



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

February 24, 2005

7 p.m. Special Meeting
Newberg Public Library
503 E. Hancock

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE MARCH 17, 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Dwayne Brittell Philip Smith
Daniel Foster Devorah Overbay
Nick Tri

Absent: Matson Haug Louis Larson

II. OPEN MEETING

Chair Smith opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

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

1. Approval of January 26, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Tri/Overbay to approve the January 26, 2005 Planning Commission Minutes. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion carried.

2. Approval of February 10, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Tri/Overbay to approve the February 10, 2005 Planning Commission Minutes.

Commissioner Brittell noted that the minutes did not reflect sufficiently his comments or accurately reflect the content of the discussion made regarding the Springbrook Oaks zone change. Mr. Brierley said staff could review the audio tapes and come back with a supplement to the minutes. Commissioner Brittell said that he was concerned that if something was not presented correctly to the Council, it could make a difference. He was just concerned. Mr. Smith said that falling short of doing that, were there any other concerns. There were none.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: (4 Yes/1 No [Brittell]/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]) motion carried.

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

1. For items not listed on the agenda

None.

V. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

NOTE: The Planning Commission has closed public testimony on this item.

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

Mr. Brierley stated the public portion of the hearing has been closed. The Commission shall deliberate on the TSP and lay out a plan of action. Mr. Brierley said the City Council has set a date they would like to hold their first hearing to consider the TSP. There are some projects to move forward – either approved or denied - and delaying the plan may affect the ability to build more projects. The Council and staff feel it important to get this to a conclusion for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Council so they can start their work. The Council has set a hearing for April 5, 2005 to consider the TSP proposal. They have directed the Commission to complete their recommendation by March 17, 2005. The Resolution presented also notes a potential March 21st workshop meeting where staff will make a presentation on the TSP to the Council.

Chairman Smith stated the Commission needs to conclude the work on the TSP. The issues before the Commission are to (1) recommend adoption of the TSP or (2) recommend denial but return with a revised TSP.

Chair Smith said he would propose that the Commission review (with staff's assistance) the various issues. In the previous meeting (February 10th) the staff, beginning on page 14, lists a number of issues. They should go through specific issues as listed in the staff report. They would then open the discussion to other issues after dealing with specific issues, then they would talk about generally the TSP – and whether it was/was not a good idea.

1. OR 219 (St. Paul Highway) Issues.

Commissioner Overbay questioned the need for the new road between Springbrook and OR 219 at 8th Street. Commissioner Overbay discussed the proposal to re-route Hwy 219 to Springbrook. Discussion was held concerning routing Hwy 219 onto Springbrook and terminating the existing Hwy 219 near the airport. She noted that it seemed to be less expensive to do it a different way than the plan shows.

1(a) Wilsonville/219/Springbrook Reconfiguration.

Discussion was held concerning the need for a new street (8th Street). Mr. Brierley reviewed the various locations. The existing 219/2nd Street intersection has problems with the bank and the end of the runway. The 2nd Street intersection also has a high accident rating. Putting the Wilsonville Road traffic there would in essence be trading one bad location for another and putting more traffic at one location - it seems to be all a problem. The physical height of the traffic signal at 2nd Street could be a hazard for planes and the ground banks, which makes it a difficult turn for trucks. It would work, but it is not as convenient and has safety issues.

Commissioner Overbay said that most traffic goes into Newberg from that area (Wilsonville Road area). She would be concerned about going up to Second Street for a few people as opposed to the people that live in that area and work there.

Mr. Brierley said he looked at the numbers. He said the majority of the traffic is going toward town, but there still is a significant amount of traffic that heads south.

Commissioner Overbay asked about rerouting Hwy 219 onto Springbrook.

Mr. Brierley said it was an option discussed when the plan was being created. Discussion was held concerning reasons why the change was not recommended. This routing would result in a longer travel

distance for those headed south on 219. It also would be a longer distance for those headed toward downtown. Also, there was the question of what to do with all the property that currently access the area. Springbrook and Hwy. 99W is already a high volume intersection. Rerouting 219 would add more traffic to that signal, and it would run into capacity issues.

Commissioner Brittell asked if Hwy 219 would go over or under Hwy 99W? It seemed that this would be the only place in Newberg that would be to access the bypass (interchange).

Mr. Brierley said the shaded area on the map is the bypass study corridor – much larger than the area would be due to lack of final designs. It means that the interchange would be somewhere in the area. Mr. Brierley said that at Hwy 219, it would be a full interchange in any direction. People traveling on 219 can get onto the bypass either direction. There would also be a limited interchange in east Newberg to go to Sherwood and back, but drivers would not be able to loop back to Newberg. There would be no signal light anywhere on the bypass.

