



## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

January 22, 2004

7 p.m. Special Workshop Meeting  
Newberg Public Safety Building  
401 E. Third Street

APPROVED AT THE MARCH 11, 2004 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

### I. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLL CALL

#### Planning Commission Members Present:

Dwayne Brittell  
Philip Smith

Matson Haug  
Nick Tri, Chair

Louis Larson  
Richard Van Noord

**Absent:** Dennis Schmitz

#### Staff Present:

Barton Brierley, City Planner  
David Beam, Economic Development Coordinator/Planner  
Dan Danicic, Engineering  
Peggy Hall, Recording Secretary

### II. OPEN MEETING

**Chair Tri** opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and announced the procedure for testifying. Citizens must fill out a Public Comment Registration form to be able to speak at the meeting.

### III. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

**MOTION: Larson/Haug** to appoint Richard Van Noord as Chair. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Schmitz]). Motion carried.

Discussion was held concerning Commission members rotating the position of Chair. and Dennis Schmitz being Chair. for the next rotation.

**MOTION: Haug/Smith** to appoint Dennis Schmitz as Vice Chair - (5 No/1 Yes Smith)

Discussion was held concerning Mr. Schmitz' attendance at meetings.

**MOTION: Haug/Larson** to appoint Philip Smith as Vice Chair. (6 yes/1 Absent [Schmitz]). Motion carried.

### IV. CONSENT CALENDAR (items are considered routine and are not discussed unless requested by the commissioners)

1. Approval of November 13, 2003 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Chair Van Noord** entertained a motion for approval of the Minutes

**MOTION: Haug/Tri** to approve the November 13, 2003 minutes. (6 Yes/1 Absent [Schmitz]). Motion carried.

### V. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR (5 minute maximum per person)

1. For items not listed on the agenda

### VI. SPECIAL WORKSHOP

Downtown Transportation Planning

**Mr. Barton Brierley** reviewed the staff report providing a history of the Plan and stating that tonight is a workshop soliciting more input. They are not reviewing specific proposals at this time. Prior workshops discussed bicycle and pedestrian traffic. They are very important things, but will not be discussed tonight. They are not creating a detailed Downtown Plan. A plan that would look specifically into how to change street patterns, not details like street trees. They will discuss big issues but not specific detail. In 1986 the City created a Downtown Development Plan that addresses what the streets, benches, and street trees should look like. The plan has many ideas, some are applicable and some are outdated. There are a few recommendations to follow to complete the Plan for 2006. Planning takes

money and commitment. Another effort was the declared future for downtown for 2020 - vision. In there, it has visions of the transportation system. These will be considered tonight.

1. Definite need and effort to revitalize downtown
2. Bypass is projected 8-10 years away- there are a lot of opportunities when the bypass is built - truck traffic will take a lot of that away.
3. Money - we need to see where the money comes from to do it.
4. PROBLEMS:
  - A. Traffic volumes
  - B. Traffic speeds
  - C. Truck traffic
  - D. Pedestrian conflicts
  - E. One-way only access
5. Strategies:
  - A. Street system alternatives - Main Street Handbook (11/99) with case studies - one of which is Newberg.
  - B. Lane configurations alternatives
  - C. Parking Configurations
  - D. Other elements; curb extensions, crosswalks and medians, etc.
6. Two-way streets
  - A. Pros
    1. Business visibility both ways
    2. Easier access
    3. Slower speeds
  - B. Cons
    1. Less traffic volumes accommodated
    2. Turning movements: may need more lanes
    3. Pedestrians just look both ways

**Mr. Brierley** said that a lot of downtown areas have one way streets and some have gone back to two-way streets - if you can have two way streets -you should.

#### 7. How to Change First Street to A Two-Way Street -

Re-route eastbound traffic to Second Street or? (Unknown). Mr. Brierley reviewed the 1986 plan for traffic flow. The Planning Commission reviewed this - and smoothed out the curves. The example still shows traffic going through buildings and taking out real estate to do this. The east end of Second Street would avoid the Hoover Minthorn House.

8. Second Street Re-Routing:
  - A. Pros
    1. Make First Street two way
    2. Make First Street a destination rather than a path to get somewhere else
  - B. Cons
    1. Impacts on Second Street
    2. Costs a big factor
    3. Land/buildings used
    4. Customer traffic re-routed also
    5. Extended downtown traffic area
    6. Longer distance

We would like to see what other people's experiences have been. The Fire Station on Second Street has had issues.

