

A Regular Meeting
of the Planning Commission
7:30 PM, Thursday Newberg Public Library July 21, 1988
Subject to P.C. Approval at 8/18/88 P.C. Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Jack Kriz.

Members Present:

Scott Bernard	Celine Hall
Bryce Fendall	Jack Kriz
Sandra Foster	Kathleen Sullivan

Staff Present:

Clay Moorhead, Planning Director
James Reitz, Associate Planner
Barb Mingay, Recording Secretary

Citizens Present:

Approximately 12 Citizens

It was announced that Public Hearing B on the agenda, relating to a conditional use permit for Burger King, has been withdrawn.

Motion: Fendall-Kelso to approve the minutes of the June 16, 1988 Planning Commission meeting with a correction to the spelling of Commissioner Fendall's name on Page 2. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearing A:

Applicant: City of Newberg, et al
Request: Annexation of a total of 9 parcels, and their withdrawal from the Newberg Rural Fire Protection District. T.L. 3228-1500 is proposed for a zone change/comprehensive plan amendment from MDR (Medium Density Residential) to IND (Industrial). The other 8 parcels are proposed for an M-2 (Light Industrial) zoning designation which complies with the IND comprehensive plan designation on the sites.
Location: The sites are located SE of the City in the vicinity of Sandoz Road, Dog Ridge Road, and the St. Paul Highway.
Tax Lot: 3220-500, -601, 700; 3221-2100, -2101, -2200; 3228- 1500; 3229-102, -201
File No: ANX-6-88

No abstentions, objections to jurisdiction or ex-parte contact were indicated.

Staff Report: Planning Director Moorhead identified the sites on a map and indicated that the City Council has an interest in having all the City owned property within the City limits. Currently, the Sewer Treatment Plant is not within the City limits. The Council is also in support of annexations within the UGB; therefore, property owners in the area of the STP were contacted relating to annexation. A number of property owners expressed an interest in annexing their sites at this time.

Due to the Federal restrictions for rural road projects however, annexation of the Sewer Treatment Plant at this time could jeopardize a grant which would provide funds to upgrade Wynooski Road. The City has therefore dropped the requested annexation of the Sewer Treatment Plant at this time. The other sites proposed for annexation are still subject to Planning Commission and Council review.

Mr. Moorhead reviewed the Staff Report findings relating to sewer and water availability in the area. He added that four property owners have requested annexation.

A brief discussion then followed relating to the periodic review process and to proposed industrial areas discussed as Alternatives A, B, and C.

Proponent: None

Opponent: DiJaun Coates, representing her husband Henry Coates and herself, read a letter into the record in opposition to the annexation of tax lot 3228-1500 and Sandoz Road. She indicated that the current use of the property was not currently in compliance with County zoning, and the matter would only be compounded if the property were annexed.

Opponent: Ron Gleason, 1416 S. Sandoz Road, indicated that he was opposed to the annexation of both 3228-1500 and Sandoz Road. He could see no reason to annex this individual property, and that an industrial designation would cause devaluation of the surrounding residential properties.

Opponent: Robert Morland, 1301 S. Sandoz Road, has a general objection to the annexations. He feels that the City's desire to provide another meeting place is not a sufficient reason to request annexation. He feels that poor planning is occurring when spot development is involved.

Opponent: Larry Atteberry, owner of two properties on Sandoz Road, doesn't think his sites are appropriate for industrial zoning and doesn't think Sandoz Road should be annexed.

Opponent: Ron Gleason questioned where the sewerage system would go along Sandoz Road. He suspected that the individual property owners would be subject to the cost of a public sewer system. He requested clarification of this issue.

Planning Director Moorhead pointed out that the current City tax rate was approximately \$7.12 per thousand and that only those properties within the City paid this rate. He added that properties could only be annexed by consent of the owner unless an island were created; only islands are annexable without the consent of property owners. He reviewed utility line installation practices, commenting that if the lines would benefit the entire community, usually they were paid for by the community through tax dollars; however, if the lines were only of benefit to specific sites, then development fees would be paid by the individual site owners. City versus County road standards were identified as well as Local Improvement District requirements. He indicated that the area between Newberg and Dundee has not been considered for industrial expansion due to the cost of utility

improvements in the area.

Commissioner Fendall indicated that there was currently a need for small one acre plus sites for use in developing family-type industries.