Commissioner Brittell also said that he and Commissioner Haug had concerns regarding the bypass and rerouting 219 to circumvent downtown. He reviewed the studies and there was an option to put 219 on Elliott Road. Those did not make any sense because it did not accomplish diverting traffic from downtown. His strong recommendation to the planners still and always will be to follow the City's plan – direct re-route of northern arterial to Mountainview and then to Crestview to the interchange. The route to Wilsonville would be a problem. He would not have any further opposition as it relates to parallel roads and not having to make the big switch to the south. This would be so much cheaper if the roads are in place.

Chair Smith said that if we put Hwy 219 onto Springbrook and direct up to Wilsonville Road, there will be problems. Discussion was held concerning the northern arterial and limited access. There may be a minor arterial designation for College Street.

Chair Smith said it brings together many concerns. Highway 219 is a line on a map. There is a lot of traffic coming into Newberg on 219, but very little going through all the way on 219. There is a lot of traffic coming from Hwy 99W into Newberg. The northern arterial is crucial to getting traffic out of downtown.

Commissioner Overbay asked where people are going who are taking the southern portion of Hwy 219?

Chair Smith said that people travel 219 have a destination in Newberg and in fact, all over Newberg. He has not backed up his comments with studies though.

Commissioner Brittell said there are problems with Wilsonville Road and local traffic. People take the easiest routes afforded to them. People don't like to get stopped in their way somewhere. People that use that road are not necessarily local residents, and they are trying to get through town. The point is that we need to make it easier for them to get through town – to Dundee, the coasts, Hillsboro or even to St. Paul and Salem, or to get them to the bypass. As it is presented, they would have to go to Wilsonville Road to Springbrook Road to Hwy 219 to get on to the bypass. Commissioner Brittell said that he does not agree with the analysis that people use Springbrook or Hwy 219 to get to downtown. Discussion was held noting that it seemed that traffic coming up Hwy 219 is not the same as other areas (going in a north and south direction).

Chair Smith said that staff recommendation is to adopt the reconfiguration.

Commissioner Brittell said he disagreed with the recommendation. He did not agree with the plan to disconnect Wilsonville Road from with Hwy 219. Commissioner Brittell said Wilsonville Road is already there – we need to do something with it – either go north as proposed or go south as previously proposed, though it was said that needed land use exceptions. Discussion was held concerning making specific

recommendations.

Commissioner Tri said he was in favor of the draft plan. He has reviewed the locations and the traffic at different times. The plan seems to take care of the situation in his estimation.

Commissioner Overbay noted she thought it better to construct the new connections at Springbrook and Hwy 219 or take care of the current situation. The next section: Second Street and Hwy 219 – cannot have traffic lights because of the airport.

Commissioner Tri said it is better and more logical to put the signal at 8th Street: it provides fewer options for accidents.

Commissioner Brittell said it was his opinion that it would be a mistake to spend any money on this and it would still be a problem, in particular with 14-foot high trucks at the 219/2nd Street intersection. It would be better to re-route 219 up Springbrook.

Chair Smith said Commissioner Brittell would propose a different option of routing 219 up Springbrook.

Discussion was held about making a more gentle movement onto Springbrook and to temporarily close off Wilsonville Road at that intersection and replace it with a 4-way signal. The City can improve Crestview to join up with the northern arterial. Wilsonville Road would merge with Hwy 219 and Springbrook Roads until the freeway is built. The existing 219 could become a local street. Discussion was held concerning a parallel road to the freeway. Discussion was held concerning access for other businesses.

Commissioner Brittell said it would serve the local traffic better.

Chair Smith - The proposal is for a new street that they would call 8th Street (crossing). Would you still need that?

Commissioner Brittell - no.

Chair Smith said that with Hwy 219 cut off, it would be like a long cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Brittell said there would be another access (Sandoz Road to Wynooski). After the Interchange Area Management Plan is complete, he hopes that the State would be sensitive to the needs of the local traffic. A lot of attention has been paid to the east, but limited attention to the south. He can understand why it is not detailed, but it would be very easy to take into consideration the local traffic in the area and makes it viable.

Commissioner Overbay addressed peak volumes in the TSP. That one section that Commissioner Brittell was talking about – Page 46 (figure 4.1) – that big fat bold line going up Hwy 99W- 219 is south, Springbrook is here. That stretch between Wilsonville Road at Hwy 219 prior to Fernwood is probably one of the thinner ones.

Chair Smith said that Hwy 219 traffic jumps onto Springbrook at that location.

Commissioner Overbay said that it would facilitate a safer passage.

Discussion was held concerning quick right and left turns straight on to Springbrook. Discussion was held concerning a master plan for 500 acres.

Chair Smith said the plan for the northern arterial would make the 90 degree turns go away.

Side 2 – tape 2:

Discussion was held concerning proposing both for council consideration.

Commissioner Overbay said she liked the second plan - less impact on people's homes and has not really been studied – not qualified to dream it up.

Direction would be to the Council to recommend that the Council ask for a staff report on this option (thought about it before?).

