

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting

April 4, 1995

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Birchill called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Commission members present: Chairman Gene Birchill, Vice-Chairman Chris Corrado, George Bechtold, Susan Claus, Rick Hohnbaum, and Marge Stewart. Kenneth Shannon was not present. Planning Director Carole Connell, Assistant Planner Lisa Nell and Secretary Roxanne Gibbons were also present.

2. Minutes of February 28, 1995 and March 7, 1995 Meetings

Chairman Birchill asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes of February 28, 1995 and March 7, 1995. Marge Stewart referred to the March 7, 1995 minutes, page 11. The figure of \$9,000 to Washington County for "connection fees" should be referring to "extension costs". There being no further corrections or additions,

Rick Hohnbaum moved that the Commission accept the minutes of February 28, 1995 as presented and March 7, 1995 as corrected by Commissioner Stewart. The motion was seconded by Chris Corrado and carried unanimously.

3. Community Comments

Chairman Birchill called for comments from the audience regarding any items not on the printed agenda. There being none, Chairman Birchill moved to the next agenda item.

4. SUB 94-1 Wildflower Phase I Final Plat

Lisa Nell reported on the Request for Final Plat approval of a 29-lot single-family attached residential subdivision on Scholls-Sherwood Road. The preliminary plat for this project was approved by the Commission on March 15, 1995. Ms. Nell reviewed the Staff Report dated March 28, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minutes book.

Ms. Nell reviewed the conditions of approval and recommended that SUB 94-1 Wildflower Phase I Final Plat be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report with the following revisions:

1. Revise Condition No. 5 by removing the reference to "Borchers Drive".
2. Remove Condition No. 5.b. Sanitary sewer extension in Lynnly Way to the west property line.

Mr. Don Holly (Jim Weddle, Inc.), 1750 SW Skyline Boulevard, Portland, Oregon 97221, informed the Commission that he was in attendance representing the applicant.

George Bechtold asked for clarification of recommendation No. 4 and the existing City ordinance with regard to the required size/caliper of the street trees to be planted. Carole Connell responded the applicant is provided guidelines for tree protection.

Following further discussion and comments,

Rick Hohnbaum moved that based upon of findings of fact outlined in the Staff Report dated March 28, 1995 and recommended modification to Item 5 and removal of 5.b., that SUB 94-1 Wildflower Phase I Final Plat be approved subject to the following conditions:

Prior to final plat recording:

1. Sign and record a waiver not to remonstrate against the formation of a local improvement district (LID) or other mechanism to improve the base facility of Scholls-Sherwood Road to County standards between Borchers Drive and Elsner Road.
2. Construct a sidewalk along the frontage of Scholls-Sherwood Road to County standards.
3. Comply with any additional requirements of the County as a result of the Access Report.
4. Each lot shall be provided with 2, (3 for corner lots) uniformly planted street trees in the front yard or in a planter strip. Street trees shall be planted prior to occupancy unless otherwise approved by the City. Street trees shall be included in the public improvements bond at the time of final plat.
5. Engineered construction drawings shall be approved in compliance with USA and TVFRD standards for streets, sanitary sewer, storm water runoff, erosion control, site grading, water service, fire protection, street lighting including illumination at the Scholls-Sherwood Road intersection, street names and street trees. Plans shall be accompanied by a subdivision compliance and maintenance agreement as well as bonding for 100% of the improvement costs. Specifically, the plans shall include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Street light located at Scholls-Sherwood Road.
6. Provide a landscape corridor plan illustrating the proposed easement, fencing and plant materials on the frontages of Scholls-Sherwood Road.

The motion was seconded by Marge Stewart and carried unanimously.

Chairman Birchill reminded the audience that anyone wishing to testify should sign the "Attendees" Sheet located by the entry to the meeting room identifying their full name and address.

5. SUB 94-7 Sherwood Industrial Park (Copenhagen) Final Plat

Carole Connell presented the report for a 15-lot subdivision for industrial uses on Tualatin-Sherwood Road, north side, just east of the auto auction salvage yard. The correct name of the project is "The Industrial Park of Sherwood".