9. Change Lane Configurations
  - A. There are 3 lanes on First and Hancock Street each way
  - B. Each is two way possible post-bypass

10. Reduce to Two Lanes
  - A. Pros
    1. Extra space for parking; angled parking; wider sidewalks
    2. Traffic calming

- 3. Shorter crossing for pedestrians
- B. Con
  - 1. Less traffic capacity
  - 2. Costs of reconfiguration

#### 11. Parking Configurations

- A. Parallel, angled and parking lots
- B. Angle Parking
  - 1. Pros
    - a. More spaces; easier to enter; traffic calming; downtown "feel"
  - 2. Cons
    - b. More difficult to exit; more accidents possible; takes more width; would require special state approval
  - 3. Special Transportation area gives flexibility on how to design traffic flow, parking and other elements

#### 12. Curb Extensions

- A. Pros
  - 1. Shorter pedestrian crossing; traffic calming; more sidewalk width and aesthetic opportunities; i.e. sidewalk sales
- B. Cons
  - 2. Some cost; limits parking (though parking not allowed near crosswalks).

#### 13. Crosswalk improvements

#### 14. Medians

- A. Pros
  - 1. Aesthetics: pedestrian refuge; traffic calming
- B. Con
  - 1. Limited applicability; costs; maintenance; limits turning

**John Bridges, 515 E. First Street Newberg**, an attorney who has an office building and law practice on First Street that is directly impacted. He has specific ideas, but it occurred to him the City offices were closed on Monday for Martin Luther King's birthday. One lesson he learned is to have vision and NOT accept what other people tell you what you have to have for your life/community. This is an opportunity to think outside the box and create a plan that will allow us to reach goals loftier than can be imagined. ODOT is dictating how downtown Newberg exist as a community. He thinks there are obvious opportunities that exist for our community if a bypass does occur. We would drastically sell ourselves short if we don't plan for a better community. We ought to be looking at a two pronged approach, what we can take advantage of if there is a bypass. We need to have a dual plan, with and without a bypass (or until it is done). As a business owner in the community and someone who has had to interact with government, he is not satisfied with just doing what they tell us to do. The goals, in the short term, ought to be cost efficiency and returning the couplet of 2 lanes on First Street and on Hancock. ODOT said that it could happen if the bypass is built. Once the bypass is built, trucks will be gone, but there will still be 22,000 cars a day. Now, the 22,000 figure would enable us to reduce traffic from 3 lanes to 2 lanes. If traffic is reduced from 3 to 2 lanes, he prefers diagonal parking which will result in slower and quieter traffic. Why 2 lanes with couplet (cars through)? Where else on Hwy 99W is there 3 lanes, in Dundee there is only one lane). To the east, there is a small segment with 3 lanes and a median that does not allow pedestrians. Travel through King City and Tigard is accomplished with two lanes, we ought to be able to manage. All those places are not the same as couplet and built for pedestrian friendly activity. He has not researched one his own, but encourages research to see if the couplets are good for the pedestrian friendly businesses. He also recognized that ODOT would not move that far. Second Street is a \$10 million waste of money.

**Commissioner Larson** said if we go to one way from two way we create an island for downtown and cut it off from the rest of the community. Mr. Bridges said that we don't have \$10 million to do the work.

**Commissioner Haug** asked Mr. Bridges his thoughts on slowing down traffic on First and Hancock Streets. Mr. Bridges said that the speed should be reduced, but there is an enforcement issue. Discussion was held concerning speed bumps, lights and diagonal parking. Mr. Bridges said diagonal parking requires traffic entering and exiting the lanes. One way people drive faster. Mr. Bridges said to slow down, pedestrian lights should have more control over traffic. The focus of your vision ought to be that this segment is completely built and committed as a pedestrian zone. Let's recognize that our road needs to change if that is to happen. When was this a viable, walk able area, at least 20 years ago. Mr. Bridges said a pedestrian zone is completely building a high density urban area and the goal in that high density urban area is to encourage pedestrian traffic vs Portland Road.