Commissioner Brittell said that the TSP is really an interim plan.

Mr. Brierley noted a light would be located at Hayes and Springbrook.

Discussion was held concerning traffic backup and not having to look at traffic lights at Hayes and Fernwood intersection.

Commissioner Brittell questioned ODOT's recommendation for traffic lights.

Chair Smith said that by putting Hwy 219 onto Springbrook and directing traffic north to Mountainview and Crestview, they would be recommendations to reconfigure a state highway which would have more considerations.

Commissioner Brittell said the existing Comprehensive Plan better provides for this.

Commissioner Foster said in response to Wilsonville Road, he remembers some opposition (Grahm) involving 8th Street and other objections were heard. The U-Haul business and coffee shop would essentially have to eliminate their businesses. ODOT said there were recommendations to have a 5-legged intersection and ODOT said already it would create a dangerous safety problem.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to adopt the staff's recommendation straight forward with no changes.

Mr. Brierley noted that Second Street and Hwy 219 need to be depressed some. It cannot be signalized. The existing plan is at 8th Street and Hwy 219- outside the footprint of the bypass (safe). The residents and Mr. Grahm believe that signalizing at the intersection is important. The plan appears to be a long term plan rather than a short term fix.

Chair Smith said that the land south of the bypass (outside the City's UGB) has to be annexed to the city. There needs to be a signalized intersection south of the bypass – very important to development of the city for the control of the development. The plan of having signals at 8th Street and further south; it would be a workable plan. He is intrigued what Commissioner Brittell has said.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: Brittell/ - should the Planning Commission approve the recommendation as presented, he would recommend that the resolution the Commission forwards to the City Council request that they study Option 2 to address the issues or re-routing Hwy 219 away from the downtown area and Newberg and it has failed to meet the comprehensive plan goals 2, 3, 4, 8 & 9 and transportation plan goal 4, policies A-F and 9 regarding re-routing). **MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF SECOND.**

ROLL CALL ON ORIGINAL MOTION: (3 Yes [2 No [Brittell/Overbay]/ 2 Absent [Haug/Larson]).
Motion carried.

1(b) Intersection of OR219 and 2nd Street.

Discussion was held concerning the emergency access errata sheet. Mr. Brierley said at Page 64 of the February 10th packet, the information concerning the median for south bound traffic was an issue for emergency vehicles. Further discussion was held concerning the price for such improvements (\$1.5 million). There being no further comments a motion was made.

MOTION: Tri/Foster to approve as recommended.

Commissioner Brittell said it was a lot of money for literally no gain. Chair Smith said we can improve it – but the rights-in-right-out access and the emergency vehicle access needs to be negotiated with the fire department. Discussion was held concerning re-routing all together. Commissioner said he would vote yes because we are cutting off a lot of traffic (2-3 times a week on to Hwy 219 to Second Street (left) to Fernwood. Discussion was held using Corral Creek or Brutscher Street. There are a lot of cases for turning left and keeping left turn a possibility (it is a local transportation street problem and should not be restricted). A well planned intersection would be welcomed. The major problem with the plan is that we are NOT looking at local needs. Commissioner Foster said that people going south on Hwy 219 would have a hardship to go through Springbrook to 8th and the traffic is big enough to show that we should not close it off. Discussion was held concerning dangerous traffic hazards and traffic issues.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: 3 Yes [Foster/Smith/Tri]/2 No [Overbay/Brittell]/2 Absent [Haug/Larson].
Motion carried.

2. EAST NEWBERG ISSUES

2(a) South Frontage Road (Project 10)

Chair Smith reviewed the serpentine arrangement through the hospital property and connecting to Corral Creek Road. He noted that testimony has already been received stating it was a bad idea.

MOTION: Brittell/Overbay to approve as shown on the graph.

Chair Smith said that at page 16 of the February 16, 2005 minutes, it reflects discussion concerning the local streets and modifications and language addressing funding. Mr. Brierley said a letter from ODOT was received noting specific language about their obligations/expectations to fund any/or all or part of this. They requested (p. 64 of Feb10th packet) language that says this street will be funded by developer and possibly by ODOT if the connector road directly enhances the traffic and access. Discussion was held concerning frontage and bypass project funding. Barton said ODOT's concern was that they did not want to be perceived as providing state funding for just any local street (city/county), but would consider it only if it has a direct relationship to the state highway project. Corral Creek will not be able to tie into the highway the way it is now.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion carried.

Commissioner Brittell said it also appears to include the condition that they would have access through Providence hospital site and their proposal (p.64) follows recommendation presented to the Planning Commission by the hospital representatives.

2(b) Providence Drive Classification.

Chair Smith said Providence was concerned with the road being a major collector - they objected to the proposal.

Mr. Brierley said that major collectors have to maintain bike lanes such as on Providence Drive.