Mr. Hohnbaum advised the Commission that he had stated a potential conflict of interest at the Public Hearing for this project and that he still planned to vote on the matter.

Ms. Connell referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated March 28, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minutes book. Ms. Connell highlighted the issues which still needed to be addressed.

A letter dated March 27, 1995, from Halstead's Arboriculture Consultants regarding tree inspection and recommendations was entered into the record. The letter stated there are two groups of trees on the property that are in fair condition and worth preserving. Ms. Connell suggested the arborist review the findings for the Commission.

Ms. Connell reviewed the conditions of approval for the Commission.

Ms. Connell advised the Commission she had received the landscape plan that evening. The plan is typical for this type of project.

Ms. Connell addressed the water line. The looping cannot occur until the line goes to Cipole Road. The size of the proposed water line is 8 inches. Mr. Hohnbaum asked if engineering had addressed the size of the water line and whether it could serve the required industrial uses. Ms. Connell responded that Public Works still has the construction plans. The water line on Cipole Road is 12 inches. Ms. Connell concurred the water line issue should be addressed and Item 3.a. was revised as follows:

Adequate water line size, looping and associated easements shall be determined by the City Engineer.

Ms. Connell reminded the Commission that each site will have a site plan review.

Chairman Birchill asked whether the applicant wished to testify.

Hugh O'Reilly, 5402 SW Joshua Street, Tualatin, Oregon 97062 addressed the Commission. Mr. O'Reilly stated they had read and reviewed the Staff Report dated March 28, 1995. All findings and recommendations included in the report are acceptable to them and

they are in complete agreement. The correct name of the project is "The Industrial Park of Sherwood". The 49 foot right-of-way will appear on the final plat. The fill on the project will be engineered fill. There will only be one phase of the project. All of the infrastructure will be completed at one time. The final plat is under construction at this time and they hope to formally submit it to the County Surveyor by the end of next week. The intersection site distance has been certified and a copy of the certification will be provided to Washington County for confirmation. Mr. O'Reilly introduced David Halstead the arborist.

Susan Claus asked Mr. O'Reilly if he had any comments regarding the water line. Mr. O'Reilly responded the character of the occupants of the lots of the industrial park are unknown and very difficult to forecast. His professional opinion is that an 8 inch water line, under the circumstances, is quite adequate. He said it would be advisable to have the City Engineer confirm whether he is satisfied with the 8 inch water line. However, the plans have been reviewed by the City of Sherwood and their consultant, David Evans, and the 8 inch water line was not raised as an issue.

David Halstead, Halstead's Arboriculture Consultants, Inc., 4490 SW 160th, Beaverton, Oregon 97008. Mr. Halstead reviewed his letter of March 27, 1995. Ms. Connell reminded Mr. Halstead that the Commission had just received a copy of the letter at this meeting.

George Bechtold asked where the caliper of the trees is measured. Mr. Halstead responded that calipers are usually measured at ground level. He continued by discussing the health of trees, structure and what happens when they become stressed or unhealthy.

There being no further questions,

Rick Hohnbaum moved that based upon findings of fact and staff recommendations with modifications as noted in Item 3.a. that SUB 94-7 The Industrial Park of Sherwood be approved. The motion was seconded by Marge Stewart.

Carole Connell asked for the Commission's recommendation regarding Item No. 1. Following further discussion, it was agreed that Item No. 1 should be revised and the original motion amended as follows:

Rick Hohnbaum agreed to amend the original motion relative to Item No. 1 to state, as recommended by the arborist and as agreed upon by the City, determine which trees can be preserved and so note on a plot plan for prospective parcel buyers. The amendment to the motion was accepted and seconded. The amended motion was voted on and carried unanimously based on the following conditions of approval:

Prior to final plat recording:

1. As recommended by the arborist and as agreed upon by the City, determine which trees can be preserved and so note on a plot plan for prospective parcel buyers.
2. Comply with the following Washington County road requirements.
 - a. Provide 49 feet of roadway dedication from the Tualatin-Sherwood Road centerline.
 - b. Provide a one foot non-access reserve strip on Tualatin-Sherwood Road frontage.
3. Provide engineered construction plans and estimated costs for all public improvements including water, fire protection, sanitary sewer, storm water runoff, erosion control, site grading, street lighting and street signage for City, USA, and TVFRD approval. Enter into a subdivision compliance and maintenance agreement with the City, including bonding for 100% of the improvements. Specifically provide:
 - a. Adequate waterline size, looping and associated easements shall be determined by the City Engineer.
 - b. Local street improvements including 50 ft. ROW, curbs, gutters and 5 ft. sidewalks on the internal street.
 - c. Half street improvements to Gerda Lane along the site's frontage.
 - d. Provide a roadway turnaround with each phase, as approved by the City and TVFRD.
4. Submit a 15-foot wide landscape corridor plan for the Tualatin-Sherwood Road frontage, including street trees and groundcover.
5. Phasing may occur up to five years from the approval date.

6. Public Hearings

Chairman Birchill read the hearings disclosure statement and requested that Commission members reveal any conflict of interest, ex-parte contact or bias regarding any issues on the agenda.

Rick Hohnbaum stated he has both a professional and personal relationship with the City Attorney whose law firm is administrating the estate of the owners of Agenda Item 6.B. Oregon Trail (Asterbrook). Mr. Hohnbaum has not had any contact with the City Attorney regarding this particular project and he planned to vote on this item.

There being no further disclosures, Chairman Birchill called for a staff report.

6.A. SP 95-3 Sherwood Business Park Phase 4

Carole Connell advised the Commission that the applicant was not present and there had been some discussion regarding removing this item from the agenda. There are two issues which need to be addressed, the sewer system and traffic report. Ms. Connell stated because of what happened with the James King & Company water request, she had decided to table this item because it still required City Council approval of the installed sanitary sewer septic system. The Council will review this at their next meeting.

Ms. Connell stated the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) has requested a traffic report before issuing any permits. The 120-day requirement to approve or deny a project is not an issue at this point in time.

The Commission concurred that these two items should be addressed prior to any decisions by the Commission.

Rick Hohnbaum moved that SP 95-3 Sherwood Business Park Phase 4 be tabled until May 2, 1995, pending review by City Council regarding allowance of a septic system and compliance of the traffic report requested by ODOT. The motion was seconded by Susan Claus.

Considerable discussion followed regarding the septic system and the wetlands issue. At this point the applicant, Brian Keicher, 3801 SW Olson Court, Lake Oswego, Oregon 97204, joined the meeting.

Chairman Birchill advised Mr. Keicher there was a motion on the floor to table the application until the City Council had made a determination regarding acceptance of the septic tank and completion of the traffic study requested by ODOT. Mr. Keicher responded that initially he had requested information from ODOT.

Mr. Keicher stated when the project was built the septic system installed was made large enough to support twice the number of buildings on the site. He already has \$45,000 invested into the septic system. Chairman Birchill responded he understood Mr. Keicher's position, but it would not be advisable for the Commission to spend a lot of time reviewing the application if the possibility remained that the City Council may deny the proposal. Discussion ensued regarding calendaring the request for another Commission meeting.

Susan Claus inquired about the letter from ODOT. Mr. Keicher responded they contacted ODOT regarding future development in the area and the traffic pattern. In turn, ODOT requested a traffic study be completed.

Mr. Keicher said the access report would be ready in about 3 weeks. The Commission agreed to place the application on the May 2, 1995 meeting agenda. The Secretary read the motion and the question was called for.

The motion was voted on and carried unanimously.

Chairman Birchill recessed the Commission meeting at 8:35 PM and reconvened at 8:40 PM.

6.B. PUD 94-1 Oregon Trail (Asterbrook) Final Development Plan and Preliminary Subdivision Plat

Chairman Birchill called for the staff report. Carole Connell reported there are two applications, the Final Development Plan for the PUD and Preliminary Plat for the Subdivision. The Preliminary Development Plan for the PUD was approved by the Commission on January 24, 1995. Ms. Connell referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated March 28, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minutes book.

