

NEWBERG PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 13, 2017, 7:00 PM
PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING (401 E. THIRD STREET)

Chair Jason Dale called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jason Dale, Chair
Allyn Edwards
Cathy Stuhr
Gary Bliss
Ron Wolfe
Philip Smith
Patricia Watson
Miranda Piros, Student

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Doug Rux, Community Development Director
Steve Olson, Senior Planner
Brad Allen, Assistant Planner
Cheryl Caines, Associate Planner
Bobbie Morgan, Office Assistant II
Kaaren Hoffmann, City Engineer

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Approval of the March 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes

PC Edwards said on the first page of the minutes, he was listed as Chair and he was no longer Chair.

MOTION: PC Edwards/PC Smith moved to approve the March 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried (7 Yes / 0 No).

QUASI-JUDICIAL PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **Dutchman Ridge annexation (continued):** Consider an annexation application for three properties located at 25020, 25240 and 25300 North Valley Road (25.66 acres total). The zoning will change from AF-10 (County) to R-1 (City low density residential).
APPLICANT: Del Boca Vista, LLC
FILE NO.: ANX-17-001 RESOLUTION: 2017-324
CRITERIA: Newberg Development Code Sections: 15.250.020 & .030

MOTION: PC Smith/PC Edwards moved to re-open ANX-17-001. The motion carried (7 Yes / 0 No).

Call to order: Chair Dale reopened the record for the Dutchman Ridge annexation hearing at 7:00 pm.

Call for abstentions, bias, ex parte contact, and objections to jurisdiction: None.

Legal Announcement: Read by Chair Dale.

Staff Report: Presentation given by Senior Planner Steve Olson. This annexation was continued from the last Planning Commission hearing in March. This was a request to annex 25.66 acres. The Comprehensive Plan designation for the property was LDR (low density residential). There was a stream corridor overlay on the property.

It was at the top northwest corner of the City along North Valley Road. The site was in the Urban Growth Boundary and contiguous to the City limits. There was a concept plan that showed how the street connections could be made and how the applicant would potentially develop around the stream corridor. The utilities could be extended from the west and south to serve the site. There were questions for the City Attorney at the last hearing on whether a Comprehensive Plan policy was a criterion for annexation of residential parcels. The policy said for annexation of large residential parcels, there shall be a mixture of zoning to include some R-3 zoned lands consistent with the policy to distribute affordable housing throughout the community and that zoning would apply to the most suitable portions of the property for high density development. The City Attorney stated yes qualified, they needed to address the Comprehensive Plan policies in the findings. It was not enough for the petitioner to identify mandatory language in one Comprehensive Plan policy. The findings had to address all of the policies that applied. After considering the evidence in the record and any new evidence, the Planning Commission should make findings answering these questions: does the Municipal Code fully or partially implement this policy, was this policy applicable to the application such as was this considered a large annexation or not, and whether it conflicted with other criteria in the Comprehensive Plan or could be met in concert with this criterion. If it could not be met in concert, there had to be a balance of competing goals and policies and an explanation for the rationale. The proposed use had to comply with the Comprehensive Plan text and the Comprehensive Plan map. The proposed use was low density residential and the zoning of R-1 would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan map. Regarding the policy of large annexations having a mixture of zoning to include some R-3 to distribute affordable housing throughout the community, the first question was if it was applicable to this application and the other question was how much was "some R-3." Staff looked up the definition of "large" and found it meant "exceeding most other things of like kind" or "dealing in great numbers or quantities." Staff provided a list of annexations over the last 20 years to compare to this annexation. There were about 40 residential annexations on the list and the average number of acres being annexed was 15 acres. Most were under 5 acres, and one was for 250 acres. Since averaging was not as useful as most annexations were small, and there was one very large one, staff thought it made more sense to group them into clusters by their impact to the community. They made a cluster of small annexations under 10 acres that would have a small impact, medium cluster in the 10-40 acre range that had a moderate impact, and annexations above 40 acres were considered as large impact. The question was where to draw the line between medium and large. Staff made findings for other relevant Comprehensive Plan policies. These policies conflicted with the idea of having a range of zoning in the LDR. There were location policies for where R-3 should be located in the City, which included having direct access on a major collector or arterial which North Valley Road was. This site was surrounded by low density residential and traffic from an R-3 site was not supposed to go through low density areas per Code. There was a commercial services property nearby, although over half of it was being used as an assisted living facility. There was a daycare, dentist and other professional offices. It was a low level of services. There was open space, although dedicated to a softball use most of the time, and a school nearby. There was a loop circulator transit route that could service the area and there was a 99W corridor bus. Staff did not find much support for R-3 on this site as it was on the fringe of the City. The Code did not anticipate a range of zoning on this property to implement the LDR, and that was in conflict with the mixed policy. The Code stated the R-1 zone was to be applied automatically to this property at annexation. To change the zoning to include R-3 there would have to be a Comprehensive Plan map amendment. Staff did not think this was a large annexation and the mixed use policy did not apply. The proposal complied with the Comprehensive Plan map designation and policies.