Commissioner Overbay said she agrees with the Hospital's desire to have calm traffic, serpentine arrangement to calm traffic – putting in medians and putting in trees.

Chair Smith said he is very much in favor of having bike lanes on Providence Drive. That is the difference between major and minor collectors - Mr. Brierley said that physically is on the ground is what you would see (bike lanes).

Mr. Brierley said that usually a major collector will have a higher volume/speed, etc. attached to it, but the only real difference on the ground is bike lanes.

Mr. Dan Danicic said that as a major collector, you can post speed limits greater than 25 mph, but he visions 25 mph for the area anyway – he does not think it needs to be stated for a final proposal. Commissioner Foster said he recently talked with some hospital nurses who have indicated that it was their recommendation that the speed be reduced.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to approves staff's recommendation with a minor adjustment that the speed limit be no higher than 25 mph on Providence Drive. Staff report says that it does not preclude some traffic calming - not necessarily speed bumps.

Discussion was held concerning adding language for the City to work with the Hospital in determining what they would need for the area.

Commissioners Smith/Tri rescinded their motion.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to approve 2(b) as a major collector that the speed be 25mph and requests that staff work with the Hospital to arrive at a good solution regarding traffic calming. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion carried.

2(c) Bypass location adjacent to Providence Drive

Chair Smith said that it appears this property is adjacent to the Providence Drive area. The proposal provides for working with the Hospital, the City and ODOT to come to arrangements to finalize the project and push it south/east as much as they can.

MOTION: Tri/Smith to approve the staff report as recommended. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion carried.)

2(d) Access Road Between Corral Creek Road and the Greens Subdivision (Project 12)

Chair Smith said the access road between Corral Creek Road at the Greens Subdivision (Project 12) is outlined in the staff report. The hospital wants the access as far east to the south as possible. Discussion was held concerning gates. Mr. Brierley said in the long term, the plan would have this become a public road and people can drive in and out. Staff recommends that this not occur or be built as a public road for access

unless some combination of improvements occur. First would be safety improvements to Corral Creek Road, second some limitation of the movements of the intersection on Hwy 99W and third construction of frontage road. This is a complex proposal. It would be gated as an emergency access road to begin with – but will be a real road eventually. Fixing Corral Creek intersection with the highway is an issue. Corral Creek is a county road outside the City's jurisdiction. Making the plan would require cooperation with the County. The proposal is to keep this as a gated street, or at some point - the county will open it up anyway. Mr. Brierley said the county owns the ball field – we cannot go around the county - however, we cannot demand they improve Corral Creek Road – we cannot make them do it, but the County would allow others to do it at their cost.

Tape 2 - Side 1:

Commissioner Foster said if the County does not improve Corral Creek – years would go by with only one egress for all the homes coming out of the entire development. We are dependent upon the county and the plan will not work unless Corral Creek Road is improved. Commissioner Brittell said it would probably be annexed in the future.

Commissioner Foster said he would like to include in the recommendation that they approach the County to do improvements sooner rather than later. We could ask staff to approach the County with negotiations on this. Mr. Brierley said we could recommend to the County that it be a high priority.

Commissioner Overbay reviewed the improvements and lists of priorities. Mr. Brierley said there is also noted in Section 8.3 transportation improvements outside Newberg. It adds Corral Creek to the list. (last page) Mr. Brierley said that on page 157 of the TSP (Project 12) is this project. It has a medium priority and we could recommend that it be changed to a high priority project. Chair Smith said that it should be a high priority in order to mesh the two streets.

MOTION: Brittell/Overbay to approve staff report and recommend to City Council that negotiations with county start right away, and that Project 12 be moved from medium to a higher priority and adding Corral Creek improvements to the list (page 171 - Section 8.3). (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion carried.)

3. Downtown Improvements.

Chair Smith said the resolution before the Commission recommends the future plans for the downtown area. The Resolution also recommends re-routing of Second Street.

Mr. Brierley said that First Street is headed east to Second Street near the end of downtown. There has been a lot of discussion and testimony on this proposal. Ultimately, staff recommended that we adopt resolutions that did not recommend the re-routing, but rather they do a refinement plan for downtown that would focus on options for changing the transportation system downtown after the bypass is constructed. This could include changing lanes from three to two lanes and doing wider sidewalks and pedestrian improvements. When you discussed in December, the Commission asked for alternate resolutions to include re-routing to Second Street.

Additional discussion was held concerning prior testimony provided.

Commissioner Foster said he does not feel okay to vote because he was not in attendance at the December meeting.

Mr. Brierley reviewed the procedures for abstention and votes required to pass a motion/resolution.

Commissioner Brittell said either resolution would be ok, as long as it is not a state highway. He was the only Commission member that was still looking at resolution number 2 after the public hearing. The Second Street meeting was very well attended. He had a different viewpoint because they were looking differently at how to count the number of apartment owners versus commercial spaces on Second Street. Second Street is zoned commercial. He would support the Second Street proposal if it had plenty of general public input not just with Second Street business and residential property owners.

