



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

## Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

Fax (503) 378-5518

www.lcd.state.or.us

### NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

August 21, 2008

TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan  
or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Mara Ulloa, Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: City of Newberg Plan Amendment  
DLCD File Number 004-08



The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. A copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures\*

### **DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: September 4, 2008**

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review 45 days prior to adoption. Pursuant to ORS 197.830 (2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

**\*NOTE: THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAN IT WAS MAILED TO DLCD. AS A RESULT YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED.**

Cc: Gloria Gardiner, DLCD Urban Planning Specialist  
Steve Oulman, DLCD Regional Representative  
Bill Holmstrom, DLCD Transportation Planner  
Amanda Punton, DLCD Natural Resource Specialist  
Steve Olson, City of Newberg

<paa> ya/email

# Notice of Adoption



**THIS FORM MUST BE MAILED TO DLCD  
 WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS AFTER THE FINAL DECISION  
 PER ORS 197.610, OAR CHAPTER 660 - DIVISION 18**

Jurisdiction: **City of Newberg**

Local file number: **ANX-07-003**

Date of Adoption: **8/4/2008**

Date Mailed: **8/13/2008**

Was a Notice of Proposed Amendment (Form 1) mailed to DLCD? **Yes** Date: **4/28/2008**

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment

Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment

Land Use Regulation Amendment

Zoning Map Amendment

New Land Use Regulation

Other: **Annexation**

Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write "See Attached".

Annexation of 18.5 acres located at 4505 E. Portland Road. Zone change from County AF-10 to City R-1, R-2 and C-2. Zones match the existing comprehensive plan designations on the site (Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Commercial).

Does the Adoption differ from proposal? Yes, Please explain below:

There are no substantial differences but there were conditions placed on the future development of the property regarding a traffic study, traffic impact fee, northern setback and sound wall, development in or near wetlands.

Plan Map Changed from: **LDR, MDR, COM**

to: **no change**

Zone Map Changed from: **AF-10**

to: **R-1, R-2, C-2**

Location: **4505 E. Portland Rd, Newberg OR 97132**

Acres Involved: **18**

Specify Density: Previous: **1/10 acres**

New: **4.4/a R-1, 8.8/a R2**

Applicable statewide planning goals:

- |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1</b>                            | <b>2</b>                 | <b>3</b>                 | <b>4</b>                 | <b>5</b>                            | <b>6</b>                 | <b>7</b>                 | <b>8</b>                 | <b>9</b>                            | <b>10</b>                           | <b>11</b>                           | <b>12</b>                | <b>13</b>                | <b>14</b>                | <b>15</b>                | <b>16</b>                | <b>17</b>                | <b>18</b>                | <b>19</b>                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Was an Exception Adopted?  YES  NO

Did DLCD receive a Notice of Proposed Amendment...

45-days prior to first evidentiary hearing?

Yes  No

If no, do the statewide planning goals apply?

Yes  No

*DLCD # 004-08 (16860)*

If no, did Emergency Circumstances require immediate adoption?

Yes  No

**DLCD file No.** \_\_\_\_\_

Please list all affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts:

Newberg Rural Fire Protection District, Yamhill County, Chehalem Park and Recreation District, ODOT

Local Contact: Steve Olson

Phone: (503) 537-1215 Extension:

Address: PO Box 970

Fax Number: 503-537-1272

City: Newberg

Zip: 97132-

E-mail Address: [steve.olson@ci.newberg.or.us](mailto:steve.olson@ci.newberg.or.us)

## ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision**

per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18.


1. Send this Form and TWO Complete Copies (documents and maps) of the Adopted Amendment to:

**ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST  
DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150  
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540**

2. Electronic Submittals: At least **one** hard copy must be sent by mail or in person, but you may also submit an electronic copy, by either email or FTP. You may connect to this address to FTP proposals and adoptions: [webserver.lcd.state.or.us](http://webserver.lcd.state.or.us). To obtain our Username and password for FTP, call Mara Ulloa at 503-373-0050 extension 238, or by emailing [mara.ulloa@state.or.us](mailto:mara.ulloa@state.or.us).
3. Please Note: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD not later than **FIVE (5) working days** following the date of the final decision on the amendment.
4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.
5. The deadline to appeal will not be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within **TWENTY-ONE (21) days** of the date, the Notice of Adoption is sent to DLCD.
6. In addition to sending the Notice of Adoption to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.
7. **Need More Copies?** You can now access these forms online at <http://www.lcd.state.or.us/>. Please print on **8-1/2x11 green paper only**. You may also call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax your request to: (503) 378-5518; or Email your request to [mara.ulloa@state.or.us](mailto:mara.ulloa@state.or.us) - ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.

Planning & Building.  
(503) 537-1240

City Attorney  
(503) 537-1206



414 East First St.  
PO Box 970  
Newberg, OR 97132

August 14, 2008

Forrest Gish  
1307 N. College, Apt. 109  
Newberg, OR 97132

Kimberly Dunn  
4505 E. Portland Road  
Newberg, OR 97132

DEPT OF  
AUG 15 2008  
LAND CONSERVATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT

Subject: File ANX-07-003/Annexation of 18.5 acres at 4505 E. Portland Rd.

Dear Forrest and Kimberly,

On August 4, 2008 the Newberg City Council adopted Order 2008-0013 and Ordinance 2008-2700, finding that the 18.5 acre parcel located at 4505 E. Portland Road met the criteria for annexation into the city and approving it subject to a public vote. The annexation ballot measure is scheduled for the November 4, 2008 election.

Any party aggrieved by this decision may appeal the decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) by first filing a "Notice of Intent to Appeal" within 21 days after the land use decision became final (OAR-661-010-0010(3)). For details on filing an appeal, contact the Land Use Board of Appeals at 503-373-1265 (550 Capitol Street NE Suite 235, Salem, OR 97301).

If you have any questions please call me at 503-537-1215.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steve Olson".

