

Canby Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
July 11, 1983

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Kahut, Commissioners Baller, MacKenzie, Davis, Shinn, and Cutsforth

MEMBER ABSENT: Commissioner Schrader

OTHERS PRESENT: Deputy City Attorney Jennifer James, Secretary Virginia Shirley, David Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. Sweet, Janice Logsdon, Bette Mims, Halvor Gregersen, Chris Gilman, Ron Berg, Irene Richardson, and others.

The minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of June 13, 1983, were approved as presented.

Item #1: Request for a four lot subdivision on property located at the north end of S. Holly Street and described as Tax Lots 5500 and 5501, Section 33CD, T3S, R1E. The applicant is Dave Anderson, Inc., for James B. Kosta. In the absence of the City Planner, the secretary read the staff report. There being no questions, the Chairman opened the public hearing. Mr. David Anderson, representing the applicant, stated that only single family dwellings would be built on the three tax lots, and that it was his intention to save as many of the trees on the property as possible. However, he stated that he would keep his options open on the size of the dwelling units, and whether or not the dwelling unit would be two-story. The Chairman asked for further proponents and Mr. and Mrs. Joe Sweet stated that the property on the east side of the parcel in question was theirs and that at a later date they planned to develop the south portion of that property also. They further stated that they were willing to develop only single family residences. The Chairman asked for further proponents, and when none came forth he called for opponents. Mrs. Janice Logsdon questioned the compatibility of these units and their loss of privacy. Further alluded to the unkept condition of the property at the present time. Mrs. Logsdon stated that most of the dwellings in the area were occupied by either retired or semi-retired people, and children noise could be disruptive. Mrs. Bette Mims asked that if the builder intends to build small moderate priced housing, how solid is his financing. Mrs. Mims also spoke of the number of retired and semi-retired people in the area. Mr. Halvor Gregersen asked if the storm water drainage would be taken into consideration. The Planning Commission Chairman stated that it would. Chris Gilman, 152 N.E. Tenth, stated that they used to own the property and that three houses was too many for the amount of property there. Mr. Gregersen wanted to know just how much street a half-street was, and the Commission explained. Mr. Ron Berg, 203 S.W. Third stated that he had been to the County Assessor's office earlier in the day and that Mr. Kosta did not own Tax Lot 5501. Irene Richardson, 407 S. Holly Street, right next to this property. Wanted to know about developing only a half of the street at this time. Until the second half is developed it will be barely wide enough for two cars to meet. Asked about parking places. Chairman informed her that parking was to take place on the individual properties. There will be no parking along the street until it is fully developed. Mrs. Richardson wanted more information regarding the possibility of apartments

being built on the property. Chairman Kahut explained that the property was zoned R-2 and that apartments could be built without going before the Commission. Mr. Gregersen stated that he would prefer seeing two or three, preferably two, houses rather than an apartment house. Also, he was concerned about parking his auto in front of his house. Mr. Berg wanted assurance that the property to the east, when it developed, would develop with only single family residences. No assurance could be given as the property is zoned R-2, and the Planning Commission might not even see the application.

Chairman Kahut asked Mr. Anderson if he had any rebuttal. Mr. David Anderson stated that if he were a neighbor he would rather have three houses on the property than apartments.

Chairman Kahut closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Baller stated that conditions could be placed on the application. Further, anything done to the property at the present time would be an improvement. Knows the type of housing Mr. Anderson builds - not sure that it wouldn't benefit the people in the audience to go look at some of the houses he has built. They are a very nice unit - good looking - well built, well constructed, and an asset to any city. The times that we are in, the people are going to smaller lots, smaller houses - because of affordability. Due to high interest rates, this is the lot of the future. By utilizing these lots that have been inaccessible in the City of Canby, and cutting them into smaller sizes - means smaller houses. This is well thoughtout and good plan for the City of Canby.

Chairman Kahut stated that the trend has been for people to go to smaller lots. Commissioner MacKenzie feels it would benefit the area too. These would be owners that would be in the homes, so they would probably be taken care of better.

Commissioner Shinn asked what had been done to get a road through and open up the southern portions of this property along S. W. Third.

Secretary Shirley answered that letters had been sent asking to do this in 1981. Commissioner Shinn stated that this application would allow development of these two lots, but would preclude development of any of the other lots. Commissioner Baller stated that it would also allow for the sewer to be brought down S. Holly Street.

Chairman Kahut stated he was not sure the Commission would want to put a loop system of street in the area anyway. The people are used to dead-end streets and that would bring alot of traffic into the neighborhood.

Chairman Kahut asked who lived at 285 S. W. Third. Mrs. Logsdon stated that was her property. She further stated that the rear lot was landlocked, however they enjoyed the privacy this gave them. She further stated they had used the Kosta property in the past to get to their back lot.

Rong Berg stated his father appeared before the Commission 20 years ago and showed them how he could have gone from Township Road all the way through to S. W. 4th Avenue in front of the high school. It would have allowed perfect development through this whole area. The Planning Commission would do nothing about it and allowed one house to be built on Ivy. His Dad even went to the point where he had everybody giving 30 feet on the end of their property all the way along from Township to 4th and it was turned down.

Chairman Kahut asked Mr. Berg his tax lot number and he stated he wasn't sure of them.

Chairman Kahut stated the Commission had tried in different area of the city on similar situations to get the people together, as Mr. Berg was trying to do, and had run into dead ends every time. We have delayed subdivisions for months and months, but can never seem to get everybody together.

Discussion was held regarding notification in 1980 or 1981 trying to get the people in the area to come up with a method of opening up the back portions of that property.

The Chairman called a recess in order for the secretary to get an additional file from the office. The Chairman called the meeting to order. He informed the people in attendance that the minutes of the meeting of November 9, 1981, reflected a proposed transportation study of the area with the objective of opening up the south portion of those lots fronting on S. W. Third Avenue. However, the applicant had not returned and the study was never accomplished. Since this was the case, are the people interested in developing their land-locked property, or what will be land-locked property once this application is approved? Are the people at 203 S. W. Third, the people at 299 S. W. Third, the Logsdons interested in developing or having access into the back of their property? Mrs. Logsdon stated that they would like to have access. Mrs. Mims stated they were neither interested in developing or in access. More discussion regarding the access to the back of the property, and the possibility of delaying decision on this project for two weeks. The Chairman asked the Public Works Department to pursue alternative methods of development, to contact the adjoining property owners on Tax Lots 400, 300, 100, 200, 5501, 5500, 5600, 5700, and 5800 to find out if they are interested in getting access to their property. The Commission would also like to know if the property can be sewerred.

The Chairman asked for a concensus of the Commission on this application. Commissioner Baller stated that if the other property owners are receptive to subdividing their property or developing and wanting access at a future date, then the Commission should take the time and explore the opportunities to provide the property with access rather than block them out completely. Commissioner MacKenzie stated these were his feelings also and the people ought to know this is the last opportunity for any consideration at all for opening up the back property. Commissioner Davis stated it is a good idea, but that two weeks is not very far away and the people can't expect that the city will contact you and do it all. The City will give you the facts, in the meantime you should have a neighborhood meeting among the property owners that are here. Mrs.

Canby Planning Commission
July 11, 1983
Page 4

Davis expressed concern for the property in phase two of the plan, as it may be under another ownership at a later date.

Discussion continued on the amount of property that would be needed if the access was to be achieved to the rear portion of the lots fronting on S. W. Third. The question was asked that when the proposal was made to the neighbors if cost would be included. The answer was no.

Chairman Kahut stated that the Public Works Department would present this to the neighbors and the idea was to see if public facilities could be made available and access made to the rear portions of the property. The Commission asked that Mr. Atwood convene a meeting with the neighborhood.

Chairman Kahut reopened the public hearing, and **Commissioner Baller moved to continue the public hearing until the 25th of July in order that Mr. Atwood and the Public Works Department could investigate possibilities for opening up the area and hold a meeting with the neighbors for consideration of different designs. The motion was seconded by Commissioner MacKenzie and passed unanimously, with the Chairman voting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35.

This meeting has been recorded on tape.

Respectfully submitted,



Virginia J. Shirley, Secretary
Canby Planning Commission