The project is a 153 lot development for 172 single family attached and detached units on SW Edy Road. Ms. Connell reviewed the plans for Phase 1 and 2 single family and Phase 3 detached units. Phase 4 is not yet complete, but may include Plan B attached housing. This development will tie into the Cedar Creek Park Estates project. The plan and plat have been modified so that no wetlands or wetlands buffer (25 ft) are on private property or in public streets, but are incorporated into the open space dedication. The setbacks have been reduced. The Commission recommended a park be included in this development and this was approved by the City Council and Parks Board. The Council and Staff have made recommendations for the trail connection to the wetlands.

Ms. Connell reviewed the conditions of approval for the Commission and explained that the applicant is proposing that access to the water quality facility be combined with a walkway to the park area. Staff needs to verify path location prior to final plat submittal.

Chairman Birchill asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff. There being none, Chairman Birchill continued the public hearing. He explained the hearing process in which testimony from proponents, then opponents and rebuttal by proponents would be heard. At that time the public hearing would be temporarily closed unless/until a Commission member ask that it be reopened for specific testimony to be entered into the public record.

Chairman Birchill called for any proponents for the application to give testimony.

Len Schelsky, 15115 SW Sequoia Parkway, Suite 150, Tigard, Oregon 97224. Mr. Schelsky said they concurred with the conditions of approval. He thanked Ms. Connell and Staff for all their help and

cooperation in working on this project. He asked if there were any questions regarding any of the conditions presented this evening.

Susan Claus asked how much the City was paying for the park. Mr. Schelsky said this needed to be discussed with the City Manager. There were no other questions from the Commissioners.

Dick Brown, 7350 SW Hunziker, #205, Tigard, Oregon 97224. Mr. Brown registered as a proponent of the application for the record. Mr. Brown stated that he is one of the applicants and did not have anything to add to what Mr. Schelsky reported.

Betty Winkleman, 25880 SW Rein Road, Sherwood, Oregon 97140. For the record, Ms. Winkleman registered as a proponent of the application and is one of the owners of the Asterbrook property.

There were no other proponents present wishing to testify.

Chairman Birchill called for testimony in opposition to the application.

Sanford Rome, 1780 E. Willamette Way, Sherwood, Oregon 97140. Mr. Rome said he stopped attending these meetings about 5 months ago because he felt the City has developed a situation where things that can't be controlled now, such as Woodhaven; whether it be some of the messes coming down the Middleton Road area, things that we let go by with the School District, various phases of the other side of Highway 99W where it is being developed it all comes down to a lot of apathy. He has some questions and he didn't know if he had answers for them. He probably knows the answers and it probably doesn't matter. But if he did not put it on the record and he starts taking actions against the City for things like that, then he'd probably look like a rebel and he would get written up in the local "Gazette" and bad-mouthed and called lots of bad names too.

Mr. Rome asked what would happen if the Commission turned down this application tonight. If he could come up with 23 good reasons, the Commission buys into these reasons and turns down the application, does this mean that the project is dead or does it mean that Carole, Jim Rapp and these people (applicants) get to go ahead anyway.

Chairman Birchill responded the applicant could appeal the decision to City Council and the Council could either uphold or overturn, unconditionally or approve with further conditions.

Mr. Rome said they saw the same thing happen or something similar to this happen when an extension became before the Board (Commission) for a project on Murdock Road. The Board (Commission) in its good wisdom and a lot of support from people in the audience decided to say nay to a PUD extension. The City

went ahead and said we will put some conditions on it and approve it anyway. It didn't matter that we spent about 2 hours expressing their opinions, the Commission's time and efforts, the efforts of the people who had something to say in that it went before the City Council and the applicant was given a year's extension.

Mr. Rome continued by saying he heard Chairman Birchill's answer, but what Mr. Birchill was really saying is if somebody throws enough mud in the water we will take the water to another pool and see if enough mud settles out and we will go on and there will be business as usual. Mr. Rome said the Commission's responsibilities to Mr. Rapp and the City Planner are overshadowed for what we are trying to do here. He said he appreciated what the Commission is trying to do, but that is the reason why a lot of people no longer show up other than the proponents who have something at stake.