Steve Olson  
Associate Planner  
City of Newberg

Enclosure: Order 2008-0013/Ordinance 2008-2700

CC: File, Tim Speakman, John Trudel, Paul & Carla Anderson, Bruce & Bobbie Barnett, Steven & Joanne Goodfellow, Dale & Doris Palmer, Bruce Ernst, Vicki Shepherd, Stan Kern, Charles Harrell, Marc Willcuts, Andrew Tull, Brian Dunn, David Jensen, Charlie Harris, Matt Keller, Tom Barnes, Dan Fricke, Amanda Punton, Bill Holmstrom

Planning & Building : e-mail: [steve.olson@ci.newberg.or.us](mailto:steve.olson@ci.newberg.or.us) Fax: 503-537-1272  
Admin: 537-1261 Building: 537-1240 Public Works: 537-1273 Finance: 538-9421 Fire: 537-1230  
Library: 538-7323 Municipal Court: 537-1203 Police: 538-8321 Maintenance: 537-1234 Utilities: 537-1205  
Municipal Court Fax: 538-5393 Public Works Fax: 537-1277 Library Fax: 538-9720

"Working Together For A Better Community-Serious About Service"



## ORDER No. 2008-0013

---

**AN ORDER FINDING THAT PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4505 E. PORTLAND ROAD, YAMHILL COUNTY TAX LOT 3216-1100, MEETS THE APPLICABLE NEWBERG DEVELOPMENT CODE CRITERIA TO BE ANNEXED INTO THE CITY, AND MEETS THE APPLICABLE CODE CRITERIA TO CHANGE THE ZONING FROM COUNTY AF-10 TO CITY R-1, R-2 AND C-2**

---

### RECITALS:

1. On April 1, 2008 Coyote Homes Inc. submitted an application to annex one parcel (approximately 18.5 acres) into the City of Newberg with a concurrent zone change to R-1 (Low Density Residential), R-2 (Medium Density Residential) and C-2 (Community Commercial) for property located at 4505 E. Portland Road, Yamhill County tax lot 3216-1100.
2. The Newberg Planning Commission heard the annexation and zoning amendment on June 12, 2008, took public testimony, and continued the hearing to July 10, 2008 to allow ODOT time to review the supplemental traffic study and revised findings. The Planning Commission continued the hearing on July 10, 2008, reviewed the supplemental traffic study and revised findings, reviewed ODOT's comment that they had no further objections to the annexation request, and recommended approval of the annexation as conditioned and placement on the November 4, 2008 ballot per Resolution 2008-252.
3. Change of applicant: On July 16, 2008 Coyote Homes, Inc. withdrew as the applicant and the owner, Forrest R. Gish, Trustee for Forrest R. Gish Living Trust dated September 15, 1997, notified the City that he was now the applicant.
4. After proper notice, on August 4, 2008, the Newberg City Council held a hearing to consider the annexation and zoning amendment request.
5. The City Council finds that the applicable criteria have been met, and that approval of the application is in the best interests of the community.

### THE CITY OF NEWBERG ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The City Council finds that the annexation and zoning amendment meet the Newberg Development Code criteria and adopts the findings, which are attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Exhibit "A" is hereby adopted and by this reference incorporated.
2. Annexation requires the City Council to adopt an ordinance annexing the property, and requires approval at a public vote. If the annexation is approved through these procedures, then the City orders the following:
  - A. The zoning of the property described in Exhibit "C" is changed to portions of R-1 (Low Density Residential), R-2 (Medium Density Residential), and C-2 (Community Commercial) as shown on the map in Exhibit "E". Exhibits "C" and "E" are hereby adopted and by this


reference incorporated.

3. This order is subject to the following:


- A. A refined traffic study out to year 2025 will be required showing the actual development proposed at that time. No direct access to Highway 99W will be allowed. The traffic study should refine the existing study based on the actual development proposal and determine the number of trips that this development would add to the Springbrook/Hwy 99W intersection.
- B. Upon future development of the property, the development shall contribute its share, based on traffic volume, of the future cost of capacity improvements to the Springbrook Rd/Hwy 99W intersection.
- C. A 30 ft building setback along the north property line will be required upon development of the site.
- D. A wetland determination and delineation report shows wetlands on the site. Development shall comply with applicable state and federal wetland standards.
- E. Development follow best management practices for storm drainage as outlined in the letter from James Bennett to the Yamhill County Board of Commissioners dated 1/30/06.
- F. Upon development, verify the capacity of the Fernwood Road sanitary sewer pump station and upsize if necessary. All public sewer lines must be gravity flow. Coordinate with DSL and the US Army Corps of Engineers regarding changes to the existing on-site stormwater drainage ways. Complete street frontage improvements along Hwy 99W. The Crestview Drive extension from Oxberg Lakes to 99W, and the eastward extension of Gueldner Drive, must be in place at the time of development
- G. Existing homes to connect to sewer and water or be removed within two years of annexation.
- H. Upon development of the property, construct a sound wall along the northern property line to be of similar design and coordinated with the sound wall on the adjacent Gueldner property to the west.

➤ **EFFECTIVE DATE** of this order is the day after the adoption date, which is: August 5, 2008.

**ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, this 4<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Norma I. Alley, City Recorder

**ATTEST** by the Mayor this 7th day of August, 2008.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Andrews, Mayor

**QUASI-JUDICIAL HISTORY**

By and through Planning Commission Committee at 6/12/2008 & 7/10/2008 meeting.  
(committee name) (date)

## EXHIBIT "A": FINDINGS

ANX-07-003

Annexation of 18.5 acres for property located at 4505 E. Portland Road

### I. APPLICABLE ANNEXATION REGULATIONS – NEWBERG DEVELOPMENT CODE § 151.261 CONDITIONS FOR ANNEXATION

*(A) The subject site must be located within the Newberg Urban Growth Boundary or Newberg Urban Reserve Areas.*

**FINDING:** The site was included into the Newberg Urban Growth Boundary by Order 2007-0001 on January 2, 2007. Certain conditions were placed on the property by Order 2007-0001 and have been included within the recommended annexation conditions of approval.

*(B) The subject site must be contiguous to the existing city limits.*

**FINDING:** The subject site is adjacent to Newberg city limits on its western and southern property lines.

### II. APPLICABLE ANNEXATION REGULATIONS – NEWBERG DEVELOPMENT CODE § 151.262 QUASI- JUDICIAL ANNEXATION CRITERIA

*(A) The proposed use for the site complies with the Newberg comprehensive plan and with the designation on the Newberg comprehensive plan map. If a redesignation of the plan map is requested concurrent with annexation, the uses allowed under the proposed designation must comply with the Newberg comprehensive plan.*

**FINDING:** The comprehensive plan designation of the site was changed concurrently with the urban growth boundary amendment application that was approved by Order 2007-0001 on January 2, 2007. The current comprehensive plan designation includes portions of LDR (low density residential), MDR (medium density residential), and COM (commercial). The applicant has proposed zoning of R-1 (low density residential), R-2 (medium density residential), and C-2 (community commercial) that exactly matches the comprehensive plan designations.

The east-west connector road (Gueldner Drive) will be extended through the site from the Crestview Dr extension towards Benjamin Road in accordance with the comprehensive plan map and the Newberg Transportation System Plan.

A wetland delineation map shows several wetland areas on this site. Most of the wetlands are along two existing drainage ditches on the site that carry stormwater runoff from a subdivision to the west that was built in the 1970s. DLCD has commented that a freshwater wetland assessment needs to be completed to verify that this annexation is in compliance with state Goal 5.