Community Development Director Doug Rux said the utility master plans sized the infrastructure for this area to correspond with the Comprehensive Plan designations. They did not anticipate R-3 on this property and there could be infrastructure implications that related to adequate utilities and streets.

SP Olson said the staff recommendation was to adopt the resolution recommending to the Council approval of the annexation as proposed.

PC Smith asked about the procedure for a legislative change. Could they pass a motion to draft certain changes in the Comprehensive Plan later in this meeting? CDD Rux recommended directing staff to come back with a resolution to initiate a Type IV review of the Comprehensive Plan.

Public Testimony:

Proponents / Applicant:

Jessica Cain and Dan Danicic, applicants, said the two issues were whether this application was defined as a large annexation or not and if the R-3 policy applied and how the Comprehensive Plan policies had competing interests and whether one was more important than the other or if they all needed to be taken in context and see which one applied the best or made the most sense. There were three separate and unrelated property owners in this case, and the properties varied in size. The property owners came together to apply for annexation to make it more cost effective. Del Boca Vista did not own these properties. Regarding services, the R-3 did not fit with the orderly development in the City. The R-3 zoning was intended to be close to City services and while some were available, they were not available to the extent that was needed for R-3. There was not a grocery or convenience store nearby and it was quite a walk to get to any professional services or public transportation. Because of the stream corridor, there was not a way to get pathways or roadways over the corridor and people would have to walk around North Valley Road to get to these locations. The utility master plans were sized to accommodate the zoning and Comprehensive Plan designations, and in this case it was intended to come in as R-1. The City was already having capacity issues because R-1 had been changed from 7,500 square foot lots to 5,000 square foot lots creating more density in these areas. They thought R-3 was economically unfeasible. It could not be affordable housing due to the cost of the land, studies, and upsizing the facilities. This was not the property to address affordable housing issues. The Comprehensive Plan policies conflicted with each other and it did not make sense to put R-3 on this property. It would not accomplish the end goal to create more affordable housing opportunities and did not provide services to R-3 needs. They did not think this was a large acreage, and it was not all developable due to the stream corridor.

PC Smith asked how they could put R-3 around the City given what had just been said. Ms. Cain responded this property was bordered by agricultural land, a 45 mph road, it did not have adequate facilities to service the property, and it did not have adequate transit services. This was not the right property for R-3.

PC Smith asked if a threshold was established for R-3, would developers deliberately stay below the threshold so they would not have to put in R-3. Ms. Cain replied there were other properties in the City that were right for affordable housing, but they did not have City services available to them currently. She agreed that changes should be made so the policy could be implemented. This was not the right property for R-3.

Chair Dale asked what the cost might be to upgrade the facilities. Mr. Danicic said the City's master plans had not anticipated the R-3 zoning and the pipes had not been designed for R-3. He did not know how much the R-3 would affect the pipes downstream, but the worst case scenario would be the sewer pump station that served this area did not have capacity and it was a half million dollar project to upgrade it. Studies would have to be done to see if that was necessary.

Ms. Cain added the costs of the development were a combination of the premium price for the land and the additional service issues. This drove up the cost for the R-3 property and no longer made it affordable housing.

PC Edwards asked how many additional houses would be added under R-3. Ms. Cain responded they did not know how much R-3 was enough, as it said "some R-3." They were planning to build 3,000 square foot lots along North Valley Road, which were more affordable houses. The concept plan had 107 lots on it, but there were wetland issues and it might be less. High density in this area would create traffic issues.

PC Wolfe asked how many usable acres they had on this property. Ms. Cain answered one of the properties was affected by the wetland buffer issues about 30% to 40% and the other two were affected about 10% to 20%.

