



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

October 14, 2004

7 p.m. Regular Meeting

Newberg Public Safety Building

401 E. Third Street

APPROVED AT THE NOVEMBER 10, 2004 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

Commissioners:

Dwayne Brittell
Richard Van Noord
Matson Haug

Phillip Smith
Louis Larson

Absent:

Nick Tri

Dennis Schmitz

Staff:

Barton Brierley

Dawn Nelson

II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Van Noord called meeting to order 7:00p.m.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of August 26, 2004 and September 9, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Haug/Larson To approve August 26, 2004 and September 9, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion Passed.

Commissioner Brittell – Commissioner Haug please read motion regarding goal 4 on page 7 is that how you wanted it to sound?

Commissioner Haug - it is reasonable.

Chair Van Noord - did these minutes go to Council before we approved them?

Barton Brierley – yes

Chair Van Noord – I think that we need to address this issue that the Council doesn't see minutes that aren't approved by us until the changes are made.

Commissioner Haug – maybe we should address that later after the presentation.

Commissioner Brittell - in September 9, 2004 minutes regarding resolution 171 wording is it correct?

Commissioner Smith – I think it is it just needs some punctuation changes.

MOTION: Smith/Haug To amend the first motion on Page 2 to add punctuation as follows:

“To adopt Resolution 2004-171, to Modify Newberg Code to prohibit long term temporary merchants in the C-3 zone from having drive up service windows, amended as follows: delete wording “long term” from #9”
Motion Passed.

MOTION: Smith/Brittell To approve and September 9, 2004 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as amended. Motion Passed.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR

None noted

V. PUBLIC WORKSHOP

1. **TOPIC:** Transportation Plan Update
FILE NO.: GR-25-01

Barton Brierley - tonight's meeting purpose is to have a workshop on the new Transportation Plan update, next month there will be a hearing on it. Tonight take the opportunity to ask questions and think of the specific issues you have with the plan, then outline them for the hearing process so they will be ready for the packet.

Introduced consultants - Dan Seeman from Kittelson & Assoc. also Anthony Yi., Paul Chiu, senior engineer for the City.

Dan Seeman - I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk with you tonight. We have had four meetings on this plan and tonight's will give you a summary of the plan. I believe the Commission has been provided a draft of the plan.

Mr. Seeman then started the visual presentation of the plan. He stated that comments from previous meetings have been incorporated with in this plan. High lights from the visual presentation are as follows:

Transportation System Plan

Functional Classification system

- * the system has arterial and collectors
- * Highway 99w is designated as major arterial
- * Highways 219 & 240 are designated as minor arterial
- * Remainder of system of roads are designated as collectors
- * Major & minor collectors distinction
 - * Major collectors trade parking space for bike lane
 - * Minor collector parking on either side.
 - * The City should carefully consider impact of on-street parking and only remove on a case by case basis

Street Cross Sections

- * Major arterial has 3 lanes 52' curb to curb
- * Minor arterial has 3 lanes 46' curb to curb
- * Collectors are 34' curb to curb
- * Local streets are 23' curb to curb

Commissioner Haug – what is the difference with what we had in plan before and this plan?

Dan Seeman - we didn't change the actual curb to curb width.

Study Area

- * Only within the UGB , the City has no authority outside of their boundary areas we have made recommendations for those areas in the urban reserves but until annexed to UGB they are still under County.

Street Improvements

- * Capacity Improvements
 - * Making recommendations for improvements for about 90% of the streets in the system
 - * Blue lines relate to County or State improvements
 - * Pretty major part of the improvement system is related to non city entities (state/county) and funded so
 - * Red and pink lines relate to City responsible improvements
- * Non Capacity Improvements
 - * ORE 219 rerouting
 - * Options are use existing route, reroute via Elliott Rd to access 99W, reroute via Springbrook to travel to northern arterial, reroute via Springbrook and Hancock to 99W
 - * Planning commission option to route 219 to bypass to northern arterial

Dan Seeman – some of the recommendations in regards to ORE 219 are: reconstruct to minor arterial standards, reconstruct Fernwood /2nd St intersection to ORE 219 to a right in right out, lower ORE 219 in the area at end of runway, or do not reroute ORE 219.