#### ***Oregon Administrative Rule 660-023-0100***

##### ***Wetlands***

*(1) For purposes of this rule, a "wetland" is an area that is inundated or saturated by surface water or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances does support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.*

(2) Local governments shall amend acknowledged plans and land use regulations prior to or at periodic review to address the requirements of this division, as set out in OAR 660-023-0250(5) through (7). The standard inventory process requirements in OAR 660-023-0030 do not apply to wetlands. Instead, local governments shall follow the requirements of section (3) of this rule in order to inventory and determine significant wetlands.

(3) For areas inside urban growth boundaries (UGBs) and urban unincorporated communities (UUCs), local governments shall:

(a) Conduct a local wetlands inventory (LWI) using the standards and procedures of OAR 141-086-0110 through 141-086-0240 and adopt the LWI as part of the comprehensive plan or as a land use regulation; and

(b) Determine which wetlands on the LWI are "significant wetlands" using the criteria adopted by the Division of State Lands (DSL) pursuant to ORS 197.279(3)(b) and adopt the list of significant wetlands as part of the comprehensive plan or as a land use regulation.

(4) For significant wetlands inside UGBs and UUCs, a local government shall:

(a) Complete the Goal 5 process and adopt a program to achieve the goal following the requirements of OAR 660-023-0040 and 660-023-0050; or

(b) Adopt a safe harbor ordinance to protect significant wetlands consistent with this subsection, as follows:

(A) The protection ordinance shall place restrictions on grading, excavation, placement of fill, and vegetation removal other than perimeter mowing and other cutting necessary for hazard prevention; and

(B) The ordinance shall include a variance procedure to consider hardship variances, claims of map error verified by DSL, and reduction or removal of the restrictions under paragraph (A) of this subsection for any lands demonstrated to have been rendered not buildable by application of the ordinance.

(5) For areas outside UGBs and UUCs, local governments shall either adopt the statewide wetland inventory (SWI; see ORS 196.674) as part of the local comprehensive plan or as a land use regulation, or shall use a current version for the purpose of section (7) of this rule.

(6) For areas outside UGBs and UUCs, local governments are not required to amend acknowledged plans and land use regulations in order to determine significant wetlands and complete the Goal 5 process. Local governments that choose to amend acknowledged plans for areas outside UGBs and UUCs in order to inventory and protect significant wetlands shall follow the requirements of sections (3) and (4) of this rule.

(7) All local governments shall adopt land use regulations that require notification of DSL concerning applications for development permits or other land use decisions affecting wetlands on the inventory, as per ORS 227.350 and 215.418, or on the SWI as provided in section (5) of this rule.

(8) All jurisdictions may inventory and protect wetlands under the procedures and requirements for wetland conservation plans adopted pursuant to ORS 196.668 et seq. A wetlands conservation plan approved by the director of DSL shall be deemed to comply with Goal 5 (ORS 197.279(1)).

Stat. Auth.: ORS 183 & ORS 197

Stats. Implemented: ORS 197.040 & ORS 197.225 - ORS 197.245

Hist.: LCDC 2-1996, f. 8-30-96, cert. ef. 9-1-96

**Finding:** The applicant hired a local wetland specialist, Schott and Associates, to review the wetlands on the site and determine whether or not they are significant wetlands. Schott and Associates assessed the wetlands using the Oregon freshwater wetland assessment method required by Goal 5 and concluded that none of the wetlands on the site are significant. The report is included with the application. The wetlands were determined to provide habitat for some wildlife species, but the fish habitat was determined to be either "impacted or degraded" or not present at all on the wetlands. The water quality and hydrologic

control functions were determined to be "impacted or degraded" for all on site wetlands. All of these wetland functions were below the standards that would deem the wetlands to be locally significant. The wetlands also did not meet the other criteria regarding water quality limited bodies or endangered or listed species that would require the wetlands to be considered significant. The wetlands are therefore found to not be significant and no local controls need to be placed over the wetlands upon annexation. The wetlands are under the jurisdiction of the Department of State Lands and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The applicant will need to comply with all State and Federal requirements prior to making any changes to these wetland areas. At this point the applicant plans to retain some of the wetland areas when they develop the site.

*(B) An adequate level of urban services must be available, or made available, within three years time of annexation, except as noted in division (E) below. An adequate level of urban services shall be defined as:*

- (1) Municipal sanitary sewer and water service meeting the requirements enumerated in the Newberg comprehensive plan for provision of these services.*
- (2) Roads with an adequate design capacity for the proposed use and projected future uses. Where construction of the road is not deemed necessary within the three-year time period, the city shall note requirements such as dedication of right-of-way, waiver of remonstrance against assessment for road improvement costs, or participation in other traffic improvement costs, for application at the appropriate level of the planning process. The city shall also consider public costs for improvement and the ability of the city to provide for those costs.*

**FINDING:** As explained below, public facilities will have adequate capacity to accommodate the demands of the site.

**Water:** The property can connect to an existing 10-inch mainline that runs along Hwy 99W at the property's southern border, and to the line within the extension of Gueldner Drive west of the site.

**Storm water:** Storm water drainage is currently provided by two storm drainage ditches that cross the property and outfall to a 24-inch diameter culvert under Hwy 99W near the center of the property. The Newberg Drainage Master Plan identifies this culvert as being undersized and needing to be replaced with a 36-inch culvert. If this work is completed by the developer of the Crestview Crossing site to the west then the applicant may need to pay for their share of the work as part of an advanced financing agreement. Certain improvements to the storm water drainage system will be required upon development to mitigate the additional demand on the system. The existing drainage ditches are low-quality wetlands. Coordination with the Oregon Division of State Lands and the US Army Corps of Engineers will be required regarding any changes to the existing on-site drainage ways.

**Sewer:** Sewer service will be provided by connecting to the new line extended north by the Crestview Crossing project. Sewer service will be extended east within Gueldner Drive. At time of development, the developer will need to verify the capacity of the Fernwood pump station. Improvements may be necessary. All public sewer lines must be gravity flow.

Roads: The subject property is adjacent to Hwy 99W on its southern side. Upon development, Hwy 99W shall be improved with curbs, gutters, and sidewalks.

The Crestview Drive extension and the Gueldner Drive extension on the property to the west must be in place prior to development on this site. The applicant has proposed extending Gueldner Drive to the east, which is in accordance with the TSP. The TSP shows Gueldner Drive connecting ultimately to Benjamin Road. This connection would need to be made as far north as possible to avoid impacting the Benjamin Road/Highway 99W intersection. The applicant's concept plan shows an additional road north of and parallel to Gueldner Drive, which provides access for the residential lots.

