinman's letter, were addressed and resolved by the information provided by the City. He felt that all issues noted by Mr. Hinman have been addressed.

Mr. Brierley stated that he believes that the staff report should be heard first, allow for public comments and then let the Commission deliberate. It may resolve some questions that may come before the Commission or the public.

4. UGB Land Use Issues. There are two ways to amend the UGB:

(A) When agencies look at space to expand, they look at areas zoned rural and planned for rural uses (farmland and hillsides and rural residential areas) and they need to do studies to plan which way to go.
or

(B) Designate an Urban Reserve Area (URA). It is beneficial to designate URA and then determine which area is to be considered. Properties within the URA are generally required to have services available at time of annexation or within three years. The UGB is supposed to contain a 20 year supply of land for growth. The City's current UGB was designed to last to 2010. The City's URA was designed for 2020. If the City is required to provide a 20 year supply of land from today, all the URA land could be brought in today. Mr. Brierley said that when looking at URA lands, there is more of a supply than just for 2020. He is not suggesting that the City take this action, but wanted to bring it to the Commission's attention.

Mr. Brierley said that some URA property lacks sewer and water service (undeveloped property). These types of areas are not right for inclusion into the UGB. He reviewed sewer pump station locations to be located in the UGB areas. About one-third of the URA is "ripe" or close to being ripe to be brought into the UGB, but there is approximately 2/3 of the land which is quite a ways out.

4. Transportation Issues. The bypass has a conceptual location (southern) in the Newberg Transportation Plan which borders the subject property. Mr. Brierley asked ODOT what their anticipated time frame was for the process for the bypass: 3 alternatives (1) southern route near the subject property; (2) Marion County - south of the river; or (3) no bypass but traffic management tools to meet demands. It will be approximately 18 months before the options will be narrowed down to 1 option. If the decision is made to go with the Marion County route, there is no impact on the subject property. If the transportation management alternative is chosen- no impact. If the southern route is chosen, however, there would be an impact. ODOT funding currently does not include buying property in the area.

If the project is built, there would be increased traffic in the area of Wilsonville and Hwy 219. This area is already being addressed by ODOT.

The Commission could deny the project, not approve the URA amendment, or approve the application with some sort of financial contribution by the applicant, with consideration of the intersection improvements. There could be an agreement that the applicant would contribute by SDC charges or through phasing. The applicant could pre-pay some of the improvement charges. ODOT has not determined what type of improvement will be done (re-align Springbrook Road, traffic signal, etc.) and

there are no concrete proposals.

5. Site access and street improvements. With the amount of development, it is important to have good access (public safety and general circulation for residents and others using the area). The applicant would have one access onto Wilsonville Road which is good access. A second public street needs to be added connecting to Springbrook Road (north). What the applicants proposed is an "at least" solution. Agreements with other property owners may be considered.

Commissioner Haug noted that the applicant owns the adjacent property to the north (negotiating for property acquisition for additional road access). Mr. Brierley said that there is an easement agreement on certain property and the applicant has a relationship with other property owners in the vicinity. He was not clear as to the exact relationship. A possibility, even though an expensive one, would be to take out a row of manufactured homes (7-8) in the adjacent manufactured home park and create a public street over an existing private road.

Commissioner Haug asked for the records of the prior Planning Commission meetings which involved the manufactured home park; which may prove to be useful in determining access permission.

TAPE 1 - SIDE 2

Mr. Brierley reviewed street widths which were acceptable for fire access.

Commissioner Parrish asked for information concerning the current street width standard (most updated public street). Mr. Brierley said it is 32 ft. (paved width w/curb). The right-of-way is 54-60 ft.

5. Stream Corridor, Park, and Environmental Issues. There is a stream corridor running through the property. There is a fork of Springbrook Creek which crosses a portion of the property. Other stream corridors in the UGB are designated for protection (Development Code). There is a difference of opinion between staff and applicant as to the location of the stream corridor boundary. The Development Code indicates that stream corridors are located at the top of the bank or 50 feet from the wetland. Staff said that there is a definite top of the bank at the location described by the applicant. He has looked at other stream corridors in the UGB which are similar where there is a ridge or hill and then drops down with a flat area where the actual stream course is located. Consistently in those areas, the top of the ridge is the beginning of the stream corridor and he requests that the Commission approve the stream corridor to begin at the top of the ridge.