Discussion was held concerning the statements contained from the public forum contained in the resolutions No. 1. We need to have enough coverage for east and west highways and the bypass and make Second Street a more local street.

Chair Smith said the staff report notes changes – but does not commit to any specific options. We may encourage building of parking structures and all other things to make pedestrian friendly in the downtown area. As the bypass is going in we need to have a plan to fix downtown and slow down the traffic (true on both resolutions).

Commissioner Overlay asked if ODOT was willing to help fund the future plans?

Chair Smith said once it becomes City property they would not.

Mr. Brierley said they were willing to fund planning, but not really the future improvements. But there appears to be an opportunity to negotiate, but clearly there is no commitment. If we chose to select Resolution No. 2 with the couplets, Mr. Brierley said that have generally talked and ODOT has indicated they would consider funding creation of a plan, but it is unlikely they would fund improvements. However, if the state were to transfer jurisdiction of the highway to the city, there would be an opportunity to negotiate what the physical configuration would be done at the time of the transfer – make changes, etc.

Commissioner Overbay asked what was the advantage to the Second Street re-routing.

Mr. Brittell asked if Commissioner Overbay received the 1981 study with the two-way- main streets and access on both sides of the streets for shopping, etc. (equal advantage with two way traffic unlike a one-way direction). First Street in-between would be two way with one way on each side. Commissioner Brittell said that Second Street representatives said they may not be opposed to having a two way downtown. The Downtown Association and staff seem to be in favor of it. This pilot project of what could happen downtown if we did it. There are 3 pieces of property in the Second Street property blocks making a nice gathering place and is prime for redevelopment (residential, offices/ shopping) and utilizing downtown more fully.

Discussion was held concerning growth and development of downtown with two-way traffic. Since Second Street is zoned commercial, it could be rezoned to residential/commercial if we wanted to consider that. The Commission should consider this option.

Commissioner Tri said he is of the same thought as Commissioner Brittell on this matter. He is tending toward supporting the second resolution.

Chair Smith said he has been persuaded by the testimony of the Second Street people. There are a couple of major problems with moving 99W to Second Street. On the east end of the downtown area, Second Street has to go back north. You have the Hoover House there, which is a major historic house. You cannot remove it, so you have to go around it. The other testimony also notes issues because of the location of the fire

station on Second Street. Second Street was not engineered as a major street. Commissioner Brittell proposed the ideas for improving the downtown area. Most of these goals can be accomplished by moving First Street from 3 lanes to 2 and creating parking between First and Second (with pedestrian walkways to shopping). He said he was convinced that a lot of things can be done without moving or affecting Second Street. There has been strong support for not having Second Street be a major street because there is some residential located in the area. Mr. Brierley said the alternatives it shows its, but is not recommended. The alternative shows that it went up School Street on the other end of Minthorn House. That is further west than it necessarily has to be. Main Street would be a good location as an alternative.

Commissioner Foster asked for clarification of the mapping in relation to the resolutions (page 82).

MOTION: Brittell/Tri to recommend **Resolution No. 2** – and also ask the Council to call for public hearings in relationship to that proposal also recommending that it would be good to restudy the re-routing of Hwy 219.

Additional discussion was held concerning the plan not meeting local problems. It all has to mesh together. They direct staff for more detailed study and re-routing Hwy 219. Did everyone read the letter from Kris Horn from Downtown Association about enhancing the downtown area. The members said “yes” Ms. Horn’s letter was presented to the recording secretary for future reference.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: (2 Yes/2 No [Smith/Overbay]/1 Abstain [Foster]/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Failed.

MOTION: Smith/Overbay to approve **Resolution No. 1** as presented. (3 Yes/1 No [Brittell]/1 Abstain [Foster]/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

4. Northern Arterial

Discussion was held concerning the letter from the President of Oxberg Estates HOA. People are generally concerned on what is going to happen.

(a) East End

MOTION: Tri/Smith to adopt the recommendation as presented.

Commissioner Brittell reviewed the Austin property as it relates to the northern arterial, enough planning with the assistance from the City before making any decisions involving that area (Mountainview) and cutting through Crestview and the impact on local streets. Mr. Brierley said there was no indication that there would need to be any change to meet the master plans. There is information to suggest a public process with hearings to review the configuration of the area between Springbrook and Aspen Way.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

(b) Springbrook Rail Crossing

Mr. Brierley said it was the intention to refine the plan in that area. The Austins have asked for such review. There are two rail crossings. The plan shown is what is adopted with the current TSP - they are not modern rail crossings. The agencies responsible for rail crossings note they are hazardous as laid out. They have had extensive discussions – if they close a couple of crossings – they would give permits and possibly funding to construct a crossing – they are moving down that path and there has been concerns by people that use this, closing will cause them to go out of direction in town. They are recommending a public process in the area that will look to keep the rail crossing but moving and relocating it in a different area – a much less out-of-direction travel for local residents. They are subject testimony and design.