A Traffic Impact Study was prepared for this project by Dunn Traffic Engineering. Dunn has been involved in the design of the Crestview Drive extension to Highway 99W on the Gueldner property, and has stated that the Crestview Drive/99W intersection will be oversized to accommodate year 2025 traffic volumes, including the expected development of the Gish, Kimball and Thomas sites. The proposed conceptual commercial and residential development on the site is expected to generate around 490 new primary vehicle trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour, plus around 178 pass-by trips during the weekday p.m. peak hour. Much of the traffic for the commercial center would not be new trips, but would be pass-by or internal trips. This shows that this center will be primarily serving the residents of Newberg and will reduce the number of overall vehicle miles traveled for the residents of Newberg. Details of the study methodology, findings, and recommendations are provided in the traffic impact study report.

One important point from the traffic study that has not been sufficiently emphasized to date is that commercial development on this site will reduce the number of shopping trips that Newberg residents currently need to make to Sherwood, McMinnville, Wilsonville, and other communities. One of the primary goals of the State Transportation Planning Rule is to reduce vehicle miles traveled, and the annexation and development of the commercial portion of this site would help meet this goal for the residents of Newberg.

The study concludes that if the Crestview Drive extension is built as planned and if the Newberg-Dundee Bypass is built (which would shift traffic from Highway 99W and allow ODOT to downgrade Highway 99W from a Statewide Highway to a District Highway) then the development of this site is expected to have no significant effect upon any existing or planned transportation facilities, and no mitigation would be required.

ODOT has commented that the proposed zones do match the City's comprehensive plan and that the Bypass is included within the City's TSP. The Bypass is not considered a planned improvement by ODOT, however, because there is no funding plan in place. They comment that the TIS is therefore flawed because its recommendations depend on the construction of the bypass by 2025 and the downgrading of Hwy 99W to a District level highway. They also mentioned that the TIS assumes the wrong mobility standard for the Crestview/Providence intersection with 99W. ODOT requested that action be deferred on the annexation until the TIS can be corrected so that its recommendations can be used to support findings that the annexation is consistent with the Transportation Planning Rule. DLCD has also commented that the TIS analysis cannot depend on the construction of the Bypass, since ODOT has stated that the construction of the bypass is not reasonably likely by 2025.

ODOT's supplemental comments on June 12, 2008 referenced a 2005 LUBA decision (Just v. City of Lebanon) that found that the Transportation Planning Rule does apply to zone changes that occur as part of annexations, even though the zone changes correspond to the existing comprehensive plan designations. ODOT's interpretation appears to be correct, so the Transportation Planning Rule applies if it is determined that the proposed annexation will have a significant effect on transportation facilities. ODOT reiterated their request that the transportation studies be revised to not depend on the bypass, as they do not consider it a planned facility because it is unfunded.

The TIS is intended to evaluate the annexation's compatibility with the adopted Newberg TSP and the State highway plan. Both of these plans include the Newberg-Dundee bypass, however, so the applicant must include the potential impact of the bypass in their TIS analysis or the City would find that the analysis is incomplete. The TIS must also consider the project's impact on transportation facilities if the bypass is not built, however. While the bypass is a planned facility in the State Highway Plan, by TPR definitions it is not a "planned facility" and therefore cannot be relied on to mitigate the impacts of development. Dunn Traffic Engineering submitted a supplemental traffic impact analysis on June 12, 2008 to the City of Newberg and to ODOT that addresses ODOT's concerns. The supplemental analysis does not rely on the bypass to mitigate transportation impacts.

The supplemental traffic impact analysis examined the year 2025 peak hour operations of the key intersections under two scenarios: the site retains County zoning, or the site is annexed and developed with the proposed City zoning. The Brutscher/Hwy 99W intersection will remain below ODOT's 0.75 v/c ratio in 2025 peak hour operations under either development scenario. The Springbrook/99W intersection will exceed the 0.75 v/c ratio in 2025 under either scenario, and the Crestview/99W intersection will exceed the 0.70 v/c ratio in 2025 under either scenario. If no intersection improvements are made at the Springbrook/99W intersection and the site is annexed then the v/c ratio in 2025 will be 4.2% higher than if the site retains County zoning. If improvements are made to Springbrook Road, such as adding northbound and southbound travel lanes, then the increase in the v/c ratio from the annexation would fall to an insignificant 2.4%. The report points out that the City has been collecting funds from nearby developments for future improvements to the Springbrook intersection. The annexation would increase the Crestview/99W v/c ratio in 2025 by 7% (from 0.85 to 0.91). The report points out that there are no additional improvements that could be done to the Crestview extension to increase its capacity, and that adding lanes on 99W has been found in the adopted TSP to be impractical and operationally infeasible. The supplemental report concludes that annexing this property and rezoning to the proposed City zoning is not expected to have a significant effect upon any existing or planned transportation improvements, thus complying with the State's TPR. The Crestview improvements go beyond the improvements called for in the City's TSP, and the proportionate share costs that will be contributed by development towards future capacity enhancements at Springbrook/99W will mitigate the traffic impacts generated by development on the annexation site. ODOT's supplemental comments dated July 3, 2008 acknowledged receipt of the supplemental traffic analysis and, with the exception of minor technical comments, found that the report had been prepared using methodologies that are acceptable to ODOT. ODOT also commented that they looked forward to reviewing the findings regarding the Transportation Planning Rule issues, and pledged to continue to work with the City of Newberg to address congestion issues on OR 99W that result from existing and future proposed development.

The TIS shows that the Springbrook/99W intersection does not currently meet ODOT's v/c ratio standards. Development of the Gish property will add some trips to this intersection and would worsen the performance of the intersection if no mitigation was done. The City of Newberg has already identified this intersection as one that needs improvement, however, and has charged recent developments in the area with impact fees based on the number of trips they added to the intersection. The fees could be used for street improvements that would improve the performance of the intersection, whether those improvements were directly at the intersection or were for a nearby street (such as the future completion of Hayes Street) that would reduce the number of trips at the Springbrook/99W intersection. The new Providence Hospital paid towards the future Springbrook/99W intersection performance improvement based on their trip generation estimates, and the Crestview Crossing development will also be required to pay towards this performance improvement based on their trip generation estimates. The City will therefore require that, upon development of the Gish site, the developer pays an impact fee based on trip generation towards the performance improvement of the Springbrook/99W intersection. A refined traffic study will be required at the time of development to estimate trip generation based on the actual proposed development (instead of on the conceptual development shown in the annexation application). This will ensure that the impact of the development of the Gish site on the Springbrook/99W intersection will be mitigated by future improvements at or near the intersection.