It was the consensus of the opponents that economic impacts on their homes were of primary concern. The Sandoz Road site was further discussed as well as current values within the City for existing vacant industrial land.

Letters, Public Agency Comments: None

Staff Recommendation:

Planning Director Moorhead recommended approval of the request for annexation, a Comprehensive plan Change on Tax Lot No. 3228-1500 to IND (Industrial), a zone change to an M-2 (Light Industrial) zone, and withdrawal from the Newberg Rural Fire Protection District. He indicated that the Sewer Treatment Plant property was not included in this recommendation.

Public Hearing Closed.

The Commission discussed the Sandoz Road site and its status as a legitimate County approved business. The benefits of a zone change to an M-1 (Limited Industrial) district were discussed. Staff pointed out that a Conditional Use Permit would be required to allow contractor's equipment storage within the City if the property were zoned M-1.

Motion: Fendall-Sullivan to recommend to the City Council that they annex the four northern parcels (T.L. Numbers 3220-500, 3221-2100, 3221-2101, and 3221-2200) together with a zone change from a County AF-10 zoning designation to a City M-2 (Light Industrial) zoning district and withdrawal from the Newberg Rural Fire Protection District based on the Staff Report Findings. Motion carried unanimously.

The Commission then discussed the parcel known as the Salmon property.

Motion: Sullivan-Fendall to re-open and continue the hearing on the Salmon property only to the August 18, 1988 Planning Commission meeting to allow additional opportunity for testimony. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff was instructed to obtain information from Yamhill County regarding the status of the business currently operating on the Salmon property.

A five minute recess was called.

Old Business: A slide presentation relating to review of a sign ordinance was presented by Associate Planner James Reitz. The Commissioners discussed the various positive and negative attributes of each slide. Comments were expressed relating to the following items:

1. Quantity of signs should be limited by type of business or by zone.
2. Definitions should be created which would differentiate between the various kinds of signs, flags, pennants, banners and graphics.
3. Signs should be limited in number or in amount of allowable wall coverage per site.
4. Include requirements addressing height of sign allowed above grade or adjacent site.
5. Ordinance should address sandwich-board signs and temporary signs, with length of duration specified.
6. Wooden signs are clean and pleasant looking.
7. Readerboard signs should be restricted and/or their size should be limited.
8. Removal of non-complying, pre-existing signs could be amortized over a specific time period.
9. Outdated, dilapidated signs should be removed or repaired within a specific time period.
10. Signs located at businesses no longer operating should be removed prior to re-occupancy by another business.
11. Permits for new signs and removal of old ones should be tied to occupancy permits.
12. Window signs located on the inside face of exterior windows should be restricted as to glass coverage.
13. Use of temporary signs, sign poles, etc. within the right-of-way should be restricted.
14. Sign size could be designated by zone.
15. Signs should have some relationship to the building and/or business, in both size and architectural features.
16. Excessive quantity of signs is a distraction, not a benefit to the business or customer.
17. Signs which are denoted as of a historical nature, i.e. on a landmarks list, could be excluded from regulations relating to removal, etc.
18. Realty signs should be restricted by quantity per site and how long they may be located on a site after the property sells/leases.
19. Portable reader-boards in the right-of-way are not appropriate.
20. Temporary paper signs are not appropriate.
21. Painted and wooden carved signs are aesthetically pleasing, either when hung flat or extended from the building.
22. Uniformity of signs (for example, all signs could only be 3 by 5 ft.) would equalize this kind of advertisement source from business to business.
23. Public agencies should also coordinate the location of directional signs so that several agencies do not advertise the same information on different signs at the same location.
24. Awning signs should be addressed.
25. Exterior painting of a building could cause the entire building to become a sign.
26. Multiple use facilities such as shopping centers should have consolidated signs, i.e. one sign for the whole complex.
27. Design review should be enacted to control sign quality.
28. Grand opening and going out of business signs should have restricted time limitations.
29. Cut out signs should have measurement methods specifically identified.

30. Sign lighting, both inside and external, should be controlled.
31. Ingress-egress problems due to sign proliferation should be controlled, corrected and/or reviewed through design review.
32. Political signs should be limited as to length of time they may be up and when they should be removed.

New Business: None

There being no further business, the meeting was then adjourned.