Mr. Seeman explained the select link analysis that was used to determine the amount of traffic that actually completes the route of ORE 219 through the downtown area. Of the 700 vehicles heading north on ORE 219 in the p.m. peak hour on the south end of town, about only 60 actually complete the route and end up north of town on ORE 219, and of those only about 7 are trucks.

Commissioner Haug - try to give me a description of what College will look like when this development is completed. How wide is existing street and how much wider will it be when it is built to the standard it needs to be in the future?

Dan Seeman – referred to the cross section drawing, then continued with visual presentation

Downtown Street Redevelopment

- * Potential revised downtown couplet, Hancock St would be one-way west, Second St would be one way east, and First St. would have 2 way traffic. This option won't be considered until after the Bypass is complete, and was not received well by the people on Second St.

Bypass Crossings

- * There are 8 proposed crossings

Transit

- * Continue current transit services, all of which are currently provided by other entities
- * Coordinate with new transit service from McMinnville to Portland
- * Support of park and ride for commuter transit
- * Require design elements on arterial to support transit
- * No added costs to City

Bicycles and Pedestrians

- * Plan for bike lane on all arterial and major collectors
- * Plan for sidewalks on all arterial and collectors
- * Facilities should conform to ADA standards
- * New bike and pedestrian Facilities should be constructed in conjunction with street improvement projects

Funding

* Overall cost of system 307 million. Costs attributed to Bypass about 200 million. Of the 107 million left after Bypass 16 million will be Yamhill County's responsibility, 20 million for other ODOT projects which brings City system transportation improvements to about 70 million of those costs 22 million will be picked up by new development, and 31million will be raised by SDC's related improvements.

Dan Seeman - some ideas to bridge funding gap are increased SDCs, street maintenance fees maybe on the utility bill, sidewalk fee and LID's. Barton any other ideas you have considered?

Barton Brierley - a local gas tax may make up part of it.

Dan Seeman – comments on Advisory committee issues and comments

ORE 219 rerouting issue needs to be quantified, road system recommendation on county roads needs to be coordinated and ultimately included in County TSP, TSP should recommend need for ORE 99 refinement plan, sidewalks should be recommended on all arterial and collectors, Bypass project will include: transit system plan and bicycle facility plan. We will need a policy to be included in comprehensive plan stating that all transportation facilities must conform to ADA

The next steps are Commission hearings and City Council hearings on Final TSP.

Chair Van Noord opened up to public comment

Alan Fox -- I would like to state that ODOT will be a proponent of the TSP. We will be posting the Contact Sensitive Solutions report on the website. This report will not be conducted as a stand alone solution it will be integrated with future parts of the bypass design process. We are now in process of taking comments from report and having engineers analyzing to see what the consequences are. We plan to file final environment impact statement in November 2004. There are a number of issues raised in TSP that will be addressed in interchange management plans and will be dealt with on parcel by parcel positions. As a heads up the interchange management plans could be fairly contentious. We are already seeing proponents and opponents for increased commercial use. As far as the Transit part of the plan there is a little bit of ambiguity for providing, the way it is described it could be implied that it is part of the bypass What is described in TSP is what we assumed and used as a model. That level of transit service was a model. We are working with Yamhill County Transit Committee to develop a transit plan for the corridor. Same for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and it is not a given that bypass will include bicycle lane.

Dan Seeman - the issues that Mr. Fox just identified were the same as other meeting and I believe we are on the same wave length.

Roy Gathercoal, 2504 Haworth, Newberg, OR – I have two overall concerns, affordable housing and accessibility..

*transit is so important if you want to encourage area for affordable housing.

*transit options are limited - families are required to own multiple vehicles to support multiple jobs.

* suggestion take in consideration low income areas and target them for transit options accessibility within transportation system.

*Newberg is not in compliance in terms of accessibility to streets and sidewalks we are required to have a plan and it does not exist at this time.

* I think about it as a system wide problem, when looking at it, how one can get from one area of the city to another it is not acceptable to wait until the end of the project to have the safety.

Cathy Stuhr – 31100 NE Fernwood, Newberg, OR – I live on undeveloped area of Fernwood Rd. I would recommend if there isn't a system in place to force coordination between City and County for these areas.