Commissioner Haug asked about the quality of the stream and environmental areas.

Mr. Brierley said the City's stream corridors study area report did not contain the subject property, and that they have the area above Springbrook Road.

Commissioner Hannum asked how much of an effect is the stream corridor issue on the entire site?

Mr. Brierley said that 4-5 lots will need to be redesigned because they are in the stream corridor.

Mr. Brierley said that there was a concern that some property may not be suitable for a neighborhood park. The applicant has proposed a significant donation. The Commission could require the applicant to provide for a playground within the development.

Commissioner Haug asked if the park land is developable?

Mr. Brierley said it was in the stream corridor. He discussed accessibility of the park lands being converted to lands available for development.

Mr. Brierley reviewed environmental issues: erosion and storm drains. The City's ordinances do not require treatment of storm water (detention pond or bio-swale) before the water is discharged to the stream. The Commission may consider requiring the applicant to provide for it.

Commissioner Haug reviewed the new revision of the Development Code in relation to development agreement concepts and how it could be used as a trade off for annexation.

Mr. Brierley said that a development agreement could be utilized between the City and the developer in this particular project.

6. Police/School Issues. **Mr. Brierley** said that there is no new information. The development of the property could provide for policing at current staffing levels. There are school capacity issues, but there is nothing set aside for school funding except for property taxes.

Commissioner Parrish inquired about information from the Fire Department.

Ms. Mingay said that the Fire Marshall provided a statement (VI-47, attachment E).

7. Zoning Designation. The applicant proposes an R-3 zoning and an R-2 zoning (northern portion) and a proposal for approximately 200 dwelling units. **Mr. Brierley** discussed the planned unit development option with R-2 (medium density residential) rather than the 400 dwelling units allowed under R-3 zoning.

Commissioner Haug asked when the Commission would know the stream corridor designation which would accompany the proposal?

Mr. Brierley said a map is included in the staff memorandum showing the proposed stream corridor and requested that it be included in the resolution, mapped (R-2 SC, page 50 of attachment H), when considering annexation.

Commissioner Haug addressed issues relating to the neighborhood park and the proposed golf course.

Mr. Brierley said that a neighborhood park could be designed in the upper portion of the proposed park area.

Mr. Brierley said that a portion of the property is proposed as a planned unit development (PUD). He would not necessarily recommend that process, even though a PUD would allow for a slightly higher density use. **Mr. Brierley** reviewed some of the benefits in PUD's. **Ms. Mingay** said that because of the stream corridor, the subdivision of the site would come to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Haug addressed ordinances which were recently adopted. He reviewed development plan issues: Type III procedure (PUD), development agreement or contract annexation.

Mr. Brierley said that staff recommended that a development agreement be allowed in order to formulate conditions. The applicant may not agree to some conditions set by the City. **Mr. Brierley** said the proposed resolution provides for a development agreement.

Mr. Brierley suggested that the Commission allow public testimony.

Mr. Campbell, PO Box 6059, Portland, Oregon 97201, asked that his five minutes be moved to the rebuttal time and would like to have other engineers' be able to provide testimony.

Chair Rierson said that would be acceptable.

Mart Storm, 22965 Sunnycrest Road, Newberg, Oregon 97132, addressed prior statements concerning

ownership. The partnership that owns the mobile home park owns a portion of the adjacent property. They are presently working together with that owner. In regard to the public street standard, the street standards have "interim" 3/4 streets which can be added onto and which fits within the proposed 28 foot access. There are two access available and they have the right to develop. The plan shown may not be the final version, but it meets the criteria which shows that there is access available (conceptual plan). Mr. Storm said that the stream corridor involves two separate forms of "top of bank", at the top of the hill or a defined top of the stream bank. At the time of mapping, a clear definition of the wetlands is considered (which may include some mapping errors). Mr. Storm discussed the impact of Measure 5. A newer house costs more than an older house. Measure 5 throws the taxes on existing homes at a modest increase. When a new house gets a new appraisal, the additional charges are at the new value of the house. In reality, a new house built today pays more today for police, schools and fire. It should not be an issue due to the present taxing structure.

