

MINUTES

CANBY PLANNING COMMISSION

7:00 PM June 13, 2005
City Council Chambers, 155 NW 2nd

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Jim Brown, Commissioners John Molamphy, Tony Helbling, Geoffrey Manley, Randy Tessman,

STAFF: Matilda Deas, Project Planner, Kevin Cook, Associate Planner, Carla Ahl, Planning Staff

OTHERS PRESENT: Pat Sisul, Doug Sprague, Elroy Knutson, Fred Kahut, Mark Person

II. CITIZEN INPUT

None

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

SUB 05-07 Chairman Brown read the public hearing format. When asked if any Commissioner had a conflict of interest, none were expressed. When asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contact, Mr. Ewert stated he had visited the site but had drawn no conclusion. No questions were asked of the Commissioners.

Matilda Deas presented the staff report. She explained that the applicant is requesting to subdivide two existing lots into 7 lots suitable for detached single family dwellings. The two existing residences will remain on lots #1 and #7. Lots #4 & #5 will function like flag lots since they only have 20' of frontage, the service providers agree that this configuration works effectively.

Matilda stated a 20' drive will access the 5 newly created lots from NE 22nd Ave. There will be a 5' sidewalk along the entire length with mountable curbs. The applicant has received permission from the Fire Marshall to install fire sprinklers in lieu of the standard emergency vehicle turnaround.

Matilda explained that NE 22nd Ave. is a county road and the applicant will be required to do full half street improvements along the entire 22nd Ave. frontage to City standards.

Matilda explained that the existing house on lot #1 faces west and so it would not function well to include it in the newly created access road.

Matilda stated the application meets all necessary criteria and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Ewert asked for clarity on the driveway situation. Matilda explained that there will be a new access created for the 5 lots, but the existing houses already have driveways that are located in such a manner that they are unable to share the access.

Mr. Ewert asked if it is a true representation of where the house sits on lot #1. Matilda stated it was. Mr. Ewert had concerns regarding the setback of 5' to the access point. Matilda stated that 5' is the acceptable setback from an access for an existing house for an access drive. Mr. Ewert questioned the location of the sidewalk. Mr. Brown stated the sidewalk starts on one side of the street and then moves to the other. Matilda stated it was done in part to accommodate the utilities.

Mr. Molamphy questioned the distance between the two existing driveways and the access drive. Mr. Brown explained there is 12' between the driveways according to drawing #1.

Mr. Brown questioned where the city limits were located. Matilda explained that north of 22nd Ave is outside the city limits and outside the UGB. Mr. Brown questioned the lot sizes in reference to the easements. Matilda explained that per our code easements are not subtracted from the size of the lots, but the engineer had shown on the plan the lots were of legal size even subtracting the easements.

Mr. Brown asked if there were other places in the City that they have allowed the sidewalks to cross sides. Matilda stated it was allowed in Garden Crossing, Valentine Meadows and several others.

Mr. Brown questioned how lot #5 was accessed with the grassy swale and the gravel area for the storm water facility. Matilda stated the applicant would explain that.

APPLICANT:

Pat Sisul, Sisul Engineering addressed the Commission. He stated they did not have a lot of issues with the staff report and that this is a pretty straight forward subdivision, with a few quirks. He stated that it is the intention to do full half street improvement to 22nd Ave. He stated they plan to pave the existing gravel driveway on lot one. They will be creating a shared access to the remaining 5 lots by way of a 20' wide paved surface with 1' mountable curbs from

either side. He explained there would be 17' from the driveway on lot #7 to the edge of the new driveway. He explained the easement would be 26' wide to accommodate the 20' access and utility easements. Canby Utility has stated that they have enough room to up in the utilities between the house and the access.

Mr. Sisul stated there is a storm water swale will be broken by the driveways for lots #5 and #6. They will put the gravel filled infiltration trench under the driveway but the surface depression would stop at the driveway. He stated there would also be a storm water infiltration device on each lot and one along NE 22nd Ave. Mr. Brown asked if they would be collecting any water from the private street that would go into the system along NE 22nd. Mr. Sisul stated there would be no private water going to that system, the driveway in that location would actually drain south. He added that these facilities would be maintained by the HOA.

Mr. Sisul stated the sidewalk does cross from the east side to the west side, to share the sidewalk between the property owners. The Fire Marshall agreed that installing fire sprinklers would be the way to go instead of creating a cul-de-sac with a turnaround on the back of the project.