Chair Van Noord- Is your property inside the urban reserve?

Cathy Stuhr - No. I am concerned with traffic coming from the new development.

Chair Van Noord - some coordination with the County is what you are recommending?

Cathy Stuhr – I think a bike path for Bypass is a great idea - too often we pass up opportunities to put in some unique areas for Newberg.

Lorrane Hall, 307 S. Edwards St, Newberg, OR, Second St. Citizens Committee – I am here to report on old business Second St. Citizens Committee returning after January meeting about info we communicated during that meeting. I am leaving packet for commissioners with information from meeting. I am very encouraged that the couplet plan has been put on the back burner at least until 2025. I have questions for Dan Seeman about reconstructing Second St. into major collector. It seems there is a conflict in information regarding Second St between pages 146 item 13 and page 113 regarding the curb to curb width and what the plan for type of lanes there will be.

Dan Seeman – there will be two travel lanes, and bike lanes both sides and parking on one side. We are not recommending that it be widened, but work with what is there for width. This street is a perfect example of statement that the Commission can make by having to decide how they want the streets to look.

Chair Van Noord - do you have a vision?

Lorrane Hall - We already have bike lanes on the two streets to the north not sure there is need for bike lanes maybe we could maintain parking.

John Bridges, 515 E. First St., Newberg, OR - refinement plan for 99W they want to put into TSP City and ODOT should talk about what 99W becomes in the future after Bypass, I think that is short of what we should do we should be more clear the City's position is on the jurisdiction. They city should have control of the roadway. Need to say we will take jurisdiction over it when ODOT builds bypass.

Commissioner Smith - concerned with issue. If we take ownership we would have to pay for it. Practical difference if we can keep a good hand in making the decisions and still have ODOT pay.

John Bridges - I think that it is worth the expense to maintain the control of how the course of the traffic flows. ODOT is good now and has been working with us, that may not be the same in the future.

Commissioner Haug - I am completely ignorant of what the physical cost would be.

John Bridges – we could ask staff what they might be.

Barton Brierley – to give perspective, Brutscher to Main project, it was mostly a maintenance project and costs 12 million. Can foresee down the road we will probably have to do another project like that, and that doesn't cover the yearly maintenance.

John Bridges – with reduced usage on it, there would be reduced maintenance costs. The number of trips in 20 years will be the same as it is now, but will be all cars and few trucks. I asked can we meet level of service we need with 2 lanes and the answer was yes. We apply a different standard on our local streets.

Dan Seeman - once Bypass is constructed ORE 99W couplet will not be a state travel route it will be downgraded to district travel route. Relegating to district level it lowers the standard of vehicle capacity.

John Bridges - level of service we have in city system is significantly higher than is allowed on state highways.

Commissioner Haug - since you are involved in downtown can you address analysis of 4 different options on movement of ORE 219?

John Bridges - I heard them say they tried to analyze neighborhoods. I didn't read that section of the report but it made sense to do the route that you suggested. Thought the old plan was to return that area to lower usage.

Commissioner Brittell - analysis of information on 219 rerouting is not in the plan not trying to downgrade work but would like to see that information.

John Bridges - adding to bypass adds to magnitude of interchange.

Commissioner Smith - recommend take a 5 minute break at 9:05pm

Chair Van Noord reconvened at 9:15pm

Commissioner Haug – in regards to the traffic advisory committee who are they and where they live. I would like to see some documentation about the 219 issue.

Dan Seeman - short discussion about 219 rerouting decision was inadvertently deleted from the plan as a clerical error. What is important to happen tonight is to identify those issues that are important to you and bring to the hearing. Want to make one important point there are about 120 vehicle during the busiest point of the day that actually will follow through that route of 219 through downtown all the way to the north end.

Commissioner Haug - surprised that using Springbrook St. was not a viable plan for rerouting 219.

Dan Seeman - in terms of Springbrook alternative we took our direction from city staff they told us that the neighbor hood impacts were too great.

Barton Brierley - 1- 1994 TSP that option was considered and not accepted, 2 - this plan does not preclude going that direction if vehicles want to travel that way they will, conversely I don't know what would keep a driver from using existing 219, when you go up Springbrook there is high traffic at intersection of Springbrook & 99W already. Most of traffic traveling ORE 219 is not going to Hillsboro. They are going into the downtown area and the existing 219 route provides that. If you shut that down it would make people have to go out of their way.