#### SIDE 2 - TAPE 1:

**Mr. Bridges** said the reason most businesses failed is we are not giving them an opportunity .

**Alan Fox ODOT** - he does not speak for ODOT on this matter, this is an operational matter, Regional Maintenance and Operations people. In the Main Street Handbook, a bypass or Special Transportation area is offered as an alternative. When you don't have a bypass, you can accept a higher level of congestion with greater flexibility with design standards. Maybe you want to have an alternative strategy. He is doing everything he can to make the project a reality. Would you ask ODOT to help design if there was not a bypass. Why have autos on first street at all? Make it a pedestrian mall bypass. Traffic is moving adequately now, but will increase by the time the bypass is complete. Future traffic volumes should be included when discussing options.

**Lorraine Hall, 114 S. Center (corner of Second and Center Street).** In May 2001 the Newberg Transportation Task Force decided to move traffic away from First Street and listed 18 projects and priorities. ODOT had no interest in seeing this happen. In the summer of 2002, the state was not interested in funding a new road bed. Another issue is that many people making suggestions did not realize 63% of those impacted are residents and there 37% businesses. Residents would lose front yards and it would condemn them to a dismal future they didn't intend when they invested in their property. Mr. Dave Bishop said that ODOT would be tied up in court. She is not sure why this was split into two one-ways. It is frustrating to even consider this and sacrifice the residential, the schools, the churches and the fire station. It needs to be off the list and stay off it. Don't think of turning Second Street into a State Road. Why aren't we using the creative approach. We did not need to knuckle under to ODOT. We should fight to get back down to 2 lanes

**Alan Fox** said that the reasons given seem to be logical, but there is a lot of demand on the few dollars available. He said it didn't seem likely. They are guarding the money for the bypass. The issue of jurisdictional transfer of Hwy 99W should be discussed at negotiations for street improvements etc., with Newberg taking back Hwy 99W. While the jurisdictional transfer is an assumption with the bypass policy, it is not a given. Is it more functional as a State Highway or inner-urban issue?

**Commissioner Haug** said that John Bridges mentioned traffic calming. What could ODOT recommend that would be reasonable, and make it a little safer and more comfortable to walk down into the area and still handle traffic. Speed bumps are not on the list. There are flashing lights and strobe lights. Mr. Fox said the book has ideas on traffic calming. It is fairly well accepted that an urban structure with wider sidewalks, street tree plantings, medians and bulb-outs have a calming effect. Mr. Fox said he is not the planner for the area and he cannot speak to those issues while representing ODOT. He is the project leader for the bypass not the planner for the Transportation Plan. He can only put out ideas for review on the Transportation System.

**Commissioner Smith** said, suppose the City comes up with various, creative proposals for slowing traffic, what would be the criteria to apply to these proposals. Mr. Fox said it is already at 25 mph and they are not obeying it. Traffic calming is the way to go that does not take any change to th. Try to see if they can really live with that. His idea is to get more officers to ticket people. Discussion was held concerning raising the fines for a money making proposal. Commissioner Haug proposed a \$250 fine if speeding. Mr Fox said that in Amity the police enforce it and fines are double in school areas.

**Commissioner Brittell** asked about Ms. Hall's statements about 63/37% for land for Second Street couplets. He can't see more than 17 residences and does not have anything to do with problems with residences and businesses. Ms. Hall said the proposal was for a much longer section of Second Street. There are quite a few apartments, she encouraged the Commissioner to walk the neighborhood, take with the people, count the houses and businesses and find out for himself. These are huge decisions that impact people's lives. Commissioner Brittell said that he challenges the length of Second Street (full length of it).

**Commissioner Haug** said that Mr Bridges said, even if we put traffic off First and onto Second, no one will be able to get inside that area. The question has to be asked and answered, if we make Second Street a highway, would it really help? Ms. Hall said when asked, as the proposal reads, would they be for it or against it, 99% of the people said NO. What about store front space and who would be interested in the back of the store? The committee made a two page recommendation for improvements.

**Kristen Horn, 610 E. Sheridan Street, also the President of Downtown Association** dittoed what Mr. Bridges said. He said it is a good time to say that he and a lot of people assumed that she was proponent of Second Street strategy even though she had never expressed it. She is in favor of doing something, but not waiting for the elusive bypass to happen. We have to come up with a better plan. We need to take the bull by the horns and do something. She dittoed John's comments. She said moving Second Street is not a good idea. She lives downtown and it is worth demanding improvements. We have to project the National Historic buildings from the large trucks streaming by the buildings. We have not taken appropriate measures to protect the downtown area.