State Transportation Planning Rule:

660-012-0060

**Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments**

*(1) Where an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, the local government shall put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule to assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g. level of service, volume to capacity ratio, etc.) of the facility. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:*

- (a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);*
- (b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or*
- (c) As measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted transportation system plan:
  - (A) Allow land uses or levels of development that would result in types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;*
  - (B) Reduce the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or*
  - (C) Worsen the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to perform below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.**

**Finding:** The zone change that will automatically occur upon annexation into the city is not a comprehensive plan amendment. A relatively recent LUBA ruling (*Just v. City of Lebanon*), however, found that the zone change upon annexation could be considered a land use regulation amendment. The Transportation Planning Rule would therefore apply to the project if it is determined that the proposed annexation will have a significant effect on transportation facilities.

The question then becomes whether or not the annexation would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility. The annexation would not change the functional classification of a

facility or change standards implementing a functional classification system. If there was no mitigation then the annexation would worsen the performance of the existing Springbrook/99W intersection, which already performs below ODOT's standards. The City has already established a precedent for mitigation of traffic impacts at the Springbrook/99W intersection, however, and this site was conditioned to mitigate the traffic impact as part of the UGB amendment process. The Providence Hospital project has paid an impact fee and the Crestview Crossing project will pay an impact fee for transportation improvements based on the number of trips that the project adds to the Springbrook/99W intersection. The developer of the Gish property will pay a similar impact fee based upon the number of trips that the Gish development would add to the Springbrook/99W intersection. The impact fee will be used for improvements at the intersection or for improvements to nearby roads that would reduce the number of trips at the Springbrook/99W intersection. The completion of the Hayes Street/Providence Drive connection is an example of the type of improvement that would reduce the amount of traffic at the Springbrook/99W intersection. The supplemental traffic analysis, which excluded the impact of the proposed bypass, found that with the proposed impact fee and mitigation at the Springbrook/99W intersection then the annexation of the Gish property would not have a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation improvement, thus complying with the TPR.

*(2) Where a local government determines that there would be a significant effect, compliance with section (1) shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the following:*

- (a) Adopting measures that demonstrate allowed land uses are consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility.*
- (b) Amending the TSP or comprehensive plan to provide transportation facilities, improvements or services adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the requirements of this division; such amendments shall include a funding plan or mechanism consistent with section (4) or include an amendment to the transportation finance plan so that the facility, improvement, or service will be provided by the end of the planning period.*
- (c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes.*
- (d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity or performance standards of the transportation facility.*
- (e) Providing other measures as a condition of development or through a development agreement or similar funding method, including transportation system management measures, demand management or minor transportation improvements. Local governments shall as part of the amendment specify when measures or improvements provided pursuant to this subsection will be provided.*

*(3) Notwithstanding sections (1) and (2) of this rule, a local government may approve an amendment that would significantly affect an existing transportation facility without assuring that the allowed land uses are consistent with the function, capacity and performance standards of the facility where:*

- (a) The facility is already performing below the minimum acceptable performance standard identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan on the date the amendment application is submitted;*
- (b) In the absence of the amendment, planned transportation facilities, improvements and services as set forth in section (4) of this rule would not be adequate to achieve consistency with the identified function, capacity or performance standard for that facility by the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP;*
- (c) Development resulting from the amendment will, at a minimum, mitigate the impacts of the amendment in a manner that avoids further degradation to the performance of the facility by the time of the development through one or a combination of transportation improvements or measures;*
- (d) The amendment does not involve property located in an interchange area as defined in paragraph (4)(d)(C); and*

*(e) For affected state highways, ODOT provides a written statement that the proposed funding and timing for the identified mitigation improvements or measures are, at a minimum, sufficient to avoid further degradation to the performance of the affected state highway. However, if a local government provides the appropriate ODOT regional office with written notice of a proposed amendment in a manner that provides ODOT reasonable opportunity to submit a written statement into the record of the local government proceeding, and ODOT does not provide a written statement, then the local government may proceed with applying subsections (a) through (d) of this section.*

*(4) Determinations under sections (1)-(3) of this rule shall be coordinated with affected transportation facility and service providers and other affected local governments.*

*(a) In determining whether an amendment has a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility under subsection (1)(c) of this rule, local governments shall rely on existing transportation facilities and services and on the planned transportation facilities, improvements and services set forth in subsections (b) and (c) below.*

*(b) Outside of interstate interchange areas, the following are considered planned facilities, improvements and services:*

*(A) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are funded for construction or implementation in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program or a locally or regionally adopted transportation improvement program or capital improvement plan or program of a transportation service provider.*

*(B) Transportation facilities, improvements or services that are authorized in a local transportation system plan and for which a funding plan or mechanism is in place or approved. These include, but are not limited to, transportation facilities, improvements or services for which: transportation systems development charge revenues are being collected; a local improvement district or reimbursement district has been established or will be established prior to development; a development agreement has been adopted; or conditions of approval to fund the improvement have been adopted.*

*(C) Transportation facilities, improvements or services in a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) area that are part of the area's federally-approved, financially constrained regional transportation system plan.*

*(D) Improvements to state highways that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when ODOT provides a written statement that the improvements are reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.*

*(E) Improvements to regional and local roads, streets or other transportation facilities or services that are included as planned improvements in a regional or local transportation system plan or comprehensive plan when the local government(s) or transportation service provider(s) responsible for the facility, improvement or service provides a written statement that the facility, improvement or service is reasonably likely to be provided by the end of the planning period.*

*(c) Within interstate interchange areas, the improvements included in (b)(A)-(C) are considered planned facilities, improvements and services, except where:*

*(A) ODOT provides a written statement that the proposed funding and timing of mitigation measures are sufficient to avoid a significant adverse impact on the Interstate Highway system, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in paragraphs (b)(D) and (E) of this section; or*

*(B) There is an adopted interchange area management plan, then local governments may also rely on the improvements identified in that plan and which are also identified in paragraphs (b)(D) and (E) of this section.*

*(d) As used in this section and section (3):*

*(A) Planned interchange means new interchanges and relocation of existing interchanges that are authorized in an adopted transportation system plan or comprehensive plan;*

*(B) Interstate highway means Interstates 5, 82, 84, 105, 205 and 405; and*

*(C) Interstate interchange area means:*

*(i) Property within one-half mile of an existing or planned interchange on an Interstate Highway as measured from the center point of the interchange; or*

*(ii) The interchange area as defined in the Interchange Area Management Plan adopted as an amendment to the Oregon Highway Plan.*

*(e) For purposes of this section, a written statement provided pursuant to paragraphs (b)(D), (b)(E) or (c)(A) provided by ODOT, a local government or transportation facility provider, as appropriate, shall be conclusive in determining whether a transportation facility, improvement or service is a planned transportation facility, improvement or service. In the absence of a written statement, a local government can only rely upon planned transportation facilities, improvements and services identified in paragraphs (b)(A)-(C) to determine whether there is a significant effect that requires application of the remedies in section (2).*

**Finding:** Sections 2-4 are not applicable because, as determined above, the annexation will not have a significant effect on an existing or planned transportation facility.