Commissioner Haug said that it makes sense to make a 3/4 street if the other side of the street is to be developed. Discussion was held concerning in-fill. Mr. Storm clarified his previous comments concerning 28ft. wide streets in relation to the location of the adjacent property (mobile home park).

Chair Rierson expressed concerns about "interim" streets (3/4 streets).

Commissioner Haug asked Mr. Storm about the subject property as it pertains to prior developments in the area. Mr. Storm said that initially, they wanted to have the 3/4 street built. The property owner to the north did not want the 3/4 street. Discussion was held concerning deeding the strip of property to the property owner and the applicant received the easement to develop a street. If the owner of the easement proposes a different alignment, alternative designs could be done to benefit both property owners.

Commissioner Haug discussed whether the road in the mobile home park could be widened to access the property behind it. Mr. Storm said he does not recall that interpretation. Commissioner Haug said that the issue of the southern bypass route was also part of the original discussion. The applicant said that they will participate and work with ODOT whenever possible. Concerns arise if ODOT does not complete their assessment within the 18 month period. Mr. Storm said he does not speak for any of his partners and he is speaking for himself.

Commissioner Molzahn asked about the time frame for annexation and finalization. Mr. Brierley said it could go to the voters in July, 2001 or November, 2001.

TAPE 2 - SIDE 1:

Commissioner Haug discussed swales, detention ponds, etc. to protect the quality of the stream. He asked Mr. Storm what his position was and what he believed could be done to make additional precautions in order to protect the stream in light of the current standards. Mr. Storm said they have built projects in Washington County and have worked with the Unified Sewerage Agency. Discussion was held concerning constructing the bio-swale and how it affects the natural stream flow. Mr. Storm said that he is concerned about the process. Commissioner Haug said that the subject property is a beautiful park setting. He also expressed concerns about long term livability and reasonable ways in which a proposal could be arranged to provide for environmentally approved stream corridors. Mr. Storm outlined how the bio-swale systems worked and what sort of maintenance was involved.

Commissioner Parrish discussed the Creekside development project. He asked Mr. Storm if it was a good planned unit development? Mr. Storm said that they were not thinking of building that particular type of development. Discussion was held concerning higher density, less land areas and attached/detached concepts. If the golf course develops next door, there may be a need to change concepts.

Commissioner Wall asked for clarification of the area which is to be given to Chehalem Park & Recreation District (CPRD). Mr. Storm said that with CPRD approval, it would need to have a golf cart

path or in the alternative park project, a walking path. Mr. Storm said that a golf course would generate more home sales. He is not opposed to the selected property being a park, but would like to see a golf course.

Chair Rierson called for a break at 8:45 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

Mr. Gary Darling, DL Engineering, 222 NW Davis Street, #403, Portland, Oregon 97209, said that the best solution for storm drainage problems would be to install manholes for bio-swales. There could be erosion control plantings. Erosion is currently an issue on the property. Mr. Darling said that with the sewer pump stations, there is adjacent property to the north which could provide for a larger pump stations rather than a small one with the first development. The larger pump station could handle all intended developments in the future to be combined with the Springbrook Oaks development. Mr. Darling said that there is adequate water, but the City is projecting the acquisition of and installation of a Marion County well and reservoir. He would like to emphasize that the 200 units would not happen all at once. The applicant feels that at the time it would be needed, the water would be available.

Commissioner Parrish addressed Mr. Darling's comments concerning the northern property. Mr. Darling said the other property at issue is in the URA, but not the property to the north of the mobile home park. Commissioner Parrish noted comments made by Mr. Soderquist concerning the time period in which the City could be in possession of Well 6 and it is operating at its capacity.

Commissioner Wall noted Mr. Darling's comments concerning the fact that the 200 units would not be developed all at once.