Attachment "B : " (Downtown Vision) Some were with us at the time the vision meetings were held in 2000, and they worked hard passing out flyers to the community. They had 125 people at the first meeting and it was the most

successful meeting the City had ever seen. That document and what the majority of the people wanted was discussed. There was a lot of public input. The proposal said we would do two-way streets.

**Commissioner Brittell** - read the statement from paragraph 3 which is Exhibit B. Ms. Horn said there was a very well attended City wide meeting dealing with that. The citizens involved said that was absolutely not what they wanted and would not go along with it. She remembered that the City said they would take it out of the mix. Ms. Horn said the future fair was that the bypass was not a reality. One of the things brought up was that the bypass may never happen and we have to have that traffic flow. She believes the bypass is going to happen and the plans we make now for the downtown should assume it will happen.

**Commissioner Haug** said there is a problem with money, the URD fell apart. The idea of slowing down traffic as a means to generate funds. Commissioner Haug asked how are we going to raise money. Is it too late to rebuild the road and we get Hancock Street. Ms. Horn said having 3 lanes allows us to have 2 lanes and have a center area or more parking. Discussion was held to get back to the 2-way First Street and Hancock and City ownership with highway down the middle and slow it down. Ms. Horn said we can't say it can't happen and we have to be forceful and do this.

**Bill Womack, 304 W. First Street** said that it would drastically affect them. Mr. Bridges is right on the money. We need to make do with what we have. We don't have the money to make it happen and we need to make do with what we have. The traffic is faster than the posted speed. He would like to slow the traffic outside of Newberg. They take the back roads to McMinnville. It is difficult to listen to sometimes, it is like the tail wagging the dog. We need to set up Newberg to provide money and safety for her citizens. He is hoping the bypass will come through and the traffic will be reduced. People that live here know the streets. The people that drive through, speed. There has to be an alternative to spending money on Second Street. Mr. Womack said Germany has speed traps. We need to reduce the labor factor.

**Sally Dallas, 115 N. College Street**, also on the budget committee and owner of the Newberg Frame Shop, said if we do not have a vision for the future it would never happen. We encourage commercial businesses. She does not want to see things stifled and we have to assume and make things improve. Think positive.

**Commissioner Haug** said of the 1986 Plan: How much of that Plan was not completed? Ms. Dallas has to think beyond what a few have brought into the community. We have to sell it to the community.

**Commissioner Smith** addressed downtown being pedestrian friendly. Does pedestrian friendly go along with economic development? Ms. Dallas said a pedestrian mall did not go well in Eugene.

**Michael Sherman, Fire Chief, 1307 Brook Drive, Newberg**, 80% of the Fire Department are volunteers. We dealt with the Second Street detour and it was a nightmare. It does not mean it cannot happen, but there are complications. He lived in a community in California that chose years ago to take what was proposed as a 3 lane road to improve the traffic flow and turned it into 2 lanes. It went down for about 8-10 blocks and traffic slowed down. The speed limit was not an issue, traffic could only go 15-20 mph. There are ways to think outside the box. If we don't - our kids will be dealing with the same problems.

Discussion was held concerning the cost to convert to 2-way. Mr Bridges said reducing from 3 lanes to 2 on Hancock and First Street.

**Lon Wall, 625 N. Morton, Newberg** spoke on the following issues

A. In his capacity as representative from the department of redundancy, John and he have been on opposite sides. As an attorney, he was absolutely brilliant and his comments and ideas were right on. He thinks a lot of things and attitudes have changed. We need not speak up for our benefit, we cannot be deterred from that.

B. Regardless of details, when he sat on the body for 6 years, many times they were told they could not do things on First and Hancock Streets because ODOT did not want it. Do we really want to concede the right of way to ODOT.

C. If the City of Newberg and the County of Yamhill do not make a commitment to deal with residential growth, our discussions tonight and this hearing are really a superfluous joke without planning. Hyper growth is right at our doorstep and we will have bigger problems.