Opponent

Charlie Harris, Newberg resident, discussed the letter he handed out to the Commission. At the last hearing there was discussion about where the Comprehensive Plan said "shall" if it really meant "shall." The City Attorney had confirmed it did mean "shall" provided the application met certain conditions. The initial staff report did not address the R-3 issue at all, and in the revised staff report he questioned the reasons for staff's position. He thought the findings were insufficient and the annexation request should be denied. Did the Newberg Code fully or otherwise partially implement the Comprehensive Plan policy? He thought staff confirmed it did not. The Comprehensive Plan map could be used as a criterion to determine whether or not the proposal complied with the Comprehensive Plan. It was not the sole criterion, but one of the criteria. The map was subordinate to the text of the Comprehensive Plan. Since the Code did not fully implement the Comprehensive Plan policy, were the criteria applicable to the current annexation proposal? He thought they were as they were residentially designated. Another question was whether this

was a large annexation. He thought the staff report was grasping at straws to say it was not large. This annexation exceeded 36 of the 40 annexations in size. He thought it should be considered large. Since it was large, there was no R-3 land in the application, and it did not meet that criterion. He did not think there was a conflict with other relevant Comprehensive Plan and Code policies and criteria. All of the criteria could be met by including R-3 land in the proposal. Staff argued that since the Comprehensive Plan map designations for the parcel were low density residential, an application to annex the land as R-1 would require the Commission to approve it. The Comprehensive Plan map was only one criterion to consider, not the controlling criteria. There was bus service and open space nearby. The applicant had been told about this issue, but they did not include the R-3 in their application, and now it was an issue.

PC Smith asked what the definition of “some R-3” would be. Mr. Harris replied “some” was a sufficient amount to have a development, such as 16 to 20 units or 20% of the property.

PC Stuhr asked what he thought large meant. Mr. Harris responded land in the 75th or 80th percentile, 10 to 15 acres.

PC Smith asked if developers stayed under the threshold, what policy could be adopted to solve that problem so the City did not get smaller annexations coming in. Mr. Harris could work on some language for that issue.

Sid Friedman, representing the Friends of Yamhill County, was opposed to the annexation as proposed because of the issues that had been raised. There was a critical need for affordable housing in the City. Affordable housing did not mean low income housing but those that were more affordable for more households. This annexation was business as usual and did not comply with the policy for R-3 development that was applicable to this property. Staff suggested this annexation was not large and was exempted from the R-3 policy, but it was the largest residential annexation in over 10 years and the fourth largest in 21 years. It was 70% larger than the average annexation of 15 acres. It was large enough to accommodate some R-3 land. The site was in walking distance to schools, park, churches, and some commercial services. If this was not deemed to be a large annexation, where was the City going to get R-3 land? A Comprehensive Plan map amendment could be done along with an annexation request and could be processed concurrently. The whole site would not be redesignated, just a portion of it. Twenty units of R-3 would take a couple acres of land, which would not be overly burdensome to the developer.

PC Stuhr asked about the definition of large and if they should count only the buildable acres due to a stream corridor or wetlands. Mr. Friedman thought it made sense to only count the buildable acres. He thought the 3,000 square foot lots did not go far enough in affordable housing. If not here, then where and when would it happen?

Rick Rogers, Newberg resident, discussed the letter he handed out to the Commission. He gave a history of how the R-3 policy had been discussed and approved. It was meant to be flexible and he thought the “some” should be determined by the developer. If there was a concern about utilities in this area, there would be utilities up and down Chehalem Drive long ago. Mixed types of housing in a single development was a good thing and could be done well. In 2008, there was no R-3 land and there was still no R-3 land in the community. He did not know why this policy was not codified back then. This was a large development as 107 houses was large. There had only been 7 acres of R-3 that had been annexed in 20 years. He thought they could accommodate a mix of zoning on this parcel. There was no perfect parcel and they did not want all R-3 in one area. There was a question of whether or not this met the Comprehensive Plan criteria. He thought it did not meet the criteria nor met the criteria for SB 1573 and should be taken to a public vote.

Lisa Rogers, Newberg resident, said there was a lack of R-3 in the City. Several years ago a mechanism was put in place to force people to have R-3 land so they wouldn't continue to face the shortage. This was an opportunity to make sure that happened. Putting in R-3 here would encourage other R-3 development in the area and would give people a range of housing options. She did not want to have a segregated community.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Jessica Cain and Dan Danicic gave rebuttal. They thought the intent behind the policy was to create affordable housing. Placing R-3 on this parcel would not create affordable housing. There were better properties for R-3. Putting R-3 on this property was not appropriate due to lack of City services and the City's master plans did not take into account R-3. If they made 25% of the development R-3, that would create 102 units, leaving 20 acres left for R-1 which was supposed to be an average of 5,000 square foot lots, equally about 80 units. She did not think this met the

large parcel category. They were coming in in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan designation and the annexation criteria and SB 1573 was met and no voter approval was required. They encouraged the Commission to find that this was not a large parcel, that there were competing policy issues, and that the R-1 zoning outweighed the R-3 policy in this case.

