

DRAFT
SUBJECT TO REVISION

Council Chambers
7:30 PM, Thursday

A Regular Meeting
of the Planning Commission

August 15, 1985
Newberg, Oregon

Members Present:

Bryce Fendall
Kathy Kelso
Jack Kriz
John Lyda

Eldon McIntosh
Arthur Roberts
Roger Veatch

Staff Present:

Clay Moorhead, Planning Director
Rick Faus, City Attorney
Barb Mingay, Recording Secretary

Citizens Present:

9 Citizens

The meeting of the Newberg Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Roger Veatch.

Motion: Kriz-McIntosh to approve the July 18, 1985 Planning Commission minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Requests from the Floor:

Jane Parisi-Mosher, 109 N. Meridian, is a member the group "Citizens for a Better Newberg". She distributed pamphlets describing what the Redevelopment effort is all about, and urged the Planning Commission to take a position for the defeat of Ballot Measure #51. She added that the issue comes before the Voters September 17, 1985.

Planning Commission Chair Roger Veatch indicated he was also a member of this group.

Roger Pyles, 1311 Palomino Court, stated he was also a member of the committee. He related his experience discussing the issue with the community while distributing pamphlets recently. He indicated that he had encountered only three people in opposition out of dozens of people he had contacted. He identified a very positive reception in the community for redevelopment. He suggested the community try it, and see if the business climate could be improved in Newberg.

Peggy Campbell, 911 E. Third, explained the differences between the Downtown Association and the Redevelopment Agency. She indicated that the Downtown Association would be involved in building revitalization with private funding, while the Redevelopment Agency would be involved in doing more major basic service projects such as infrastructure improvements.

She commented that if NCRC were deactivated on September 17, the Agency must stay in business until the existing debt is paid off, at which time it would no longer function. The Main Street program is funded 50% by NCRC.

Planning Commission Comments:

Arthur Roberts: He commented that on the whole, its a good plan. There are other alternatives, but this is one of the best ways for our American system of government to use. He encouraged the Commission to support redevelopment. He is in favor of it.

Kathy Kelso: Indicated she was in favor of redevelopment. This is a way for the citizenry of Newberg to invest in the future of Newberg.

Bryce Fendall: He was in favor of it, but had some concerns that it doesn't become too concentrated in the core area, but that it encompass the whole city.

Jack Kriz: He was in favor of it.

John Lyda: He had questions regarding the selection of the boundary, but was generally in favor of it.

Staff identified some of the reasons the boundary was chosen, pointing out that primary infrastructure problems, building safety standards and traffic problems were all considered when choosing the final boundary.

Eldon McIntosh: As a former Council member during the development of the redevelopment plan, he was in favor and still is in favor of redevelopment. He indicated that he has visited other cities operating under redevelopment agencies and the cities have been drastically improved. He commented that if this agency is lost, the downtown is a dead issue.

Roger Veatch: He indicated he was in favor of the agency even though some elements may not be totally perfect. His contact with the public has shown that a positive attitude toward redevelopment exists in the community.

Motion: McIntosh-Roberts to reaffirm the Planning Commission decision and go on record as endorsing the Redevelopment Plan and supporting its continuance. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearing A:

Applicant:	Redevco Co./Future Investments
Request:	Appeal of a Planning Director decision for approval of variance to the front yard setback to allow for Donald Harr to locate a sign within the front 15 ft. yard area.
Location:	2201, 2203, 2205, 2207A, 2207B, and 2207C Portland Road
Tax Lot No:	3217DC-1100
File No:	Appeal-1-85 (Refer to V-2-85 Planning Dept. File)

After brief discussion with Council, a motion was made.

Motion: Kriz-McIntosh to dismiss Public Hearing A. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearing B:

Applicant: City of Newberg/P. Champagne
Request: Vacation of the eastern 100 feet of the alley located within Block 57 of Edwards Addition Subdivision, being bounded by Eighth and Ninth Streets, and College and Meridian Streets in Newberg, Oregon
Location: Alleyway adjacent to 815 S. Meridian
Tax Lot: Adjacent to Tax Lot No's 3219DA-2400 and -4100
File No: VAC-1-85

No abstentions or objections to jurisdiction occurred.