**Kathy Thelander, 212 W. First Street, Newberg**, as Lorraine and others mentioned in the 2001 meetings - she was told that Second Street would be taken off the 1986 Plan. She said when she received the notice she was surprised. Her home is a 1916 bungalow and she loves small towns. As a single parent she works hard, she puts up with traffic has complained about air brakes, and sees that her house is on the chopping block and she takes offense.

**Commissioner Haug** said it was a Transportation Task Force work shop and they will go through the recommendations to the Council. They have to sort through them. We want to make a recommendation -adopt city

ordinances and city laws. Their group was lead to believe that it would be removed from the board. Commissioner Haug said that they will be feeling this out and there is a lot of opposition to go Second Street. The detour was a negative experience on Second Street

**Commissioner Brittell** said that it has not worked. He hoped that the Police Chief would be in attendance to here the discussion that was being held and add his input.

**Andrew Stevens, 210 W. Second, Newberg**, said when they were working on Hancock there were a lot of accidents and traffic issues and 9-1-1 was called many times.

**Chair Van Noord** asked if anyone had any bad experience during the Second Street detour. Ms. Horn said the two-way traffic had positive feedback.

] Discussion was held concerning a positive statement of Second Street. Mr. Stevens said that the echoes coming out of Nap's were separate transportation/traffic issues.

**Bill Leaser, 300 Green Valley Drive**, work done on Hwy 99W had improved Newberg and made it a nice town rather than a dumpy town. He sees nothing wrong with the set-up and it is a big improvement. He does not shop downtown Newberg, there is no place to park. He has lived here since 1968 has not walked the streets of Newberg in years. We have to do something to slow the traffic down. We need to be doing something with the parking problems. The Second Street bypass route meant that most people were not taking the cutoff and going through town both ways.

**Commissioner Larson** said the issue was on Second Street. He did have an opportunity to talk with City Manager Duane Cole and thought Second Street was off the table. He also was surprised. The hassle of what we went through when Hancock Street was built and there was an opportunity to drive through. There were many days First Street had difficulty in processing the flow of traffic.

**Commissioner Brittell** said he has other questions to staff:

A. Was the Plan of 1986 adopted by the Council and the Planing Commission. Mr. Brittell said he believed it was but was not sure, Mr Brierley said he was not sure.

B. Comprehensive Plan not changed since 2000? Mr. Brierley said not substantively, especially in the transportation area.

C. Are following goals and plans important -

1. Section - (D) policies - relates to downtown This goes along with John Bridges and others' testimony - slow down traffic and look alternatives.

2. Goal 3 - alternative transportation -

3. Goal 4- emphasis-desire to provide alternate routes and it was strong and the re-routing of Hwy 219 around to the east - we need to talk about this.

4. He feels we need not to look at several layouts. \$8-10M is realistic and it would be ridiculous to spend more money. He had hoped that the State of Oregon and ODOT would to work together and look at goals and policies and make them work. The 1986 study was a good study. Why are we not looking at it more. Discussion was held concerning putting it aside. It was a forum for future plans. We are talking about traffic. The 1986 is an excellent plan. The plan may cost less than \$2M by rounding out corners and rounding off corners now. Maybe recommend it again to the Council.

**Commissioner Haug** discussed routing the highway to First and Second Street. First Street is two way and part of the 1986 Plan. He concurs with Kris Horn that they did a great job interacting with the committee so why reinvent the wheel and why are we even looking at transportation. Take it out of the hands of ODOT. He is going to recommend to the council that the couplets at First Street, and that whole system be based on classifications of roads, (minor arterial similar to Mountainview). We only need one major arterial (bypass). The city would take control, maintain and improve it. It would be later on about 10 years. Make downtown Newberg a viable place to shop and live. The 1986 mapping is different than that currently proposed. The 1986 mapping follows the current roads. Some of the ideas of the 1986 Plan are outdated.

**Commissioner Haug** addressed Hwy 219 and Hwy 240. Move them to the arterial and bypass and not have them even come into the city. We should get significant City interest. Take Hwy. 219 to St. Paul and it follows the bypass to past Villa Road and to the airport until it connects to the bypass. Hwy 240 then would eventually connect to the northern arterial. Would it help the livability of the town. Discussion was held concerning make this a high priority.

**Commissioner Haug** said there is a difference in the current and the 1986 Plan. The 1986 Plan is consistent with the livability. Use what we have and improve it. Use what we have in the most constructive way.