PC Bliss asked why services for R-3 cost more than in other places in the City. He thought the lines were sized by topography not by the size of future development. In Washington County, they went beyond the boundaries in anticipation of the drainage basin. He thought there was a conflict with the cost of the sizing. Mr. Danicic said land use laws precluded cities from designing their infrastructure systems for land outside the Urban Growth Boundary. The City's master plans forecasted loads to the system up to, but not past, the Urban Growth Boundary and utilized the anticipated density of population within the basins. They ran the risk of every annexation including R-3 and the greater density might impact the infrastructure downstream. If there was a constriction a mile away from this site, the developer would have to remedy it.

PC Stuhr asked if this had been clearer in the beginning, many of these questions would have been answered. Mr. Danicic responded that if the Code had the implementing language that defined what large was and what some meant, it would have been taken into account during the preliminary assessment of the property. If they thought it was still economical, they would have come forward with a plan that included R-3. He thought they were meeting Code as it was currently written.

PC Smith did not think the application met the Code as it was currently written. Would they be willing to go to a vote? Ms. Cain answered she did not think the Commission had the authority to send it to the vote.

Chair Dale closed the public testimony portion of the hearing at 8:54 pm.

Final Comments from Staff and recommendation:

SP Olson discussed the costs associated with infrastructure including analysis costs and potential infrastructure costs. The annexation data staff provided was gross acreage and did not take into account stream corridors or wetlands. They did not have to approve the annexation because it was R-1. The staff report said the R-1 zoning complied with the LDR Comprehensive Plan designation. Regarding the shortage of R-3 in Newberg, there was a finding that stated there was a need for R-3 in the staff report. Regarding the question of a vote, he summarized the change in State law and the requirements for not going to a vote. He thought going to a vote was a moot issue if the Planning Commission and City Council adopted findings that said it met the Comprehensive Plan. If there was a denial of the application, it would not go to a vote either. Any decision could be appealed to LUBA.

CDD Rux said the Commission needed to decide what large meant, what some meant, and these would be part of the findings. Regarding the sizing of infrastructure, the City could size it according to the development that would occur in the Urban Growth Boundary. There was a deficiency of R-3 land in Newberg. There was discussion currently about addressing the affordable housing issue. The work that was done several years ago on the R-3 policy was never implemented into the Code which left a tension between policies. There had to be a balance to these differing Comprehensive Plan policies and Code issues.

SP Olson said staff recommended adoption of the resolution which recommended approval to the Council.

Chair Dale recessed the meeting for a 10 minute break at 9:11 pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:20 pm.

Planning Commission deliberation:

PC Stuhr thought the first issue they needed to address was the definition of large. She suggested something bigger than 15 acres and smaller than 40 acres should be considered large. Stream corridors and wetlands should be taken into account as well.

PC Smith said in answer to the City Attorney's questions, the Development Code regulations did not fully implement the R-3 policy. However, the criteria were applicable to the current application. He thought the application did not meet the criteria because he considered this a large annexation. The Municipal Code said only R-1 zoning was appropriate to implement the LDR designation. He would approve this application, but he wished he didn't have to.

PC Watson concurred with PC Smith. The study for a portion of the project to be R-3 should have been done at in the beginning of this process. It would have answered many of these questions. Because of the language in the Code, it would probably be approved, but she thought R-3 should be brought in. If they didn't start somewhere, nothing was going to change.

PC Edwards said high density did not equate to affordable housing. This parcel was not accommodating for an R-3 development. It was too far away from conveniences that an R-3 area would require. He agreed the Code needed to be changed through a legislative process. He thought the application should be approved.

PC Stuhr stated if not here, where would the R-3 go in town? She thought the argument for the location could be made either way. She worried about making developers bring in smaller parcels. Right now LDR was only R-1 and she did not think R-3 could be placed there currently.

PC Bliss did not agree with the cost issue brought up by the applicants. No matter where R-3 was put, most of the residents would have a car. Large should be taken in context. He thought it should be 20-30 acres and he thought this application should be considered a large annexation.