Commissioner Smith - my concern is that there is a nice improvement to College but on one stretch close to Hancock St., those improvements would destroy small neighborhood between Hancock St. and railroad tracks.

Barton Brierley – We can address it. This section of the road requires a specific creative design something other than the typical standard.

Commissioner Smith - if we can have a state highway that can be narrow we are going to have to do some specific planning.

The commission had a discussion of bike paths in towns.

Dan Seeman - speed limit would probably stay the same and be accommodating to bikers.

Make suggestions for TSP to develop special design plan for that particular stretch of College.

Commissioner Haug - reply to Barton's comments. If you reroute 219 to Springbrook would eliminate the problems with College.

Commissioner Smith - for our next meeting I would like to have an analysis of Springbrook and northern arterial connection from 219 to consider and analysis of leaving 219 where it is with the protection of College street between 1st st and the railroad tracks to the north.

Commissioner Brittell - who are the others that worked on the plan?

Dan Seeman - Kittleson was the prime consultant the other consultants brought more specific information to the plan.

Commissioner Brittell - TSP restricted to UGB and URA are you going to continue to study and report to County for the reserve are? And why were you so interested in extending the frontage road.

Dan Seeman - it is just a frontage road and part of it is called Hayes St. TSP restricted to UGB only is a state mandated rule. Bypass will sever access to 99W, the frontage road is the solution that has been worked out between the City and the property owner.

Commissioner Brittell - Where does frontage street go?

Barton Brierley - the frontage road is designed as a local access only.

Discussion of uses and access to frontage road, Corral Creek Rd, and Fernwood Rd area.

Alan Fox - think we will address a lot of these issues in the interchange management plan. This is a good interim guide as to what you want to see happen. After we get a better design idea we may have more options to present.

Commissioner Brittell - what I was trying to suggest is maybe this shouldn't be shown on the map to avoid petitioners at the public hearing. I didn't get that feeling from reading the material, I just got from Alan Fox.

Dan Seeman - we had a different set of lines 2 weeks ago but made changes from staff.

Barton Brierley - it is extremely important for staff that it be shown on map, it could prevent us from collecting development fees.

Dan Seeman - maybe a reasonable solution is to provide a blurry line with out identifying a specific location.

Commissioner Brittell - there are also 2 other areas identified as a special design area maybe this could be a third.

Commissioner Haug - comment on issues we need to deliberate on. Would like to have information from slide from comments from Technical Advisory Committee.

Dan Seeman - they wanted to see a greater amount of discussion.

Commissioner Smith - Discussion of bicycle facility plan and having a well marked north-south and east-west plan and how long before these can be implemented.

Barton Brierley - in my previous employment, they planned to build bike bridge across the Rogue River, and it happened, not everything you plan happens but if you don't plan for it, it won't happen.

Roy Gathercoal - There needs to be greater discussion about the importance of accessibility.

Commissioner Brittell - We understand your position.

Chair Van Noord - The language for ADA is in the Transportation Plan. The problem is getting it done.

Roy Gathercoal - I am not willing to set back and see TSP get passed and the accessibility issues to be put on the back burner. Number one priority should be to get into compliance.

Commissioner Brittell - is this a project that is in the works in the area of the high school.

Barton Brierley - Hopefully, we have applied for the funding.

Roy Gathercoal - his point is that the City is required to have a plan for steps to make the City ADA accessible, and the City doesn't even have the plan yet. The accessibility issue needs to come before the TSP plan.

Paul Chiu - east-west bike route on Mountain View, the route east of Villa Rd is in the County and not a lot can do about it. We are making efforts to have these routes.

Barton Brierley - there will be a hearing on this on November 10th, a reminder it is a Wednesday meeting.

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items

Chair Van Noord - I think it is appropriate that we approve minutes before they go to council.

Barton Brierley - There is an issue of timing . Whenever we can, we do supply them after they have been approved. Would you want to have special meetings to approve minutes?

Commissioner Haug - if minutes have to go to Council and we have not approved they need to clearly understand that they have not been approved.

