

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 10, 2005

7 p.m. Regular Meeting

Newberg Public Safety Building

401 E. Third Street

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE FEBRUARY 24, 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

### I. ROLL CALL

Commissioners:	Dwayne Brittell Devorah Overbay Nick Tri	Philip Smith Louis Larson
Absent:	Matson Haug Daniel Foster	
Staff:	Barton Brierley Dan Danicic Dawn Nelson	

### II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Smith opened the meeting at 7:00 pm

### III. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of January 13, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION: TRI/LARSON** To approve consent calendar. [5Y / 0 N / 2 ABSENT (Haug/Foster)] Motion passed.

**Commissioner Larson** - Commissioner feels it is inappropriate to continue meeting without minutes from January 26, 2005 and it slights the speakers from that meeting by not having this information to review.

**Commissioner Overbay** - concur.

**Commissioner Tri** - concur.

**Commissioner Brittell** - concur. Maybe Barton could review issues in the packet and this would be a good time to ask questions of staff about their recommendations.

**Commissioner Larson** - move not to start deliberations tonight due to absence of meeting minutes from January 26, 2005, Commissioner Overbay seconded.

**Chair Smith** - Commissioner Brittell has suggested we listen to recommendations and ask staff questions what is the Commissions feeling.

**Commissioner Larson** - as a caveat to that I think we are going to have to have a detailed summary of tonight's meeting because there will be a disconnection between meetings.

**Commissioner Overbay** - think there may be a difference between asking questions for the purpose of clarifying things and it would be a good use of time tonight.

**Commissioner Tri** - good time to get some questions clarified.

**Commissioner Smith** - I'm not voting for motion would like to see us get some production out of tonight's meeting. I suggest we take 30 minutes and read the minutes.

**MOTION: LARSON/TRI** not to start deliberations tonight due to absence of meeting minutes from January 26, 2005 .  
[3Y / 2 N(Brittell/Smith) / 2 ABSENT(Haug/Foster)] Motion passed.

#### **IV. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR**

**Grace Schaad, 31525 NE Schaad Rd, Newberg** - would like to point out some ambiguity in wording for project 12, the Greens project memo dated January 31, 2005 the wording for this project calls for gated emergency road but on page 29 of TSP and page 17 of staff report there is no mention of that wording.

#### **V. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**NOTE: THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS CLOSED THIS HEARING TO TESTIMONY**

1. **REQUEST:** Adopt updated Transportation Plan, including amendments to the Development Code  
**FILE NO.:** GR-25-01

#### **Staff Report Presented by - Barton Brierley**

I'm not sure what information to give you since are not going to do any deliberating tonight. So I will cover major issues raised in public comments.

#### **219 Wilsonville Rd.**

**Commissioner Brittell** - heard that most of us feel that we are going to hold off deliberation till next meeting.

**Commissioner Smith** - the key issue is that we can't start making decisions tonight but seems to me that we should be free to ask staff questions to help when it comes to deliberation should be a good time for preliminary discussion otherwise we would be wasting evening.

**Commissioner Overbay** - I heard ODOT's version of what they want to do, is there another party that could give an unbiased decision.

**Barton Brierley** - Dan Seeman has been hired as transportation engineer not working for ODOT on this project.

**Dan Seeman** - want to disclose that Kittleson has been retained by ODOT to work on bypass project. You want to know if the recommendation provided to you by ODOT is reasonable. As part of the TSP project we considered many things outside of ODOT. He then went on to cover some of the options that Kittleson looked at.

Divert Wilsonville road southward outside of UGB to connect with Wynooski is a workable solution however there are a number of issues associated with it, which were the reasons we dismissed this option. The major reason it involves rerouting road outside UGB. There is a major goal exception issue there, also directing it southward is away from the flow of traffic. Most traffic using Wilsonville road are heading into Newberg.

The option that ODOT has recommended is the same option that Kittleson recommended in TSP, independent of ODOT's decision.

To simply add a traffic light at the existing intersection from an engineering standpoint and safety issue this would cause a build up of traffic and operationally issues and safety problems.

The long range realignment is outside the range of the interchange with the bypass. Our analysis confirms the same findings that ODOT has.

**Commissioner Overbay** - thank you

**Commissioner Smith** - staff also examined 2 stop lights. The staff report shows you get very long signal waits on the highway. Is that correct?

**Dan Seeman** - yes

**Commissioner Brittell** - on page 77 dealing with 3<sup>rd</sup> alternative item #22 table 5-4 and page 94 indicates Wilsonville road was rerouted to south to align with Wynooski. Not sure agree entirely with orientation of the Wilsonville road side, but I think it would be much smoother cleaner transition for Wilsonville road. Hard to envision any other solution than this one especially after highway is constructed.