Mr. Rome said he could not change the process to stop this project and he does not want to, but he put this out that if this Board (Commission) is really going to continue to function and really be meaningful and not just lip service and paperwork, that maybe we should make it so that something happens.

Mr. Rome continued to testify about why he thought Oregon Trail was not a PUD. He stated this project looks like a subdivision and that the City has "given away" 32 or 34 foot streets with parking on both sides. If it walks like a dog, if it barks like a dog and it bites like a dog, it probably is a dog. This is probably really a subdivision under the disguise of a PUD.

Mr. Rome also addressed the wetlands, storm water and wastewater management issues. He referred to various subdivisions where he felt the City gave something away.

Mr. Rome asked the Commission to stop and look to see if this looks like a subdivision. It's time to stop any give-aways. If tonight we've had people who have been proponents come before here and say that we are in favor of something, whether it be the property owners or whether it be the engineers or people doing the design work and so forth with Carole and Mr. Rapp, Mr. Rome brought up another point and it's very much the same point. What happens when these projects are done, they go on to the next piece of parks, property that they can purchase or buy or they take their money and they leave the town. Mr. Rome said he knows of very few developers of property in this town today and he could only think of two that currently live within the town and try on a regular basis to contribute to the town other than for their own project. That in itself should have enough standing before the Commission to make all the difference here in the world and that is why he is speaking and he is not even a developer. If it doesn't then it is once again what use are you really here for.

Lowal Labahn, 18283 SW Edy Road, Sherwood, Oregon 97140. Mr.

LaBahn said he was definitely opposed to this application. It would be a threat to his livelihood and his business. Mr. LaBahn stated there isn't anybody around the area of the project that wants it except the applicants.

Chairman Birchill asked Mr. Labahn what his livelihood is. Mr. Labahn responded he has a nursery adjacent and west of the project and identified the location on the map. Susan Claus asked Mr. LaBahn what he thought the subdivision would do to his nursery. Mr. LaBahn responded that traffic, people, vandalism, complaints about his work (noise and spraying) at any particular time would be a problem.

Chairman Birchill asked if the applicant wanted to present any rebuttal to the comments made.

Len Schelsky responded to Mr. Rome's comments. During the process the applicant has followed in submitting the PUD, they have reviewed the property, worked with Staff, addressed concerns for the wetlands by doing a mitigation plan which should enhance the wetlands, and addressed the criteria which had to be met for the PUD which resulted in some significant features of a PUD. The applicant is giving up 12 acres of land that are on the City's books as having certain density. Mr. Schelsky said they could have applied for more units on this parcel, but didn't because they wanted to keep it single family. Regarding the small lots, Mr. Schelsky said he thought Mr. Rome was referring to the duplex lots which will be attached housing. There will be different types of designs which will fit those lots better. Mr. Schelsky said a lot of time was spent on the PUD and that this is not just a haphazard subdivision.

Chairman Birchill temporarily closed the public hearing and opened it to Commission Members for discussion and/or questions.

Rick Hohnbaum inquired as to what options are available to the City legal-wise to assure that pre-existing use of neighboring property is not hindered by new residents, i.e., spraying, noise.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked what kind of assurances the Commission places on CC&R's or some other methodology which would prohibit new residents trying to deter the livelihood of pre-existing property.

Ms. Connell responded this issue did come up in the public hearings and the City Council hearings. The neighbors recommended using a device the County uses which is a type of waiver. Both the Commission and Council determined that this is a County document which they are allowed to require by their statutes. The point was made that they are made for properties outside the Urban Growth Boundary where development may occur. Inside the City, the Council did not feel it was appropriate nor did they have the legal documents or authority to require it.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked whether it would be within the legal ability to require at least a level of awareness in the form of a statement as a part of the CC&R process which could be provided to new

owners. Mr. Connell responded she did not have an answer to Mr. Hohnbaum's question from a legal standpoint.