Chris Maciejewski, asked that he be able to give his time to Mr. Carl Springer. Mr. Maciejewski said that he worked on the project with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Carl Springer, DKS Associates, 1400 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 500, Portland, Oregon 97201, traffic engineer, authored the traffic study. The report presented in the staff report looked at traffic impacts with the trip generation analysis adding up to the same levels. They chose to pick the highest generation with the applicable mix. Mr. Springer said that they took the worst case scenario. He said that the report identified impacts at Wilsonville and Springbrook Roads and Hwy. 219. Their analysis showed that if the Commission considered all other projects already approved, it will show an impact, but the impact on this particular project would cause some problem, but not as big as an impact as the other larger developments. ODOT is working on a solution for the intersection problems. The applicant is not sure of the time line and what will be developed. The percentage of impact to the already existing area is approximately 5-7%. Mr. Springer presented a letter to the Commission concerning a report entitled "Response to Traffic and Transportation Comments on the Springbrook Meadows Residential Development application." What is the best solution? What is important? ODOT sees the existing short term solution, but also sees the need for doing something else. Mr. Springer said ODOT has recognized this dangerous and hazardous intersection. The purpose of the analysis is to: change functional class of roadway system - change from arterial to collector? Change the access standards? If annexing larger acres, the City needs to view the project in the whole scheme.

Commissioner Haug said there are five different directions of traffic flow coming at the intersection of Wilsonville Road and Hwy. 219. He asked Mr. Springer how he would handle the flow. Mr. Springer said there are insufficient cues for access. He said that he and others have suggested a signal. He does not understand ODOT's concern with respect to placement of a signal. A more involved and separate issue is the spacing of the location of the connected streets. There is a well recognized problem, but ODOT is not sure how to proceed. Either separate the street and have the signal or provide for a left turn lane on Hwy. 219. Discussion was held concerning a "round about", which may prove difficult because of the five intersections. Mr. Springer said that the character of the street will need to be changed unless there is a large radius (not enough property).

Commissioner Parrish said he does not agree with the comments made in the study. Discussion was held concerning the calculations and the time periods are too conservative. Commissioner Parrish said that Hwy 219 most definitely is a dangerous highway. There has been recent fatalities in the area. Commissioner Parrish asked who was going to pay? Mr. Springer said that it is standard practice to use time periods from 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. If they are aware of large employers in the area, they will make adjustments. Discussion was held concerning unusual shift patterns and the lack of information provided by the City and other sources which may have affected the outcome of the traffic study. Commissioner Parrish inquired about street width (22 ft. wide) involving safety and pedestrian access. Mr. Springer said that he would like to have both accesses on Springbrook Road (better connection with left turn lane) and Wilsonville Road.

Tape 2 - Side 2:

Commissioner Wall reviewed the Springbrook Oaks Traffic Study. He said that he liked Mr. Springer's traffic study which contained the language "should" which is a recommendation. The project should not be assessed the whole cost of re-doing the streets. Mr. Springer said that with the UGB, the URA amendment and the annexation, it is sometimes confusing on what issues to consider. The applicant should not be required to improve the surrounding streets. That is something that ODOT should be doing. Mr. Springer said that it would be nice if the SDC charges would be applied to improving the streets.

Commissioner Haug said that what is missing is a concrete proposal which would resolve the problems. Mr. Storm said that it is in the Transportation Plan for approximately \$3M to be paid by SDC charges (paid by developers). The project (200 units) will pay over \$300,000 in SDC fees to fix the problems identified in the plan. The City and ODOT is building it (the money is being collected).

Mr. Springer said that one potential short term solution is the "all-way" stop. Place a stop at all corners. The downside is that everyone has to stop. The problem is that ODOT controls the intersection. An all-way stop may be a temporary solution, and possibly force the solution to do something.

Commissioner Parrish said that a recent fatality accident (south of Wilsonville - near bridge) backed up traffic on Wilsonville Road for 15 miles.

Opponents: John Bridges, Attorney for Alvin Elbert, 515 E. First Street, Newberg, Oregon 97132, asked that the ODOT letter by John G. deTar, Planning Manager, be read into the record and expressed the importance of the information contained in the letter to the hearing process. Discussion was held concerning the possibility of adjourning the meeting to allow the letter to be read and other information presented in support or against the application. Commissioner Parrish addressed late testimony (written) being given to the Commission or entered into the record without the Commission's prior review and consent.