In general, with the improvements included in the transportation plan and traffic mitigation measures, adequate transportation facilities will be available to serve the proposed use.

*(C) Findings documenting the availability of police, fire, parks, and school facilities and services shall be made to allow for conclusionary findings either for or against the proposed annexation. The adequacy of these services shall be considered in relation to annexation proposals.*

**Finding:** Police services are currently provided to the area by Yamhill County Sheriff's Office. Fire service is provided by Newberg Rural Fire District. The proposed annexation will shift police and fire services to the city. The annexation and development of the property will generate additional needs for police and fire services. The annexation and development also will generate additional revenues to pay for those services, including property tax revenues, franchise fee revenues, and cigarette and liquor tax revenues. Recent growth in these revenues has increased to the point that four additional police officers are proposed in the General Fund budget for FY08-09. However, property tax limitations have capped the growth in assessed value on existing and new properties within the city. Because of this, property tax revenues have not increased sufficiently to cover existing and new needs for public safety personnel. The Budget Committee's proposed budget for FY08-09 would fund an additional three officers with a public safety fee yet to be established. If this fee is established, then this annexed property also would pay. With this fee, annexation and development of this property should generate sufficient revenue to cover increased public safety service needs. The residential development of the property may also increase the demand for parks and school facilities, which will be partially offset by the system development charges for parks and the school construction excise tax.

*(D) The burden for providing the findings for divisions (A), (B) and (C) of this section is placed upon the applicant.*

**FINDING:** The applicant has provided written findings for this section.

*(E) The City Council may annex properties where urban services are not and cannot practically be made available within the three year time frame noted in division (B) above, but where annexation is needed to address a health hazard, to annex an island, to address sewer or water*

*connection issues for existing development, to address specific legal or contract issues, to annex property where the timing and provision of adequate services in relation to development is or will be addressed through legislatively adopted specific area plans or similar plans, or to address similar situations. In these cases, absent a specific legal or contractual constraint, the Council shall apply an interim zone, such as a limited-use overlay, that would limit development of the property until such time as the services become available.*

**FINDING:** This criterion is not applicable to this property.

***NDC § 151.267 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Designations***

- (A) The comprehensive plan map designation of the property at the time of annexation shall be used as a criterion to determine whether or not the proposed request complies with the Newberg comprehensive plan. A redesignation of the comprehensive plan map may be requested concurrent with annexation. The proposed redesignation shall then be used to determine compliance with the Newberg comprehensive plan.*
- (B) Upon annexation, the area annexed shall be automatically zoned to the corresponding land use zoning classification which implements the Newberg comprehensive plan map designation. The corresponding designations are shown in the table below. The procedures and criteria of § 151.122 shall not be required.*

***Comprehensive Plan Appropriate Zoning Classification***

<i>OS</i>	<i>Any zoning classification</i>
<i>LDR</i>	<i>R-1</i>
<i>MDR</i>	<i>R-2</i>
<i>HDR</i>	<i>R-3</i>
<i>COM</i>	<i>C-1, C-2, or C-3 as determined by the Director</i>
<i>MIX</i>	<i>C-2, M-1, or M-2 as determined by the Director</i>
<i>IND</i>	<i>M-1, M-2, or M-3</i>
<i>PQ</i>	<i>Any zoning classification</i>
<i>P/PP</i>	<i>Any zoning classification</i>

- (C) If a zoning classification is requested by the applicant for other than that described in division (B) of this section, the criteria of § 151.122 shall apply. This application shall be submitted concurrently with the annexation application.*
- (D) In the event that the annexation request is denied, the zone change request shall also be denied. (Ord. 96-2451, passed 12-2-96)*

**Finding:** The applicant has requested zoning designations of R-1, R-2 and C-2 that exactly match the comprehensive plan designations on the site. They are therefore not required by the Newberg

Development Code to address the criteria under § 151.122, which are the criteria for a comprehensive plan map amendment or zoning map amendment. The zone change from County to City zoning is an automatic change and is not a zoning map amendment because the zones match the comprehensive plan designations. This is significant because the criteria for § 151.122 (below) call for the applicant to make findings addressing the State Transportation Planning Rule. Newberg's development code does not require the applicant to make findings addressing the State Transportation Planning Rule if the requested zones match the comprehensive plan designations.

***NDC § 151.122(3) Procedures for Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map Amendments – Amendment Criteria***

- (a) The proposed change is consistent with and promotes the goals and policies of the Newberg comprehensive plan and this code;*
- (b) Public facilities and services are or can be reasonable made available to support the uses allowed by the proposed change.*
- (c) Compliance with the State Transportation Rule (OAR 660-012-0060) for proposals that significantly affect transportation facilities.*

**Timing Consideration:**

***NDC § 151.263 Annexation Procedures***

*All annexation requests approved by the City Council shall be referred to the voters in accordance with the requirements of this code and O.R.S. 222.*

*(A) Annexation elections are normally scheduled for the biennial primary or general elections which are held in May and November of even numbered years. Applications for annexation shall be filed with the Planning Division before 5:00 p.m. on October 1 for a primary ballot election in May and before 5:00 p.m. on April 1 for a general ballot election in November. An applicant may request that the Council schedule an annexation ballot measure for a special election date. Applications proposed for review at a special election must be filed with the city eight months prior to the proposed special election date. Filing of an annexation application and having the application deemed complete does not obligate the city to place the annexation question before the voters at any particular election. This division does not obligate the city to process an annexation application within any time frame not required by ordinance or state statute.*

*(B) The application shall be processed in accordance with the Type III processing procedures outlined in this code. Once the Director receives a completed application for annexation, he/she shall schedule a recommendation hearing before the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission shall make a recommendation to the City Council as to whether or not the application meets the criteria contained in § 151.262. This decision shall be a quasi-judicial determination and not a legislative determination. The Planning Commission may also recommend denial of an application based upon a legislative perception of the request even though the findings support and would allow annexation. A decision to recommend denial of an annexation, even though the findings support the request, shall be specifically stated in the record and noted as a legislative recommendation separate and apart from the quasi-judicial recommendation.*

*(C) Following the Planning Commission hearing, the Director shall schedule a City Council hearing to consider the request. The City Council shall conduct a quasi-judicial hearing and determine whether or not the application meets the criteria contained in § 151.262. The hearing at the City Council shall be considered a new hearing. If additional testimony is submitted, the Council*