**Dan Seeman** - you are referring to figure 5-6, it shows 2 projects #17 which reroutes Wynooski and project #22 which reroutes Wilsonville road, as I said this would work. What it results in is out of direction traffic.

**Commissioner Brittell** - doesn't feel that if it were done correctly it would cause out of direction traffic.

**Dan Seeman** - the reason for the direction is to maintain spacing required from bypass. Came out a quarter of a mile from the interchange - keep in mind this is a planning document. Trying to draw logical locations details would be refined at project level.

**Commissioner Brittell** - testimony from ODOT why #22 would not work but they said that #17 does work even though it goes through farm land. Why wasn't this alternative chosen other than it is easier because it would be an exception.

**Dan Seeman** - I can provide you with technical answers: these choices need to be made by the Commission. I can tell you that it wasn't chosen because it would create a greater amount of out of direction travel and routing a street that is serving urban traffic outside the city brings with it some exception problems.

**Commissioner Brittell** - do you agree that would improve connectivity to have on the south side of the bypass.

**Dan Seeman** - either option will work.

**Barton Brierley** - staff seriously looked at option and it would be an advantage never to have to cross the bypass. When we get more detailed info on bypass we may have to look at this option closer, when you come off of Wilsonville road most traffic heads north.

Project #17 does go into farm land but anything going north gets into the interchange area so Wynooski north of bypass doesn't work because of the airport and ravine. This was the best guess without detail of bypass. May move intersection to the south after details of the bypass are completed.

**Chair Smith** - could you summarize the difference between getting permission to build on farm land and annexing land.

**Barton Brierley** - statutes deal with putting road on farmland, road can't be used for urban usage and you have to explore alternatives. You could get an exception if you are realigning road it is easier to put in farm land. To annex land you have to show that usage can't go to other places within the city.

**Barton Brierley** - if we pretend that the bypass doesn't exist there is still a problem with a 5-legged intersection. It still doesn't work and still going to end up with the same situation.

**Chair Smith** - any other question? I think we are making good use of our time.

## **219/Second St intersection.**

**Commissioner Tri** - The staff report is not clear on how median would come about. I have a real hard time believing younger drivers would abide by that configuration.

**Dan Seeman** - what you would end up with is mountable curbs that are easily maneuverable by emergency vehicles.

## **East Newberg Issues**

Providence Drive is designated as a major collector down to Hayes Street. Hayes street will connect to Corral Creek under bypass.

**Chair Smith** - could you address timing of this project here.

**Barton Brierley** - connection between Springbrook Oaks and Corral Creek would not happen until safety improvements on Corral Creek, that is why it is currently only emergency access road. The next thing is modifications to the Corral Creek & 99W intersection. There will likely be some limitations at this intersection.

**Chair Smith** - Has the County had any discussions about this intersection limitation?

**Barton Brierley** - yes they have discussed but have not take any action yet. It is possible that it might be eliminated all together, then Corral Creek would become a dead end street with only one way in which leads to the frontage road. It is likely not to occur until after construction of bypass. Disconnect of 99W & Corral Creek could happen before that.

**Chair Smith** - if the County cuts off access before project 10, that leaves the residents in a bind. Could you explain serpentine alignment?

**Barton Brierley** - serpentine means it is not a straight shot. It has curves. For example, North Main has curves so that it is not abused as a straight shot. This is to keep speed down.

**Chair Smith** - it seems that drivers coming down project #10 would probably continue along Hayes St and not use Providence Dr.

**Barton Brierley** that is the reason that Providence continues down to Hayes

Discussion about traffic calming options, landscape medians, separating the bike path from road, using bulb outs at crossings these things give visualization for drivers to slow down.

**Commissioner Brittell** - from previous things said, question why are we concerned with connectivity in these areas when they are outside of city.

**Barton Brierley** - things we can do outside of UGB frontage road that provides access to properties, can do emergency access and encourages use of existing streets.

**Commissioner Brittell** - thinks those same reasons just stated would work also for previous Wyooski/Wilsonville problem.

**Barton Brierley** - frontage road solves problems if Corral Creek & 99W intersection is closed off.

**Commissioner Overbay** - how many employees will be at hospital, where will parking be?

**Barton Brierley** - parking will be on 99W side of hospital. I don't know how many employees.

### **Downtown Improvements**

**Chair Smith** - clarification on recommendation - I believe it to mean construction after bypass.

**Barton Brierley** - yes anticipate planning of bypass within the next 3 years.

**Commissioner Brittell** - in regards to the statement retention of postoffice downtown and occupancy of existing building, what jurisdiction does City have over federal building why would this be in the plan.

**Barton Brierley** - its something that the city as a policy wants to encourage. It is in the comprehensive plan under downtown policies.

It was decided that this topic was outside of the discussion of the TSP, the comprehensive plan does includes transportation policies.