Commissioner Wall said that realistically, the Commission will probably not go into deliberation at this meeting. It may be a good idea to take the information home.

Commissioner Larson concurs with fellow Commissioners concerning the late testimony.

Commissioner Haug suggested that the Commission hear all public testimony and close the hearing and that he doesn't want to accelerate anything to get the matter done. Discussion was held concerning the public having the opportunity to review the information as well and keeping the public testimony open for future rebuttal or testimony.

Ms. Mingay said the ODOT letter will be distributed to the Commission to be reviewed later.

Proponent: Mr. Mark Dane, 13005 SW Cedar Hills Blvd., Beaverton, Oregon 97205, addressed the staff's process in dealing with land use issues. The question seems to be if there is going to be a

development, when will it be developed or when is it appropriate? Mr. Dane said that the City planners try to represent the public's best interest. To that end, he holds more weight to the City staff than the applicants. He looks to see what the planner recommends. It is not a perfect solution. Roundabouts are a good thing. They are used in European motor ways which are very productive and safe. This is the first step in the process for a planned development. The applicant has offered a park, but keep in mind the offers which are to be made (4, 5 or 6 acres) have varied. What determines what is good - available services? Make sure the property for the park is accessible and can be maintained. The applicant appears to have met the burden of proof. Mr. Dane is a land use planner who is interested in the area for future prospects.

Commissioner Wall addressed Mr. Dane's comments about the projects coming down to details (missing traffic peak times, traffic studies, improvements to be made, etc.). The solution to the problem does not lay with just the applicant, but also with the City, the County and ODOT.

Commissioner Haug asked Mr. Dane if he would annex land if it was in the middle of the southern bypass route (possible additional compensation required) due to the bypass. Mr. Dane said there are three options for the bypass (2 official locations). Who would lose? Who would gain? Once the property is developed and the bypass is selected, what then? Mr. Dane said he does not have the answer.

Mr. Matt Dunckel, 3765 Riverside Drive, McMinnville, Oregon 97128, left the meeting before providing testimony.

Mr. Thomas Barnes, 1000 S. Springbrook Road, #46, Newberg, Oregon 97132, left the meeting before providing testimony.

Mr. Roger Grahn, PO Box 43, Yamhill, Oregon 97148, said that he owns property to the west. The downside to a PUD is that you are wired to whatever that PUD is. When market conditions change, you are stuck. He would never consent to a PUD. There is flexibility, but if the applicant is going to build immediately, it may work. The Oak Knoll development is being built slowly. He purchased his property five years ago and is going to do something different than what he originally planned to do. The proposed construction agreement for the developer requires that in item 4, the applicant is to forego all claims in reduction of property values dealing with Measure 7, which is a constitutional issue. This is also a Dolan case issue. The requirement would be a condition of the annexation.

Mr. Grahn said he supports the annexation. There are unique circumstances in that the bulk of the available land is not going to develop it (Austin Industries). There is very little land available. Mr. Grahn said that he disagrees with the traffic analysis. Where will the people that live in the project go. Most people in the project will work in Wilsonville, Portland or Salem.

Discussion was held concerning allowing written and oral testimony at the next hearing, leaving everything open.

Motion #4 :	Wall/Haug to be adjourned to the February 8, 2001 meeting and allow for public testimony and oral and written testimony (leave the hearing open).
--------------------	--

Vote on Motion #4 :	The motion carried (Unanimously).
----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Tape 3 - Side 1:

Mr. Brierley said that there is additional documentation which he will present into the record at the next meeting.

Commissioner Parrish said that he questions item 4 (development agreement). He would like staff to

Tardiff previously had indicated they would service the area, but he had questioned whether or not it would generate enough funds to support the staff required to service the area. Commissioner Parrish asked for information from these agencies.

Commissioner Haug asked about the financial impact for the City in the costs associated with the purchase of property for the southern bypass (undeveloped or developed). ODOT would have to purchase the property. He asked that staff provide this information at the next meeting.

Commissioner Molzahn said that due to the length of time it takes to determine the bypass route, the build-out would also affect the marketability and value of the property. Ms. Mingay said that she would review the request and provide a simplified calculation.