Mr. Sisul explained that the square footage called out on the plan does not include easements or sidewalks. He stated that they want the development to blend in with the existing neighborhood. He asked that the Planning Commission approve the application.

Mr. Brown questioned what the purpose of the "S" curve was, when it would be possible to shift the water quality facilities across the street the chicane would not be necessary. Mr. Sisul stated they looked at the depth of lots #5 and #6, they are moving the driveway west due to the 19' setback from the driveway to the garage, the buildable depth of the lot would be shrunk down and would push the curb line into lot #6.

John questioned if there was any feasible way to connect the driveway for lot #7. Mr. Sisul did not believe there was enough room to accommodate that.

Mr. Ewert questioned if the structure and the pool behind the house would be removed. Mr. Sisul believes the plan is to develop the other lots first, leaving the pool for as long as possible.

Mr. Ewert stated that there were concerns raised at the neighborhood meeting regarding street lights and asked for clarification. Mr. Sisul stated that he believes the concerns were that there would be light going onto other peoples yards. He stated they would be using the standard Cobra Heads which shine directly down.

Mr. Ewert questioned the sidewalk situation. Mr. Sisul stated it would be

curb tight, match the existing sidewalk and the sidewalks to be installed at Auburn Farms. The transition to planter strips would happen as the adjoining neighbor develops

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Mr. Brown questioned if there is a sidewalk along N. Maple at this time. John stated that there may be some inconsistent sidewalks to the south and hopefully there will be sidewalk improvements along N Maple in the future, but there is nothing scheduled at this time.

Mr. Manley questioned if there were sidewalks along NE 22nd at this time. Matilda stated lot # 7 has a curb tight sidewalk at this time. Mr. Brown questioned why would there be a transition from Auburn Farms. Matilda stated that public works wanted curb tight.

Mr. Ewert questioned why we would not want the sidewalk to match Auburn Farms. Matilda stated that during the pre application meeting public works had wanted curb tight so that is what the applicant had done. Mr. Ewert asked if the sidewalk could be done to match Auburn Farms to have continuity down the street. Mr. Sisul stated if that is the only issue, it could be done, it was the intention to have lot 300 be the transition point. The existing homes have mature landscaping and it would be pushing into their yards.

Mr. Tessman questioned if the planter strips serve a purpose. Matilda stated that Auburn Farms does use theirs as a storm water system, but the current code requires planter strips.

Doug Sprague applicant addressed the Commission and explained there would be a power transformer and 2 light poles that would need to be moved to accommodate a planter strip. He explained that it would disrupt the landscape. And there is no sidewalk on 22nd to Maple St at this time. On the other side of 22nd there is a curb tight sidewalk which was standard at the time the homes were built.

Mr. Lucas stated he understood about connectivity, but there are areas where the sidewalk transitions all over town and did not believe it would be an issue to have the transition at lot 300.

Mr. Tessman stated he did not believe it was an issue either, but that planter strips can be a benefit to the city.

V. FINDINGS

VI. MINUTES

January 10, 2005

It was moved by Mr. Molamphy to approve the minutes for January 10, 2005 as amended by the correction of the date to read 2005. Seconded by Mr. Helbling. Motion carried 6-0-1 with Mr. Ewert abstaining.

VII. DIRECTOR-S REPORT

John commended the Planning Commission for the job they did throughout last year.

John informed the Commission there would be two Minor Land Partitions for the next meeting.

John stated that the NE Master Plan meeting was well attended. He stated most people who live in the area do not want the master plan. He explained to them that this is their opportunity to design something that works for everyone in the area instead of having hodge podge development. The next meeting will be in February.

Darren stated the first North Redwood master plan meeting will be held January 27th to look at street designs. The next meeting will be on February 24th to discuss Willow Creek and the final meeting is scheduled for March 24th to review residential and subdivision design standards.

John stated there will be a meeting Wednesday between Urban Renewal, City Council, the Urban Renewal budget Committee and the City Council Budget Committee to do a cash flow analysis for the Ardnt Rd project.

John stated that there have been no Measure 37 applications filed at this time. He stated that nothing will really be known until there have been a few cases filed.

The Planning Commission requested copies of the live ability survey that was recently completed. John stated he would get them out to the Commission.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT