

Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
August 27, 1975

Present: Chairman Ross, Commissioners Cutsforth, Edgerton, Hulbert, Merrill and Shaw

Also Present: Planning Consultant Edwards and Several Guests

Absent: Commissioner Johnson and City Attorney Bettis

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ross at 8:02 p.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on August 13, 1975, were approved as presented.

Since the Planning Commission never gets information as to the outcome of County Planning Commission hearings to which we submit recommendations, the secretary was directed to write a letter to the Clackamas County Planning Commission to request that Canby be sent a copy of their minutes, or a memo, regarding the outcome of hearings for which we have provided input.

Mr. John Arends, Work Session to Discuss Low Density Rental Housing on 3.25 Acres Between Grant and Eccles Schools (Tax Map 3 1E 33 CB Lot #3200, located where N.W. 6th dead ends by school grounds): Mr. Arends came before the Planning Commission to get their opinion as to whether the land in question is developable for a low-density rental project for the elderly, under the Farm Home Program, which would include probably 40 to 45 single story dwelling units, a recreation center, landscaping, etc. He stated that, according to Canby's zoning regulations, the land would be large enough for 52 units, but that with the recreation center and parking, they would be putting in only 40 to 45 units. It would have to be at least 40, he said, in order to provide good management for the project and good facilities for those living there; otherwise, it would be economically impractical.

The major problem involved here is that of access to the project. There are two possible routes: from Knights Bridge Road, through Mr. Jack Fisher's property (there is a 25 foot strip of access to a portion of the south side of the lot which was a condition of the granting of a minor land partition on February 26 1975, at which time further development of this property was discussed); or from Grant, west on N.W. 6th to the proposed project. The Commission expressed a desire to see this entire route opened up, if at all possible, from Grant through to Knights Bridge Road. Mr. Arends will discuss the situation further with Mr. Fisher to see whether an agreement could be reached to provide a 50 foot right-of-way through the Fisher property to the project. (As was stated at the Feb. 26 meeting of the Planning Commission, this 50 foot right-of-way will have to be provided by Mr. Fisher, anyway, before he can divide his land further.) Mr. Arends will also discuss the use of N.W. 6th with the Grade School to get their opinion. The School has already dedicated 10 feet along 6th for street right-of-way and have stated that this is all they intend to dedicate. The City is still under a moratorium set by the Council against building on any street of less than 60 foot right-of-way; however, this could be waived by the Council on recommendation from the Planning Commission and, too, the length of the street would be less than 1800 feet, which means that 50 feet width would be sufficient.

A little over a year ago, Mr. Maynard Nofziger tried to put in a high-rise apartment building on this same property. The major hangups at that time were the street

right-of-way and the school's opposition to the proposal. They are naturally concerned for the safety of the children on school grounds, with regard to the increased traffic which such a development would create on 6th. At the May 8, 1974 Planning Commission meeting, it was suggested that the developers put up a chain link fence along the south side of Sixth for protection of children; that an agreement be made with the School for ingress and egress in case of an emergency by having an alternate route for emergency equipment; and that the street be improved. It was also stated that, before the 60 foot right-of-way requirement could be waived, the Commission would have to receive a letter from the School District stating that a solution to the street problem had been worked out. The application never went any further, and no letter was received from the School District. This is an opportunity to do something with this land. It was felt that it would not be advisable to give the School District the final decision again. The School should not be allowed to legislate the use of the land unless they intend to buy it.

The applicant has given assurances that the project would not be objectionable to the neighbors. There would be screening of some sort to benefit both the project and the neighboring properties. The traffic problem would not be greatly increased, due to the nature of the housing. The elderly people usually do not drive much or do not have cars at all. (This is one of the reasons why this property is being considered - because it is close to town - with walking distance.) There would be a sidewalk and fencing along N.W. 6th and the street would be improved, possibly through an L.I.D. Regarding parking for the project, Mr. Arends stated that a variance will be requested to reduce the parking requirement, since there will be fewer vehicles than normal. He stated that 25% is usually enough for a project of this type. The Commission wishes to see more parking than that and was assured that the applicant will cooperate in providing as much as possible. He suggested that perhaps they could start with a smaller amount of parking and have a section of landscaping which could be converted to parking spaces, should the need arise. Mr. Arends said that he has discussed sanitary and storm sewer needs with City personnel and is satisfied that there will be no problem with either.

The only other concern of the Commissioners was the possibility of the project's being used by other than elderly people at some time in the future. If the Commission waives certain ordinance requirements on the basis of its being an elderly project, then we will need some kind of guarantee that it will remain just that. Mr. Arends gave assurances that it will be generally elderly people with, perhaps, some special categories, such as handicapped persons. But, there will be no young people with young children moving into the project. When asked what would happen if they decided to sell the project in the future, Mr. Arends gave several reasons why this is not likely to happen. He stated that, once it is set up, the owners of the project will be locked in for several years, and that it is primarily a tax advantage with backers investing for a long period of time. He also said that there will be a waiting list of people waiting to move into the project, which would be a deterrent to changing the usage of the project.

Chairman Ross asked that Mr. Arends be put on the September 10 agenda and asked Mr. Arends to prepare a preliminary plot plan and ingress/egress suggestions for presentation at that time.

Planning Commission
August 27, 1975
Page 3

Comprehensive Plan: Discussion of Usability of Right-of-Way for Major Arterials, Collectors and Local Streets. At this time, there is no written input to add to the diagram which was presented at the last meeting. Planning Consultant Edwards requested that any of the Commissioners who have input on this subject contact him as soon as possible.

Further Business: Due to lack of agenda items during recent months, Chairman Ross suggested that the meetings be cut to once a month, with special meetings called for overload. Commissione Shaw moved that the Planing Commission begin meeting only on the second Wednesday of each month, with special meetings being called should the need arise. Commissioner Cutsforth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrie Dinteman

Merrie Dinteman, Secretary
Canby Planning Commission