Discussion of downtown design ordinance and it has been effective. Mr Brittell feels that the wording "control" is to strong of language.

Discussion of 219 continuation through downtown.

**Commissioner Brittell** - why are we so focused on some intersections and not others, such as Chehalem Drive/240; Main Street/Illinois/240, and College and Main Street. We haven't had any discussion on these.

**Barton Brierley** - we have had discussions about many of those intersections that are problems.

**Chair Smith** - is it fair to say that staff report is mostly in response to the public testimony.

**Barton Brierley** - yes and in workshops you made lists of things wanted to deliberate on.

**Chair Smith** - Commissioner Brittell mentioned many intersection with problems,

**Commissioner Brittell** - Mr. Brittell questioned if the city was being driven by regional planning instead of local planning.

Discussion of policies dealing with ORE219 that have been removed from plan.

**Chair Smith** - Commissioner Brittell has raised question about 219. What would like for next time from staff is an option to restore language regarding 219 and reason for why it was deleted.

**Commissioner Brittell** - lets have staff initiate hearings on these items like discussed in the plan.

**Dan Seeman** - downtown couplet as part of bypass project ODOT is doing analysis of a jurisdiction transfer and highway 99W refinement plan.

A lot of discussion took place in December at meetings about 219 rerouting, it was talked about .

### **Northern Arterial**

**Barton Brierley** - we are going to use type 2 process as defined in development code to come up with best location.

**Commissioner Tri** - just south of railroad there will be a turnaround so you can still get into industrial area?

**Barton Brierley** - yes

### **Bypass**

**Commissioner Overbay** - looking at some current drawings it goes right over houses are these going to be removed?

**Barton Brierley** - what is shown is the study corridor much wider than actual road. Some consideration will be taken to go around existing buildings, but it isn't going to be built with taking down some buildings.

**Commissioner Overbay** - why is it wider in some areas?

**Barton Brierley** - there are particular issues in those wider areas, they may have to avoid certain issues and that will push bypass one way or the other.

**Dan Seeman** - generally bypass will be at grade. There are 8 collector streets that cross it and those things need to be evaluated.

Discussion of quality of life being reflected in the TSP in regards to improvements especially dealing with the bypass.

**Chair Smith** - discussion of items for next meeting, downtown couplet, 219 issues.

**Commissioner Brittell** - one of the objections I have, we are looking at piecemeal items.

**Chair Smith** - in deliberation will deal with 8 items specifically then the TSP as a whole.

Discussion of how to proceed at next meeting with deliberation and how many meetings it will take to get through this plan

**Barton Brierley** - appreciate your volunteer time and effort. You have an assignment to make a recommendation to Council on the plan. I would encourage you to get to a point where you can do that.

## **VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

### **1. Update on Council items**

**Barton Brierley** - Council held hearing on golf course urban growth boundary amendment and approved. There will be a hearing Feb 23 for the County Commissioners.

**Commissioner Overbay** - why delete 82 acres.

**Barton Brierley** - compromise between proponents and opponents.

**Barton Brierley** - on the issues of the Oaks at Springbrook and zoning, we gave council presentation of options.

**Commissioner Overbay** - were you going to come back with this group about how the decision was made.

**Barton Brierley** - at the end of the packet I have given information on decision and code criteria.

**Commissioner Brittell** - understand staff reasoning for decision, but not sure they followed intent of code of the Springbrook Oaks plan. Not sure Mr Gougler's reasoning was true in respects to 10% issue. It was a mistake. We should be more careful to follow our own ordinance.

**Barton Brierley** - you asked Council to look at areas in development code that might need to be changed, council said sounds good and made it an assignment of Planning Commission, we will work on after TSP. Also asked for info on construction access at the oaks I prepared memo on that.

**Commissioner Overbay** - you mentioned amendment compromise xyz what are yz

**Barton Brierley** - technical changes to table, deed restrictions

2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence
3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: February 24, 2005 Newberg Public Library

## VII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

**Commissioner Larson** - reported on Council report. He laid out reason to Council for resolution regarding Springbrook Oaks, articulated as much as could for reason for that. Made specific point to delineate himself as a personal view would represent Commission. Feeling got from council members somewhat supportive. Feels some brushed aside. Relate one item of interest, one member was critical of his presentation comments from the *Graphic* stating people of Springbrook Oaks were told by realtors what would be positioned across from them. This member rejected the idea that realtors represent the City. I think that gives you an idea of the thinking.

Discussion of zone changes being by hearing. 99% are of them already are.

## VIII. ADJOURN

**Chair Smith** adjourn meeting at 9:25


Approved by the Planning Commission this 24th day of February, 2005.


**AYES:**

**NO:**

**ABSENT:**  
(List Name(s)):

**ABSTAIN:**  
(List Name(s)):

  
Planning Recording Secretary

 2-24-05  
Planning Commission Chair Date