PC Wolfe said they could not continue kicking the can down the road and not defining these things so it was clear to everyone. These issues needed to be addressed and clearly set forth.

PC Watson thought they could approve this application, and then address the issues for future applications so this did not happen again. A lot of this could have been taken care of in the beginning.

Chair Dale said since there were no definitions of large and some, whatever the Commission decided was arbitrary and left them open to appeals. He thought they should be disregarded because of the conflicting policies. He was in favor of starting legislative procedures to fix these issues.

Action by the Planning Commission:

MOTION: PC Smith/PC Watson moved to approve Resolution 2017-324. The motion carried (7 Yes / 0 No).

PC Stuhr addressed the findings. She agreed that even if the R-3 policy applied, it would still conflict with the Municipal Code that stated only R-1 zoning was appropriate to be implemented. She suggested deleting the finding about the lack of support for the location for the R-3.

PC Smith agreed about deleting this finding as he thought this was a good location. In future findings, this kind of language needed to be balanced against the policy for a housing mix in all areas.

PC Stuhr added that there needed to be a determination of large. PC Smith said for the purposes of this decision, the builder thought this would create around 100 units and anything in that range would have to count as large. He thought it should be left vague and be more specific when they went through the legislative process. Since they were not requiring the R-3, the Commission did not need to define the term "some R-3" at this time. The findings regarding the Transportation Planning Rule would stay the same with no change, similarly for the police and fire services.

PC Stuhr suggested deleting the finding about the commercial services available, the finding about open space available, and the finding about the low level of transportation services in the area.

PC Stuhr found a typo on page 32, where the word "or" should be added. It should be placed "or" removed 50 cubic yards.

MOTION: PC Smith/PC Wolfe moved to delete the wording in the current findings on pages 30 and 31 and to add the word "or" on page 32 as discussed. The motion carried (7 Yes / 0 No).

MOTION: PC Smith/PC Stuhr moved to direct staff to initiate a policy change to allow a mix of zones in LDR, density variations in LDR, a balance of the housing policy with other criteria and making the mixed housing a priority, definition of a large annexation and some R-3, and looking at the timing of the policy implementation and take it from annexation to UGB. The motion carried (7 Yes / 0 No).

2. **Telecommunications Antennas:** Consider a conditional use permit & design review application for new wireless telecommunications antennas and ground equipment at 530 E. Edgewood Dr. The application proposes antennas inside a fiberglass “faux steeple” on the roof of the building.

APPLICANT: Verizon Wireless

FILE NO.: CUP-17-002/DR2-16-007

ORDER: 2017-03

CRITERIA: Newberg Development Code Sections: 15.225.060, 15.220.050(B), 15.445.190

Call to order: Chair Dale called the hearing to order at 9:57 pm.

Call for abstentions, bias, ex parte contact, and objections to jurisdiction: None.

Legal Announcement: Read by Chair Dale.

Staff Report: Presentation given by Assistant Planner Brad Allen. This was a request for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review approval for six wireless telecommunications antennas and ground equipment on Edgewood Drive. The applicant was not proposing a new tower, but the antennas would be placed on an existing building. The site was the location of the Newberg Seventh Day Adventist Church. The property was in the R-1, low density residential, zone and cell towers were not a permitted use in the zone. Antennas incorporated into an existing structure were allowed by Conditional Use. This was in the northwest part of town, located on Edgewood Drive and had frontage on College Street and Princeton Street. It was surrounded by R-1. This would be around 400 square feet of leased area on the east end of the church. The lot had a lot of landscaping on the north and south which was a buffer to the surrounding houses. He discussed the site plan and the elevations of what the church looked like now and what it would like with the antennas which would be housed in a faux steeple and would match the rest of the church. The Conditional Use criteria had to deal with the compatibility with the surrounding area, how it would create a functional and attractive living, working, shopping civic environment, and if it was consistent with the Code. Staff found that the faux steeple camouflaged the antennas in a way that was consistent and logical with a church building and made it reasonably compatible with the residential neighborhood. The location and design made a functional improvement to the coverage and capacity of cell service in the area. He discussed the Design Review criteria which included design compatibility, parking, setbacks, landscaping, signs, and compliance with the zoning in the districts and sub-districts. This was an unmanned facility with no employees and would be visited once per month by a technician. It did not create more traffic or need for parking. They were not proposing any signs and the setbacks were met. The criteria for telecommunication facilities had to do with new towers and this was not a new tower. There was a requirement to demonstrate that existing towers could not accommodate the proposal. The applicant contacted the other tower owners in the City and made a good faith effort to show that the nearest tower on Alice Way could not accommodate the increase in capacity and coverage the applicant was trying to achieve. There was also a requirement to preserve existing vegetation to the greatest extent possible, and they were removing a small area of grass for the generator and dumpster enclosure. The steeple design and site obscuring fence and wall reduced the visible impact to the surrounding area. There was a condition that the applicant provide written statements from the Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Communications Commission, and Oregon State Department of Aviation that confirmed the project complied with those organizations' requirements or that compliance was not required. Staff recommended approval of the application with the suggested conditions of approval.