Chair Van Noord - If there is a timing problem, perhaps staff could e-mail the minutes to the Planning Commission and ask if they see any major problems. Planning Commissioners could let staff know before the minutes go to the City Council. They wouldn't be officially approved, but we would know if there are major problems.

Barton Brierley - This sounds like an excellent idea. We can implement that.

Barton Brierley - The Council did consider the policies that were recommended on they bypass they did pass the policies. I took Commissions new motion to Council and asked if they wanted to accept into the record and they did not. Also the whole plan has been appealed to the land use appeals. I received 10 appeal notices, among them 1000 friends, Roger Grahn, Charlie Harris.

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence

Barton Brierley - a new assistant planner has been hired. Her name is Harper Kalen.

3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: October 27, 2004

Barton Brierley - there are 2 hearings scheduled - 1 application for subdivision/2 application zone change

VII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Councilor Larson – I would like to talk about forwarding resolutions to City Council tonight.

As an example of my point the Golf Course that is going in CPRD took over golf course and we were all surprised that this had happened when we found out about it a few months ago. Not in opposition of golf course just in opposition of the process of how it came about.

I would like to talk about the Werth property and the people living in The Oaks. There have been articles in the *Graphic* about the administrative zoning change that took place in regards to the property across from The Oaks. People who purchased property in The Oaks were lead to believe that property across Brutscher St. was residential-professional and then the zoning was administratively changed to industrial. Now they have their new homes across the street from potential industrial property. Stanton Furniture manufacturing is looking at property. I'm not objecting to a manufacturing facility but I personally feel that when a new person moves to our community believing something and then it is changed without a public hearing I don't feel it is right.

I discussed The Oak situation with 2 city councilors this week, they were not aware that Stanton Furniture was going to build on property across from the Oaks.

Offer for Commission to send resolution to Council to reverse zoning change on property across from The Oaks. I think at the very least there needs to be a public hearing.

Commissioner Haug - some of the things you say I would vote yes but I would like to know who the people are that you discussed this with.

Commissioner Larson - board member CPRD- Mike McBride, Councilors Larson and Boyes.

Commissioner Haug - I would support requesting them to review that decision and have a public hearing. They need to gather the information of all the impacts that this situation created. We need to express our concerns about having a public hearing.

Commissioner Brittell - important to get Barton's input on this. There was a public forum. They are working it out and there are not that many people that are opposed to this one main person.

Commissioner Haug - it could be that it is being blown out of proportion.

Commissioner Larson - my premise is that in fairness to the public, they need to have some input in the form of a public hearing on this kind of change. The issue is that there are actions being taken without public review.

Discussion of how to change the process for administrative changes.

Barton Brierley – the Springbrook Oaks Specific Plan was developed in 1999 that plan had 280 acres divided into various areas. It was built in the plan that small zone changes could be made as long as there was not significant change in acreage percentages.

Chair Van Noord - is there a way that these people that are affect get together and request a hearing.

Chair Van Noord - is there a way that these people that are affected^{ed} get together and request a hearing?

Barton Brierley - yes

MOTION: Larson/Haug recommend to Council that they have a public hearing to review the administrative zone change to property on NE corner Brutscher and Fernwood with the possibility of reversing the decision . 4 Yes / 1 Abstain (Brittall) Motion Passed.

Commissioner Larson - suggested public review of housing development plans.

Commissioner Haug - take an incremental approach, if you ask for too much you aren't going to get anywhere.

Commissioner Haug - there is development that should have some public hearing that doesn't have it now. If we review the development code we will probably find more than one instance where this needs to be considered.

MOTION: Smith/Haug Recommend to council initiate a review of possible places in development code where greater public input may be needed. Motion Passed.

Barton Brierley – at the end of year some Commission terms expire Van Noord/Tri/Schmitz if you would like to reapply please do so or if you know someone interested get others to apply.

VIII. ADJOURN

Chair Van Noord adjourned meeting at 11:35p.m.

Approved by the Planning Commission this 10 th day of November, 2004.

AYES: 4

NO: 0

ABSENT: 3
(List Name(s)): Larson
Schmitz
Haug

ABSTAIN: 0
(List Name(s)):



Planning Recording Secretary

 11-10-04

Richard Van Noord Date