**Commissioner Larson** said that it appeared we are still making Second Street one-way east. Discussion was held concerning both ends of Second Street being one-way, thereby making Second Street more accessible. We need to see what the plan says and whatever works on Hancock and Second Street, same zone. Take traffic off First Street to have the full capacity.

**Commissioner Smith** said if the City goes through the trouble of making a plan we should not ignore the plan in our current thinking. We don't need to look at the Second Street Plan with curves as the only option. Discussion was held concerning the 1986 Plan. Testimony for the new Plan was not favored by the audience. We should consider the earlier Plan, he is concerned about the costs of adopting the Plan. Tonight we have to work on the primary goal and the testimony tonight is to make downtown pedestrian friendly. The 1986 Plan has the same goal in mind with specific details. He likes the ideas presented by Mr. Bridges with the two road couplet. We ought to examine and use that.

**Commissioner Haug** said that in using what we have, there are no trees in the area from the older Plan, we can significantly enhance the area with a canopy of trees. We agree to incorporate the idea from 1986 without changing the streets.

**Commissioner Smith** said much of the parking for Newberg is off Second Street. There will be an increase in traffic on Second Street anyway, but the improvements projected encourage traffic to slow down.

## **Tape 2 - Side 2**

Discussion was held concerning the people driving through and not necessarily parking downtown. Discussion was held concerning traffic in 1986. 20,000 on Hancock and 20,000 on First Street (cars now)

**Mr. Daniel Seeman** said the numbers are in the Downtown Development Plan. The volumes are about 15-1700 in the west bound direction and 1500-2000 in the east bound direction during the peak hour. Multiply by 10 for the daily volume. The traffic volume for the two streets combined is 27-32,000 vehicles each day. It takes 3 lanes to get through town. This is a volume to capacity standard. State Highways are designated at this level. This is a statewide traffic and truck route until the bypass is constructed. The highway through Newberg is a standard. Any attempt to slow down the traffic would be met with resistance. Mr. Seeman is addressing traffic lanes. It is important to note this. Discussion was held concerning Tigard traffic (through downtown). Discussion was held concerning proceeding with going from 3 lanes to 2 lanes. ODOT is seriously pursuing the bypass. At that point you can have this road through Newberg and a lower order of highway taken over by Newberg and can operate as two lanes in each direction of the couplet.

**Ms. Horn** said she disagrees. She has attended meetings with ODOT and representatives from other cities. They worked with ODOT to achieve their goals, work out compromises and make things happen. ODOT will work with people, but we have to have a plan. Who is the person at ODOT to share the vision? Mr. Fox said that structural improvements to First Street with the jurisdictional transfer discussion is a give and take and you have the strongest leverage. ODOT has a planning section in the interim. They need to be talking to ODOT planning people with specific proposals. The director has taken a positive approach and will say yes when possible. There are realities of traffic volumes to deal with but they are always willing to listen to a reasonable proposal.

Discussion was held concerning the traffic volume of 1986 (figure 4), summer weekday traffic and peak hour volumes; 15,500 in one direction and 14,600 in another. There were about 30,000 cars in 1986 and today there is a slight increase. The seasonal factor is about 30% higher than the average annual volume.

**Mr. Brierley** said that you can estimate average daily traffic, but in fact the average daily traffic is higher, especially during the peak hours.

**Commissioner Brittell** asked how Kittleson is involved because of the decisions to be made by the southern bypass? Mr. Seeman said they have two plans to be coordinated. We need to discuss local things.

Discussion was held about how much traffic would be taken away from the downtown area. Mr. Seeman said it will not take out as much as eastern areas, about 40% which will increase 50-60,000 over the next 20 years. In 20 years they can expect about a 20,000 growth. There is a fairly constant growth of traffic.

**Chair Van Noord** asked about the casino traffic on the weekend. Mr. Seeman said ODOT is designing into the system a reasonable worst case scenario. Also involves beach traffic.

**Commissioner Brittell** noted discrepancies in what is happening. He hears from good sources that the bypass is not planned to have more than two lanes in each direction, but is taking land for 4 lanes in each direction. What about the cost to add more lanes? They are still planning on Main and Hancock being the State Highways. The goal of NDTIP is to be compatible with other ODOT efforts.