Susan Claus stated that previously the Commission reviewed particular wording regarding this type of concern. Ms. Connell responded the City Council reviewed the matter and did not think it was appropriate. Ms. Claus inquired about the stipulations the Commission made for the Church. Ms. Connell responded the Council took out the fencing requirements because they did not think it was appropriate nor did they want to get into the business of requiring fences.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked a process question. Ms. Connell responded this preliminary plat does not go back to the Council and the Commission could place certain conditions on it. It could then be appealed to the Council. Ms. Connell explained the difference between a PUD and Final Development Plan. Ms. Connell said the Commission may want to make a finding that the Final Development Plan has met the conditions of the Preliminary Development Plan and make a separate motion on the Plat stating specific conditions.

Discussion continued regarding the size of the lots, parking, setbacks and the pedestrian pathway.

Chairman Birchill called for any further comments or questions. There being none,

Rick Hohnbaum moved that PUD 94-1 Oregon Trail (Asterbrook) Final Development Plan and Preliminary Subdivision Plat be approved based upon findings of fact and staff report, testimony provided with the conditions as presented, modification of Item No. 11 to include a statement notifying homeowners of adjoining farm, forest and church activities as stated in original approval dated December 20, 1994, and the addition of a condition, Item No. 13 stating in accordance with the Phasing Plan, construct a six (6) foot wooden fence adjoining the church property, the location and materials to be agreed upon by the church, applicants and the City. The motion was seconded by Chris Corrado and carried with 5 ayes and Mr. Bechtold voting nay.

The Commission approved the following conditions:

Prior to submittal of the Final Plat, the following conditions must be satisfied:

1. Dedicate the open space to the City in the Phase I Final Plat. Obtain necessary permits from the Corps of Engineers and the Division of State Lands for utility extensions in the floodplain/wetlands.

2. The cutting of vegetation in the designated open space area is prohibited, except as necessary for utility extensions and right-of-way improvements and as agreed upon by the City.
3. All lots in Phase I and 2 must be at least 5,000 square feet. All lots in Phase 3 shall be designated for attached housing only. All lots need to be plotted as shown on the final plat.
4. Provide "No Parking" signage, lighting and sidewalks on one side of the hammerhead street. All other public local road right-of-way width may be reduced to 46 feet and parking is allowed on both sides of the street. All other local road improvements must meet City standards.
5. The location of the pedestrian pathway in Phases 2 and 3 providing access to the wetland area will need to be approved by Staff prior to final plat submittal. All pedestrian paths shall be in a 20 foot easement, improved as required by the City.
6. Obtain a demolition permit from the City for removal of the existing structures.
7. Provide a water well abandonment plan to the City for existing structures.
8. The front yard building setback for Lots 122-127, Lots 135-140, Lots 145-152 may be reduced to fifteen (15) feet, except that garages must be setback twenty (20) feet from the front property line. Lots 145, 146, 151 and 152 may have a 10-foot rear yard setback.
9. No streets may exceed a 10% grade.
10. Provide engineered construction plans for public and private improvements including costs, maintenance and bonding provisions in compliance with City, USA, Washington County and TVFRD standards. The plans shall include provisions for streets, pathways, sanitary sewer, water, fire protection, storm water runoff, erosion control, street lighting, landscaping, street names and signage. Provide utility extensions to all adjoining properties. In particular:

Storm water runoff:

- a. Provide on-site storm detention if required by the City.
- b. Provide USA and City concurrence that a regional storm water treatment site (minimum 1 acre) is not planned to be purchased on this site.

- c. On-site water quality facilities are not permitted within the wetlands or the 25 ft. wetland buffer, unless the buffer is widened to compensate for the encroachment. In no case shall the facility be closer than 15 feet from the wetland boundary.
- d. A 25 foot undisturbed corridor shall be platted parallel to the wetlands. The corridor should be replanted as part of the development using native vegetation.
- e. The intersection of Edy Road and the internal streets in Phase 3 should be moved east to protect the wetland and allow for the required undisturbed corridor.
- f. Provide an all-weather maintenance road to the water quality facilities.
- g. Each lot shall have a separate connection to public storm and sanitary sewer. The private lines connecting each structure to the public main must be on the lot being served.
- h. Obtain a permit from USA for connection to the 24 inch main in Cedar Creek. Obtain appropriate State and Federal Permits prior to any on-site work.