Commissioner Haug said that the land already annexed into the City is different. The property has yet to be annexed. We need to add in guaranties to resolve potential storm drainage problems and environmental impacts, etc. As to the stream corridor, he knows that at the top of the slope, and if you go another 10 feet and make the stream corridor there, you would influence and affect the stream corridor. The City should have a choice to consider alternatives (defined slope) He would like to see that the City require the applicant to designate a set acreage which would not deteriorate the stream corridor. As a condition of approval, part of acreage for the neighborhood park would be placed in a specific area with set amount of acreage allotted for it.

Commissioner Haug said that he wants to see the prior record on the mobile home park project (property immediately to the west). There may be relevant information concerning informal agreements or discussion which will prove helpful.

Chair Rierson asked that staff provide information concerning the easement which was mentioned. He would like to see part of the land be accessible to the public, not just for the golf course.

Commissioner Haug said that it should be part of the neighborhood on the housing side. In regard to Measure 7, he requested that staff contact City Attorney Terry Mahr to discuss how it applies to the City and this particular project.

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items

Mr. Brierley stated that Steve Ashby, Warren Parrish and Brett Veatch were appointed to the NUAMC committee. There is one "at large" position yet to be filled. The Sign Committee will be providing information on street lights on First Street.

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence
3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: February 8, 2001

Mr. Brierley addressed upcoming items to be presented to the Planning Commission at the next meeting and how some items may need to be set over until March, 2001.

Motion #5:	Haug/Wall to continue the C-2/C-3 items to the March 8, 2001 meeting.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #5:	The motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Commissioner Larson asked that the C-2/C-3 matter be set for a definite period without the possibility of a set over to the April 12, 2001 meeting due to time conflicts.

Motion #6:	Wall/Parrish to continue the C-2/C-3 Items to the April 12, 2001 meeting.
-------------------	--

Vote on Motion #6:	The motion carried unanimously.
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Mr. Brierley discussed the upcoming joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission concerning policies and land use issues. Further discussion was held concerning continuing the hearing to the March meeting due to the joint meeting on the bypass and other land use issues. Mr. Brierley also noted that specific projects would NOT be mentioned during the joint meeting.

VII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Parrish said he was informed that when Mr. and Mrs. Wants zone change amendment was heard before the City Council, the Planning Commission minutes were not attached. Mr. Brierley noted that he discussed the issue with the City Council and that future minutes will be attached to the Council's packet for their review and consideration when applicable.

Commissioner Haug discussed the McBride zone change issue and the requirements which were not satisfied. The City should make sure that the applicants do what they say they are going to do.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:20 p.m.

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

AYES: 6

NO: 0

ABSTAIN: 0
(list names)

ABSENT: 0

ATTEST:

Peggy Hall
Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature

Peggy Hall 2-8-01
Print Name Date

**INFORMATION RECEIVED INTO THE RECORD
AT THE January 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 #

UGB-1-00	Letter dated January 8, 2001 from John deTar
UGB-1-00	Letter from DKS Associates.
UGB-1-00	Photograph from Mart Storm concerning stream corridor banks
UGB-1-00	Agreement between Springbrook Estates and Alvin and Jeanine Elbert. (1996)
UGB-1-00	Future PM Peak Hours Traffic Volumes Diagram
UGB-1-00	Future AM Peak Hours Traffic Volumes Diagram

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

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

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Thomas Barnett
1000 S. Springbrook, #46
Newberg, Oregon 97132

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
John Bridges, Attorney
515 E. First Street
Newberg, Oregon 97132

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Doug Campbell
PO Box 6059
Portland, Oregon 97201

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Mark Dane
13005 SW Foothills Drive
Portland, Oregon 97205

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Gary Darling (DL Engineering)
222 NW Davis Street, #403
Portland, Oregon 97209

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Matt Dunckel
3765 Riverside Drive
McMinnville, OR 97128

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Roger Grahn
PO Box 483
Yamhill, Oregon 97148

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Chris Maciejewski, Traffic Engineer
1400 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97201

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Carl Springer, Traffic Engineer
1400 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97201

UGB-1-00/ANX-1-00
Mart Storm
22945 Sunnycrest Road
Newberg, Oregon 97132