**Mr. Alan Fox** noted they are planning for four lanes. It is twice as wide during the corridor, it is an environmental study and there is room to be flexible in a four lane road. Secondly, Transportation System Plan adopts a different role for Hwy 219 and Hwy 240. ODOT is working with the City and will not meddle in their plans, if the City wants to change the Plan ODOT will respond to it. The letter is well stated. Why hasn't ODOT planned for 6 lane traffic versus having to maintain the corridor downtown. Mr. Fox said they have projected the volume of traffic through the reduction of congestion in Newberg and Dundee. The function of Hwy 99W after the bypass is built is not resolved. The bypass policy of the State assumes that it is not 100%, but the bypass would be on the table for discussion and possible

transfer back to local jurisdiction ( negotiations with give and take). The function that the road serves after the bypass may just be a district highway and not a State Highway. It is not an automatic jurisdictional transfer back to the City. There are a lot of issues to resolve including the percentage of traffic and the reasonableness of how we can take care of it.

**Mr. Brierley** said they accomplished the goal set for hearing issues of the Commission and the public. The comments will be noted and will be part of the record.

## **VII. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

### **A. Update on Council items**

**Mr. Brierley** said they heard a conditional use permit for Granite Motor Sports, applicants appealed to the Council. The Council considered the appeal and it was successful. The applicants were not able to speak at the hearing, but they were able to submit written argument. The Council voted to uphold the Commission's decision with the exception that they were not allowed to display vehicles in parking lot for advertising purposes. They cannot do it in landscape area. Discussion was held concerning removal of auto related businesses in the downtown area. It could not be any clearer and stick to the intent of the ordinances. It is a contradiction to the purpose of allowing auto businesses back in the downtown area.

**Councilor Soppe** said he went through the notes handed with correction with requirement number 9 and he was looking for the logic behind it. Findings have to be tied to criteria. Restrictions are based upon city ordinances. Councilor Soppe said that they pass the resolution to things on the record (not a thorough record). A discussion was held concerning having the record be correct. Unfortunately it was not taken. Councilor Soppe said that he did not see the correction in the minutes, the discussion and what was deliberated. When we make a decision it has to be tied to criteria and dealing with findings. Discussion was held concerning the minutes not reflecting the discussion of the matter.

**Commissioner Brittell** referred to item 3 and read the statement for the purpose of findings.

**Commissioner Larson** addressed the appeal at the January 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr Larson said that on January 20<sup>th</sup> the business had a vehicle in the landscape area which was in contrast to what was allowed.

**Councilor Soppe** said he spoke with the auto repair business owners and they asked about Newberg Ford's compliance. He said two other dealerships on Portland Road have similar situations but it has now pretty much vanished. Discussion was held concerning the downtown (C-3) zone and the highway and about notifying Mr. Brierley about compliance.

**Councilor Soppe** said this was his view about a commission's decision being overturned by the Council based on the information they have presented before them.

B. Other reports, letters, or correspondence - none

C. Next Planning Commission Meeting: February 12, 2004, They have a full agenda with 3 hearings.

## **VIII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS**

**Commissioner Larson** addressed a code violation for the property located at 3220 Juniper Drive. He said that he did not get a response from the Planning Department concerning the trees in the development not meeting the code. It was his understanding that we are or are not following code. We need specific standards and the public should be notified. If the tree code is not followed, what other codes are not being followed. Another house on Juniper got a completion notice before it was completed. The wallboard contractor showed up the next day to do more work even though it says it is completed? What does the completion notice mean - that the project is done? Commissioner Larson said that he has had a hard time dealing with it. Discussion was held concerning the tree size not being within code regulations. Commissioner Larson said his trees are 15 feet and in code compliance. Further discussion was held concerning compliance.

**Commissioner Smith** addressed testimony and transportation issues in relation to downtown development. What is the next step? He does not want to see the good input left alone. Mr. Brierley said the next step is to put together a draft plan as a proposal for review.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 p.m.

Passed by the Planning Commission of the City of Newberg this \_\_\_\_\_ day of March, 2004.



AYES: 5

NO: 0

ABSTAIN: 0  
(list names)

ABSENT: *Hang  
Schmitz*

ATTEST:

*Peggy Hall* *Peggy Hall* 3/11/04  
Planning Commission Recording Secretary Signature Print Name Date