Staff Report: Planning Director Moorhead presented the staff report, identified the subject property and distributed a copy of two petitions, one in opposition and one in favor. He identified some of the State laws regarding vacation proceedings and the method the City has used in the past to process vacation requests.

Proponent: Lorene Champagne, 815 S. Meridian, has lived at this location for 20 years and no one uses the alleyway unless they have used Champagne's driveway as there is no curb cut on the Meridian side. They would like it closed to allow them use of the added space for parking of their vehicles.

Opponent: George Burnside, 803 E. Ninth, opposed the vacation based on 6 reasons: 1. The vacation is not in the long-range best interest of the citizens of Newberg and would compound the problem of usage of the alley. 2. Alleyways should be unobstructed for the complete length with suitable provision for ingress and egress. 3. There should not be a dead-ended alley that necessitates larger vehicles having to back either in or out. 4. Access to the rear of our building lots would be permanently impaired. 5. The alleyway would be used more if it were opened all the way through. 6. If the vacation were to occur, and if at some future time there was a need to re-open that part of the alleyway, re-acquisition would be required.

Opponent: Carol Burnside, 803 E. Ninth, indicated they were building a carport at the rear of their home and would have better access to it from the Meridian Street end of the alleyway.

Opponent: Francis Keltner, 820 S. College, indicated that the Planning Commission would probably not be in favor of new development allowing a dead end street of this length, so why allow an alleyway to deadend.

Questions to Opponents and Proponents:

Mr. Burnside was asked why there was a duplication in some of the names on the opposing petitions. He commented that the most recent petition, (that in opposition), contained the current views of those people who had previously signed Mrs. Champagne's petition.

Mr. Keltner responded that he had lived at that location 35 years and that the alleyway had originally been blocked by blackberries at the Meridian end.

Mr. Champagne responded that the Meridian end of the alleyway had never been used as an accessway and a curb had always existed at the alleyway entrance. He has gravelled the portion of the alleyway adjoining his property for his own benefit.

Mr. Burnside indicated he would be interested in gravelling the remaining ungravelled portion of the alleyway if the Meridian Street end were open and accessible.

No public agencies commented, no other letters were received with the exception of the two petitions.

Proponent Rebuttal:

Mrs. Champagne indicated that the neighbors rarely requested access from the Meridian end, and that the alleyway was seldom used for access for hauling items in and out.

Opponent Rebuttal:

Mr. Burnside indicated that only approximately 50 feet of the alleyway is ungravelled, and the use of the alleyway has changed from the past and will continue to be used in the future.

Staff Recommendation: Based on the number of objections to the closing of the alley and based on the six reasons as submitted by the opponents, Planning Director Moorhead recommended not vacating the alleyway.

Motion: Roberts-Kriz to recommend to City Council the denial of the vacation request. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff identified that due to notice requirements, the City Council would review the request at the October 7, 1985 City Council meeting, with additional testimony allowed at that time.

Old Business. Mr. Moorhead identified that a subcommittee was being created to develop a new sign ordinance. The proposed makeup of the subcommittee could include a Planning Commission member, Council member, lay citizens and Ex-Officio members. The subcommittee would draft an ordinance for Planning Commission and City Council review.

Motion: Roberts-Kriz to recommend that Eldon McIntosh serve on the committee to establish a sign ordinance. Motion carried unanimously.

New Business. Commissioner Kelso distributed Walking Tour brochures. She indicated that a draft historic preservation ordinance was being compiled. A portion of the draft ordinance was distributed, identifying standards. The consensus of the Commission was to continue discussion of the historic ordinance draft in a workshop format at the September Planning Commission meeting.

Motion: McIntosh-Kelso to adjourn. Carried unanimously.