Edy Road:

- a. Obtain a Traffic Impact Report from Washington County. Comply with their road dedication, improvement and traffic safety recommendations.
- b. As a part of Phase 1, provide a half-street improvements to Edy Road from the west boundary of Phase 1 to the easterly side of Lot 1. Additional half-street improvements to Edy Road shall be completed with Phase 2.
- c. Provide a one foot non-access reserve strip along any Edy Road frontage.
- d. Provide a landscape corridor plan for lots adjoining Edy Road frontage.
- e. Provide all necessary lane striping, including a bicycle path.
- f. Adequate intersectional sight distance be certified by a registered P.E. to meet Washington County CDC requirements after completion of the construction of the three proposed accesses from Edy Road.

Fire Protection:

- a. Locate fire hydrants in accordance with district standards.
11. Submit project CC&R's for City approval. Include a statement notifying homeowners of adjoining farm, forest and church activities.
12. The City park shall be traversed by an improved 5 foot concrete pathway and be graded, seeded and dedicated to the City. Pathway improvements and park grading and seeding shall be completed by the applicant.
13. In accordance with the Phasing Plan, construct a six (6) foot wooden fence adjoining the church property, the location and materials to be agreed upon by the church, applicants and the City.

Planning Director's Report

Carole Connell reported she will be attending the Annual APA Conference in Toronto, Canada next week. Ms. Connell will be receiving an award for the Oregon Visions Project, "A Guide to Community Visioning".

Other Business

George Bechtold stated it was clarified at the meeting that the caliper of trees is the size of the tree at the base of the tree. He thought this was an important distinction because there are developers that are putting in trees that are 1 to 1-1/2 inches in diameter at chest level and developers that are putting in trees that are 1 to 1-1/2 inches diameter at ground level. It appears that the developers are not clear on the requirements. Chairman Birchill said it would not be in the best interests of the Commission to become too restrictive on the standard for the caliper of trees as a condition. Ms. Claus suggested that the Tree Protection Guidelines include a statement that the trees need to be staked. Ms. Connell responded it would be more appropriate to put this in the Code.

Carole Connell introduced Roxanne Gibbons, the new Planning Department Secretary.

Susan Claus inquired about the status of Sherwood Pacific Lumber. Ms. Connell has been in contact with them and will keep the Commission informed.

Ms. Connell said the City Council will be making appointments to Boards and Commissions at the April 11, 1995 Regular City Council meeting.

Chris Corrado requested that the Commission be provided some feedback or notification when the City Council has altered a recommendation or condition of approval from the Commission. The

Commission concurred.

Susan Claus asked about the Murdock Road/Oregon Street Realignment. Ms. Connell responded this project is being given top priority. The MSTIP is a County Project which will realign the intersection. Ms. Connell suggested that if Commission members have any questions regarding the status of a specific project to feel free to call Ron Hudson, City Engineer.

Marge Stewart asked if it would be possible to review when policy was set on utilities, sewer, water and streets. If there is not a policy, there should be one so that every developer is treated the same. Ms. Connell will follow-up on this request.

Mr. Bechtold remarked that one of the issues brought up during the School Board election was that the Board wanted to be more involved in the planning process. Considerable discussion followed on how this could be accomplished. Chairman Birchill suggested the Board appoint a liaison who could provide testimony at Commission meetings. It was agreed by Commission members that if Mr. Bechtold addressed the School Board as a member of the Planning Commission that his comments be general in nature, he encourage them to become involved and to provide information on the procedure to do this. Ms. Claus suggested that a copy of the Planning Director's Monthly Report be sent to the Board Members. The Commission agreed with this idea.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne Gibbons
Planning Commission Secretary