MOTION: Tri/Foster to approve the recommendation as identified. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

5. Transit Service

Chair Smith thanked Roy Gathercoal for his previous testimony concerning the city's transportation issues/problems.

MOTION: Brittell/ Smith approve (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

6. Bypass

Mr. Brierley said the matter is currently on appeal and no lawsuit has been filed. Some of the participants in the appeal are Roger Grahn, 1000 Friends, and Charlie Harris. Mr. Brierley said that staff recommends not making changes that would readdress those issues already adopted.

Tape 2 - Side 2

MOTION: Smith/Tri to approve staff's recommendation of NOT making changes to the draft plan on this matter. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

7. Street Standards

(a) Local Street Widths

Commissioner Brittell said narrower streets are more calming. Standard city street width is 32 feet. He said the state recommends a standard of 28 feet or narrower which is better than the 32 foot width. Discussion was held concerning bike lanes.

Commissioner Foster said if we make our less than the 32 feet, then we have to worry about safety issues like fire trucks, ambulances, etc. Planned unit developments have narrow streets and thinks that 32 feet is a good width, however there are strengths to both sides.

Chair Smith said that wider streets give more access. Narrower streets cause people to slow down. His recommendation would be to stay with what we have as a street standard (32 feet) or take the time to re-study the situation and make recommendations for any changes. The other option is to make the street width 28

feet.

Commissioner Brittell discussed access and parking provisions. He felt that the ordinance should be changed. We should study possibilities of new street width ordinance and allow provisions for private streets. Currently, the City does not allow private streets (since a 1998 action by the Council)

MOTION: Brittell/Overbay to have the Council study the alternatives to local street width standards (3 Yes(Brittell, Overbay, Smith)/2 No(Foster/Tri) Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

(b) Cul-de-sacs.

Chair Smith said that the current situation allows for cul-de-sacs. Further discussion was held concerning need for connectivity. It is staff's recommendation that we take no action. Mr. Rydell is a civil engineer who has questioned the current requirements.

MOTION: Foster/Tri to take no action (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]). Motion Carried.

(c) Private Streets/Driveway Access

Chair Smith said he was not in attendance at the Planning Commission meeting when this was discussed.

Mr. Brierley said in the 1990's, there were subdivisions with narrow private streets and there were quite a few people dissatisfied with access. The City then amended the standards and said you can only have a private street serving up to six lots. There was a subdivision that came before the Commission that had six lots off a private street. The Commission voted to deny that subdivision because of the concerns for inappropriate parking and whether police can ticket non-compliance/violations of parking prohibition, blocking streets, driveways, etc. The Commission felt strongly that they should not create exclusive gated communities and they ought to be part of the whole community. It was appealed to the City Council who agreed with the Planning Commission, but noted that the standards at that time allowed private streets. The Council approved the subdivision, but then changed the standards. The Commission recommended an ordinance allowing no more private streets and defined it more fully wherein a private driveway would not serve more two lots sharing one common driveway. That was supported by the Council and adopted by the current code and is now the law of the City. The entire situation had very ugly results because in that particular subdivision, there were six houses which ended up with a private street. One of the neighbors had a beauty shop and its guests would park on the side of the street and the neighbors would voice their dissatisfaction. The neighborhood was torn apart due to parking issues involving the private street and it has taken a long time to resolve the issues.

Further discussion was held concerning flag lots and the various proposals. Mr. Brierley said that in two cases, the Commission has said "no" to developers on flag lot options having more than two lots accessing one driveway. CC&R's are governed by the HOAs and Commissioner Foster said that most CC&R's are not enforced generally without the assistance of a business management company that manages the HOA's affairs.

Commissioner Brittell said that the State of Oregon requires increased density in housing and most cities would encourage development of flag lots or large oversize lots to maximize use of the existing

infrastructure and minimizes extensions. Commissioner Brittell said the two lot restriction was difficult. I made it work with a 3 lot subdivision. We worked with ODOT to make it work. He would be in favor of a proposal servicing the 4 lots and would recommend bringing up the matter for further studies.

Chair Smith asked how do we encourage density and does this restriction on flag lots against private drives keep us from future development of private lands with restrictions? What is the answer?

Commissioner Foster said the City would meet the density requirements if we allowed more, but based on the City's past experience - it could be an issue. Discussion was held concerning in-fill development. Commissioner Foster asked about the new development by Willamette Valley Homes which has several flag lots servicing two lots which have an 18 inch to 24 inch median between the two driveways. Discussion was held concerning driveway width requirements. If you have two adjacent driveways, it is a wide paved area.

MOTION: Brittell/Foster to reconsider issues relating to private street/driveway access. (3 Yes/2 no [Overbay/Tri]; 2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

(d) **Block Length**

Chair Smith said that staff recommends increase in block length. Staff's further recommendation is to revisit this proposal at a later time and not adopt it as part of this TSP update.

MOTION: Tri/Overbay to remove the proposal and take NO action. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

OTHER ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

Chair Smith asked Mr. Brierley if there were other issues to be addressed? Mr. Brierley said yes, there are specific intersections as noted below.

8. **Specific Intersections**

(a) **240/Illinois/Main Intersection**

Chair Smith said they have had heard previous testimony and it would be staff and the Commission's recommendation for more input/testimony. Discussion was held concerning studies. Mr. Brierley said we would do so and possibly hire a consultant to do a traffic study.

Commissioner Brittell noted he read in the plan there was a (priority list). He said he was concerned about the Main Street Improvement project and how we need to complete that project with sidewalks, etc.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to approve staff recommendation for more study/testimony. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

Commissioner Brittell asked about the closing of Illinois, a minor arterial in particular. His road (North Street) would become the East-West minor minor arterial. Chair Smith said that closing Illinois and Main

Street intersections are a bad idea. Commissioner Brittell also noted that he would make recommendations for staff's further discussion concerning other solutions for this dangerous intersection.

(b) College Street/Hancock/First Street Intersections

Chair Smith opened discussion on appropriate service levels. Mr. Brierley said there would be some changes in lanes, something not so specific, but would still require traffic signals. Further discussion was held concerning truck radius issues and re-routing traffic to other streets with similar problems. Commissioner Brittell said it is not a matter of signalization, but a matter of design.

Chair Smith said that relieving truck traffic onto College or First Streets depends upon a northern arterial that works so that trucks will use it. Trucks have to have a way to reach NW Newberg.

MOTION: Smith/ Tri to take no further action and adopt the staff report, do nothing on this. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

Mr. Brierley said the next meeting (March 10th) is clear for reviewing the TSP issues. Commissioner Brittell said he wants to prepare some testimony in response to comments made this meeting.

(c) 240/Chehalem Drive Intersection

Mr. Brierley said it was mentioned at the last meeting. This is a 4 legged intersection. The south leg is a cul-de-sac, and 240 is a state highway and Chehalem Drive is a major collector. Discussion was held concerning PM peak traffic volumes. Chehalem Drive is estimated to have 100 trips, 240 would have 1200 (about every 3-4 seconds) during this PM peak period. Vehicles traveling Chehalem Drive during busiest hours of the day would complicate existing problems at the other areas. By the end of the planning period, it could require a signal. Discussion was held concerning promoting annexation in the area and future improvements scheduled, including widening of sidewalks. Chair Smith said that he runs in that area and there are some terrible shoulders in the area with no sidewalks which are dangerous. The bridge has a curve in it. Signalizing may not be the answer on a state highway. However, the study done on Illinois may not require a signal.

Mr. Brierley noted that a half mile is the spacing for signalized intersections, but in some instances, spacing as little as 1/4 mile can also be done too.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to approve staff's recommendation with the additional caveat for a need for a signal. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

Tape 3- Side 1

(d) Potential re-route of Wilsonville Road to the South

Mr. Brierley said that at page P22, they talked about intersections and how they are not recommended as a short term solution for traffic problems. This plan involves the bypass, if the Wilsonville Road crossing could not be made, then, this would be a very attractive option, actually, the only option.

Chair Smith said the short term recommendation to the City Council would be to approve the plan but if they feel it would be a long term situation, the area may need to be annexed to the City of Newberg. Wilsonville Road should come through the middle of it and will link to Wynooski for a large scale industrial area.

Commissioner Brittell said the County would probably support this. It would work to squeeze closer in the ability to call it a frontage road. Discussion was held concerning building it and it is easier to do with the existing driveways. From the county road viewpoint, it is so much safer to extend Wynooski.

Chair Smith said once we obtain state approval, it would be better to service the area long term. Discussion was held concerning the frontage road. Chair Smith said it looks as if we will still need to annex it to the City.

Commissioner Brittell said he recommends the TSP, Alternative No. 3. There were exceptions noted for other parts of the plan, so why not here. Discussion was held concerning resolving many city, county, state and 1000 Friends problems. Long term, we need a road out there, location is not an issue right now, but a real road that would service industry. Once we succeed to annexed the land – limitation between the bypass and the frontage road.

Mr. Danicic said there is a 1/4 mile distance from the frontage and providing an alternative route.

Discussion was held concerning showing the southern route going through county property and an alternative for Wilsonville Road. Barton said that long term if it comes into the UGB, it could happen. If it does not cross, this could happen. The plan would be remanded if we showed the road outside the UGB at this point. We could make a recommendation as a long term solution, if that crossing cannot happen or the property is brought into the UGB, recommend that Wilsonville Road go to the south.

Commissioner Brittell asked for clarification of the exception documents. Mr. Brierley said that everywhere the bypass goes in farm land, they have applied for an exception to state wide goals to preserve farm land. Wherever there is an option to have the land outside farmland they are taking the option. That is the reason it is going through UGB: to limit the exceptions needed. Wherever there was an option to NOT take an exception, they have done so.

Chair Smith said he would like to see more industry in the area. Commissioner Brittell said we probably do not have to go that far south for a viable option.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to have the City Council study the realignment of Wynooski and Wilsonville Road as part of the TSP to provide future service to the area.

Commissioner Brittell said he does not want to cut off the possibility to get something sooner. This area could be an industrial area. Brittell said that anything after 20 years is considered long term.

Mr. Brierley said we have a need for several large sites (20+) acres. There are no large industrial sites in Newberg excluding the Austin's properties. Commissioner Brittell said we should not pinpoint problem areas to provide for local planning. Discussion was held concerning what happens to Springbrook and overloading Hwy 99W and what would happen to the Wilsonville/Springbrook curve?

Discussion was held concerning coordinating findings in support of the recommendation. Barton said the Planning Commission has referenced a study to be conducted. If there are future plans to include this area into the UGB it would be a reason to do it. Commissioner Brittell said that in order to meet Goal 4 and allow separation of regional and local traffic, Wynooski would go into a local street/ It would resolve the County's problem and meet Goal 4 conflicts with local and regional traffic, tied together with plans and in terms of funding possibilities. It could be a frontage road and the state could participate in its planning/development.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION: (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

(e) Streets Cross Section for College Street, Hancock to Railroad (page P23)

Chair Smith said we are not required to put in 3 lanes with provisions for bike lanes - design studies would need to be considered and reviewed.

Commissioner Brittell said that the rights of way along the portion of the road was already in place and that no other right of way would be required. The bike lane plus three lanes would take 80 feet and not 60 feet. Mr. Brierley said it would be two lanes – two bike lanes, etc. The Hancock to railroad section, foregoing the center turn lane, which would be narrower section and have narrower bike lanes, etc. North of the railroad would have center turn lanes?

Mr. Brierley said it is possible that it will, but have to work with existing development.

MOTION: Smith/Tri to adopt staff recommendation to provide for a special design study for this section of College Street Need public meetings to receive testimony and adopt a design. (5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

Who would pay and do the study? Staff would have to have a proposal to see what is possible (need to recommend to the State what improvements would be requested). The state completed a specific plan for 99W and Dundee. It would be a proportionate re-route – the state may entertain discussion to help fund. Commissioner Brittell said it is not worth the expense of funds to do this. We need to look at the question of re-routing. That is a state highway and it needs improvement and it is believed that it is the state's responsibility to pay for it.

We need to have the State pay for Hwy 219 and the railroad intersections. Keep it narrow but make it better, As long as it remains a state highway, they need to do that. Discussion was held concerning priorities of improvements to the network of roads. There is a priority list (page 156 of TSP). Mr. Brierley said it is now listed as a "medium" priority. The commission discussed that Bell Road to First and Bell to College should also be given a higher priority than medium.

Discussion was held concerning funding allocations. Mr. Brierley said they have separated a couple of sections. Discussion of priority regarding historic designations. Further discussion was held concerning the northern arterial which may cause delays. Not sure why there are not more higher priority items. "S" is for short term (higher priority) rather than "L" for long term. The study should be a short term priority so we know what to do.

MOTION: Smith/Overbay to separate two portions of College and recommend higher priority for design studies for the section of College between First and the Railroad.

(5 Yes/2 Absent [Haug/Larson]. Motion carried.

Mr. Brierley reviewed the URA and St. Paul highway study.

The next meeting will take up discussion of Highway 219 routing. Additional discussion was held concerning the Planning Commission members NOT attending the Council meetings as private citizens to discuss the TSP and comments. The Commission will further consider and discuss the TSP and other issues noted tonight at the next Planning Commission meeting on March 10th. In general, talk about the TSP and vote on it at the next meeting. It would be preferable to have all the Commission members present to review the minutes and discuss the remaining issues.

VI. ITEMS FROM STAFF

1. Update on Council items
2. Other reports, letters, or correspondence
3. Next Planning Commission Meeting: March 10, 2005

Mr. Brierley presented the March 3, 2005 open house for land use of Newberg's future. It is presentation by an ad hoc committee. The workshop will be held at the Chehalem Senior Center at 6:30 p.m.

VII. ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS

None.

VIII. ADJOURN

Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

Approved by the Planning Commission this 17th ay of March, 2005.

AYES:

6

NO:

0

ABSENT:

1

(List Name(s)) Tri

ABSTAIN:

0

(List Name(s))



Planning Recording Secretary



Planning Commission Chair

Date