PC Bliss asked if there was an indication of the decibels that would be generated at the property line. AP Allen replied it was not in the application, but a study had been done by the applicant.

Public Testimony:

Applicant: Sofia Mekkers, representing Verizon Wireless, said there was one change to the plans. The plans said they would be putting in a 30 kilowatt generator, but it would actually be a 20 kilowatt generator. A noise study had been done which showed the noise from the generator and cabinets would not exceed permissible noise levels. She entered the study into the record.

PC Stuhr said a number of public comments had been received regarding health concerns. She asked if Ms. Mekkers could address those concerns. Ms. Mekkers responded the application contained a report from their certified health physicist stating the facility would operate far below the FCC exposure limits. There was a concern about how it might affect a heart defibrillator and the physicist addressed that issue with a statement explaining how the medical devices were tested at a level that fell far above anything expected from this facility. She entered the potential interference from radiofrequency sources and ICDs report into the record as well.

The Commission read the report.

PC Edwards complimented the aesthetically designed steeple as it was pleasing to the eye. He asked if this would be accessible to other users, or exclusively for Verizon. Ms. Mekkers said the structure would be exclusive, but the church could enter into an agreement with another carrier as long as it did not interfere with Verizon. It would strengthen the service that was already in place and ensured there would not be capacity issues moving forward.

Written Comments: The supplement letter was already received and added to the packet.

Close of public testimony portion of hearing: Chair Dale closed the public hearing at 10:18 pm.

Final Comments from Staff and recommendation:

AP Allen said in the R-1 zone there were height standards, which were not to exceed 30 feet. The tower would be 36 feet high. The 30 feet was an average height and the applicant chose to apply an alternative building height standard which allowed exceeding the maximum height provided they were far enough from the property lines and it would not cast a shadow on the properties to the north. It was far below the alternative building height limit. This application met the criteria and staff's recommendation was to approve the application.

PC Bliss would abstain from the vote as he did not have a chance to review the application.

Action by the planning commission:

MOTION: PC Stuhr/PC Watson moved to approve Order 2017-03. The motion carried (6 Yes / 0 No / 1 Abstain [PC Bliss]).

CDD Rux said the Water Master Plan was on the agenda for tonight, however he recommended continuing the hearing to April 27, 2017, at 7 pm due to the lateness of the evening. PC Bliss would not be in attendance on April 27.

LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING (complete registration form to give testimony - 5 minute maximum per person, unless otherwise set by majority motion of the Planning Commission)

1. **Water Master Plan:** Consider a resolution recommending that the City Council adopt the 2017 Water Master Plan. Resolution 2017-326. File No. CPTA-17-001

Chair Dale opened the hearing at 10:24 pm.

MOTION: PC Stuhr/PC Watson moved to continue the hearing to April 27, 2017. The motion carried (7 Yes / 0 No).

ITEMS FROM STAFF:

CDD Rux introduced new Associate Planner, Cheryl Caines. CDD Rux updated the Commission on the Riverfront Master Plan. The next Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for April 27, 2017 (Special Meeting) and May 11, 2017.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

PC Edwards asked if staff could look into reviewing the construction fees as appropriate with the number of new houses that were coming into the system. The parks district was going to levy another \$10,000 per new home development and he thought the current construction fees should be reconsidered. CDD Rux responded SDCs were calculated and established through the City's master plans. The Council made the decisions about SDCs. Currently water SDCs were going to go down, and transportation SDCs were going to go up. The master plans had identified projects for a 20 year horizon and the SDCs paid for all or a portion of these projects, and if the SDCs were reduced, the funding was not available for the

projects. That might increase the rates to generate the revenue needed. He would talk with the City Engineer about the issue.

Chair Jason Dale adjourned the meeting at 10:32 pm.

Approved by the Newberg Planning Commission this May 11, 2017.



Jason Dale, Planning Commission Chair



Bobbie Morgan, Office Assistant II