*may, at its own discretion, return the application to the Planning Commission for further review and recommendation. The City Council may also deny an application based upon a legislative perception of the request even though the findings support and would allow annexation. A decision to deny an annexation, even though the findings support the request, shall be specifically stated in the record and noted as a legislative recommendation separate and apart from the quasi-judicial recommendation.*

*(D) If the City Council approves the annexation request, the proposal may, at the City Council's sole discretion, be placed before the voters of the city as follows:*

- (1) The biennial primary or general elections which are held in May and November of even numbered years, or*
- (2) An available special election.*


**Recommendation:** The applicant has requested that this annexation application be approved by the City Council and placed before the voters at the November 4, 2008 election. If the Council approves the annexation they are not bound to place the annexation on the next available ballot. The decision on when to send an approved annexation to the ballot is at the City Council's sole discretion. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council place this item on the November 4, 2008 ballot.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**  
**ANX-07-003**

The following conditions of approval apply to the annexation of the property located at 4505 E. Portland Road, Yamhill County Tax Lot 3216-1100.

- A refined traffic study out to year 2025 will be required showing the actual development proposed at that time. No direct access to Highway 99W will be allowed. The traffic study should refine the existing study based on the actual development proposal and determine the number of trips that this development would add to the Springbrook/Hwy 99W intersection.
- Upon future development of the property, the development shall contribute its share, based on traffic volume, of the future cost of capacity improvements to the Springbrook Rd/Hwy 99W intersection.
- A 30 ft building setback along the north property line will be required upon development of the site.
- A wetland determination and delineation report shows wetlands on the site. Development shall comply with applicable state and federal wetland standards.
- Development follow best management practices for storm drainage as outlined in the letter from James Bennett to the Yamhill County Board of Commissioners dated 1/30/06.
- Upon development, verify the capacity of the Fernwood Road sanitary sewer pump station and upsize if necessary. All public sewer lines must be gravity flow. Coordinate with DSL and the US Army Corps of Engineers regarding changes to the existing on-site stormwater drainage ways. Complete street frontage improvements along Hwy 99W. The Crestview Drive extension from Oxberg Lakes to 99W, and the eastward extension of Gueldner Drive, must be in place at the time of development
- Existing homes to connect to sewer and water or be removed within two years of annexation.

**EXHIBIT "B": ANNEXATION MAP**



**EXHIBIT "C": LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

LEGAL DESCRIPTION  
CITY OF NEWBERG ANNEXATION  
PLANNING FILE NUMBER: ANX-07-003  
MAY 1, 2008  
PAGE 1 OF 2


ALL OF THAT CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED DOCUMENT NUMBER 199715739; SAID PROPERTY IS SITUATED IN THE SEBASTIAN BRUTSCHER DONATION LAND CLAIM, NOTIFICATION #1470, CLAIM #51, IN TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 2 WEST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, YAMHILL COUNTY, OREGON, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT NUMBER 1 PER COUNTY SURVEY #2795 BEING ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BRUTSCHER CLAIM (SAID POINT BEARS SOUTH 89°57' EAST, 677.8 FEET, MORE OR LESS FROM THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE BENJAMIN HEATER DONATION LAND CLAIM); THENCE SOUTH 89°57' EAST ALONG SAID BRUTSCHER CLAIM LINE, 863.2 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT NO 2 OF SAID SURVEY #2795, SAID POINT ALSO BEING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 4A, OF SAID COUNTY SURVEY #2795; THENCE ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 2 SOUTH, 742.25 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO A POINT OF 5496.74 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE LEFT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE WEST SIDE PACIFIC HIGHWAY (BEING 40 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE THEREOF, MEASURED PERPENDICULAR THERETO); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE, THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES, MORE OR LESS:  
1) ALONG SAID 5496.74 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE LEFT (THE CENTER OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 21° 42' 03" EAST, 5496.74 FEET) THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 00° 24' 47" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 39.62 FEET (THE CHORD OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 88° 05' 34" WEST, 39.62 FEET) TO THE BEGINNING OF AN OFFSET SPIRAL (THE CENTERLINE SPIRAL IS A 400 FOOT SPIRAL, WITH A NORMAL CURVE RADIUS OF 5456.74 FEET); 2) ALONG SAID OFFSET SPIRAL (THE CHORD OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 66° 29' 15" WEST, 401.44 FEET); THENCE SOUTH 65° 47' 10" WEST, 502.53 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 2, SAID LINE BEING ON THE CURRENT CITY OF NEWBERG LIMITS; THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE, ALONG SAID CURRENT CITY OF NEWBERG LIMITS NORTH, 1124.05 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO SAID POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINS 18.437 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT ENTITLED "ANNEXATION MAP" IS MADE A PART HEREOF.

THIS DESCRIPTION HAS BEEN COMPILED FROM RECORD INFORMATION AND IS MEANT FOR ANNEXATION PURPOSES ONLY. IT IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED IN THE TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY.



**EXHIBIT "D": COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP**





EXHIBIT "E": PROPOSED ZONING MAP





## **ORDINANCE No. 2008-2700**

---

**AN ORDINANCE DECLARING PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4505 E. PORTLAND ROAD, YAMHILL COUNTY TAX LOT 3216-1100, BE ANNEXED INTO THE CITY OF NEWBERG AND WITHDRAWN FROM THE NEWBERG RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT SUBJECT TO A PUBLIC VOTE, AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY ELECTIONS OFFICER TO CERTIFY TO THE YAMHILL COUNTY CLERK A BALLOT TITLE FOR THE MEASURE TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE ELECTORATE OF THE CITY OF NEWBERG FOR THEIR APPROVAL OF AN ANNEXATION FOR THIS SAME PROPERTY**

---

### **RECITALS:**

1. Coyote Homes Inc. submitted an application for annexation and consent to annex on April 1, 2008 for property located at 4505 E. Portland Road, Yamhill County tax lot 3216-1100. On July 16, 2008 Coyote Homes Inc. withdrew as the applicant and the owner, Forrest R. Gish, Trustee for Forrest R. Gish Living Trust dated September 15, 1997, notified the City that he was now the applicant.
2. After proper notice, on August 4, 2008, the City Council held a public hearing on the item: accurately stated objections to jurisdiction, bias, and ex-parte contact; considered public testimony; examined the record; heard the presentation from staff and the applicant; examined and discussed the appropriate criteria to judge the project (as listed in the staff report); considered all relevant information regarding the item; and deliberated.
3. On August 4, 2008, the City Council adopted Order 2008-0013 which affirmed that the annexation met the applicable Newberg Development Code criteria.
4. The City of Newberg Charter requires that territory may be annexed into the City of Newberg only upon approval by a majority vote among the electorate of the City.
5. The applicant has requested, and the Planning Commission has recommended, that this matter be placed before the voters at the November 4, 2008 general election.

### **THE CITY OF NEWBERG ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The question of annexing the property shown in Exhibit "A" and described in Exhibit "B" shall be submitted to the electorate of the city at the November 4, 2008 special election. Exhibits "A" and "B" are hereby adopted and by this reference incorporated.
2. The City Council directs that all costs associated with placing the item on the ballot be paid


for by the applicant/owners. This includes but is not limited to noticing, signage, advertising, and costs assessed by the Yamhill County Clerk to place the item on the ballot. Owners may be required to place monies in escrow to cover the costs of election(s).

3. The City Elections Officer is hereby authorized and directed to certify to the Yamhill County Clerk the ballot title for the annexation measure to be placed before the voters. Further, the City Elections Officer is directed to give all necessary notices of the ballot title and do all other necessary acts and deeds which may be required to place the matter before the voters of the City of Newberg at said election.
4. The City Attorney is directed to have prepared and review the explanatory statement which shall be submitted to the Yamhill County Clerk with the ballot title. Such explanatory statement shall be filed with the City Elections Officer and the City Elections Officer is further directed to certify this explanatory statement to the Yamhill County Clerk.
5. The City Elections Officer is authorized to do all other necessary acts and deeds which may be required to conduct the election concerning this measure.
6. Should this annexation request be approved by a majority of the electorate of the City of Newberg at the identified election date, the property shown in Exhibit "A" and described in Exhibit "B", shall be annexed and withdrawn from the Newberg Rural Fire Protection District, and the following events will occur:
  - A. The City of Newberg land use inventory data and GIS data, including the comprehensive plan map and zoning map, will be updated to reflect the new addition.
  - B. The Recorder of the City of Newberg is hereby authorized and directed to make and submit to the Secretary of State, the Department of Revenue, the Yamhill County Elections Officer, and the Assessor of Yamhill County, a certified copy of this ordinance.

➤ **EFFECTIVE DATE** of this ordinance is 30 days after the adoption date, which is: September 4, 2008.

**ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City of Newberg, Oregon, this 4<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2008, by the following votes: **AYE: 5** **NAY: 1** **ABSENT: 1** **ABSTAIN: 0**

(Currier) (Shelton)

  
Norma I. Alley, City Recorder

**ATTEST** by the Mayor this 7th day of August, 2008.

  
Bob Andrews, Mayor


#### **LEGISLATIVE HISTORY**

By and through Planning Commission Committee at 6/12/2008 & 7/10/2008 meetings.  
(committee name) (date)

Exhibits:

- Exhibit "A": Annexation Map
- Exhibit "B": Legal Description

**EXHIBIT "A": ANNEXATION MAP**



**DESIGN INC.**  
 5415 SW Westgate Dr.  
 Ste 100 / Portland, OR  
 97221 / Tel. 603.418.2600

**EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_**  
**ANNEXATION MAP**

A PORTION OF THE SEBASTIAN BRUTSCHER DLC #61, 618, 736, R2W, W/M.  
 YAMHILL COUNTY, OREGON

PROJECT NO. CH7710  
 DATE: 05/01/2008  
 BY: PDG  
 SCALE: 1" = 150'  
 SHEET NO. 2 OF 2

**EXHIBIT "B": LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

LEGAL DESCRIPTION  
CITY OF NEWBERG ANNEXATION  
PLANNING FILE NUMBER: ANX-07-003  
MAY 1, 2008  
PAGE 1 OF 2


ALL OF THAT CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED DOCUMENT NUMBER 199715739; SAID PROPERTY IS SITUATED IN THE SEBASTIAN BRUTSCHER DONATION LAND CLAIM, NOTIFICATION #1470, CLAIM #51, IN TOWNSHIP 3 SOUTH, RANGE 2 WEST OF THE WILLAMETTE MERIDIAN, YAMHILL COUNTY, OREGON, AND IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT NUMBER 1 PER COUNTY SURVEY #2795 BEING ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BRUTSCHER CLAIM (SAID POINT BEARS SOUTH 89°57' EAST, 677.8 FEET, MORE OR LESS FROM THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE BENJAMIN HEATER DONATION LAND CLAIM); THENCE SOUTH 89°57' EAST ALONG SAID BRUTSCHER CLAIM LINE, 883.2 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT NO 2 OF SAID SURVEY #2795, SAID POINT ALSO BEING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 4A, OF SAID COUNTY SURVEY #2795; THENCE ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 2 SOUTH, 742.25 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO A POINT OF 5498.74 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE LEFT ON THE NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF THE WEST SIDE PACIFIC HIGHWAY (BEING 40 FEET TO THE CENTERLINE THEREOF, MEASURED PERPENDICULAR THERETO); THENCE ALONG SAID NORTH RIGHT OF WAY LINE, THE FOLLOWING THREE (3) COURSES, MORE OR LESS:  
1) ALONG SAID 5498.74 FOOT RADIUS CURVE TO THE LEFT (THE CENTER OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 21° 42' 03" EAST, 5498.74 FEET) THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 00° 24' 47" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 39.62 FEET (THE CHORD OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 88° 05' 34" WEST, 39.62 FEET) TO THE BEGINNING OF AN OFFSET SPIRAL (THE CENTERLINE SPIRAL IS A 400 FOOT SPIRAL, WITH A NORMAL CURVE RADIUS OF 5458.74 FEET); 2) ALONG SAID OFFSET SPIRAL (THE CHORD OF WHICH BEARS SOUTH 68° 28' 15" WEST, 401.44 FEET); THENCE SOUTH 65° 47' 10" WEST, 502.53 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 2, SAID LINE BEING ON THE CURRENT CITY OF NEWBERG LIMITS; THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE, ALONG SAID CURRENT CITY OF NEWBERG LIMITS NORTH, 1124.05 FEET, MORE OR LESS, TO SAID POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINS 18.437 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

THE ATTACHED EXHIBIT ENTITLED "ANNEXATION MAP" IS MADE A PART HEREOF.

THIS DESCRIPTION HAS BEEN COMPILED FROM RECORD INFORMATION AND IS MEANT FOR ANNEXATION PURPOSES ONLY. IT IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED IN THE TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY.





usps

049382047976

\$02.600

08/14/2008

Mailed From 97132  
US POSTAGE

**CITY OF NEWBERG**

P.O. BOX 970

NEWBERG, OR 97132

*PLANNING*



DEPT. OF LAND CONSERVATION & DEVEL.  
ATTN: PLANNING SPECIALIST  
635 CAPITOL ST NE, SUITE 150  
SALEM, OR 97301-2540