



P.O. Box 167  
Sherwood, Oregon 97140  
625-5522                      625-5523

## PUBLIC NOTICE

The Sherwood Planning Commission will meet on Thursday, April 19, 1984 at 7:30 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 400 N. Sherwood Blvd.

The Planning Commission will be reviewing the Clear Vision requirements set forth in the Comp Plan.

The public is invited to attend.

Polly Blankenbaker,  
Recorder

April 11, 1984

TO: Sherwood Planning Commission  
FROM: Bob Price, Planning Consultant  
RE: Agenda for April 19, 1984 meeting

No applications for land use actions have been received which could be scheduled for this meeting of the Planning Commission. However, this will provide an excellent opportunity to work closely on the Clear Vision Area requirements of the Code (Chapter 2, Section 5.01 (E)). For your next meeting, I will prepare a table illustrating the requirements of some other jurisdictions within the metro area. In preparation for the meeting and the subject at hand, you should do the following:

1. Review Chapter 2, Section 5.01 (E) of the Community Development Code.
2. Identify intersections within the city where clear vision may be a problem.
3. Think about whether or not a change of the Code is needed.
4. What is the magnitude of the change necessary to accomplish whatever it is which must be accomplished?
5. How many clear vision problems has the city experienced since the Code was formulated?
6. Develop other thoughts and questions on this issue.

See you on Thursday, April 19th.

E. Clear Vision Areas

A clear vision area shall be maintained on the corners of all property at the intersection of two streets, a street and a railroad, or a street and an alley.

1. A clear vision area shall consist of a triangular area, two sides of which are lot lines measured from the corner intersection of the street lot lines for a distance specified in this regulation; or, where the lot lines have rounded corners, the lot lines extended in a straight line to a point of intersection, and so measured, and the third side of which is a line across the corner of the lot joining the nonintersecting ends of the other two sides. All clear vision dimensions shall be measured from the curb line, if such is in existence. If no curb line exists, then measurements shall be from the edge of the right of way (paving line). \*
2. A clear vision area shall contain no planting, sight obscuring fence wall, structure, or temporary or permanent obstruction exceeding 2½ feet in height, measured from the top of the curb, or where no curb exists, from the established street center line grade; except that trees exceeding this height may be located in this area, provided all branches and foilage are removed to the height of seven feet above the ground.
3. The following requirements shall govern clear vision areas in residential, commercial and industrial designations:

<u>2. Type of Intersection</u>	<u>Measurement</u>
1. Controlled intersection (stop sign or signal)	
two way	15' stop side, 60' on other
four way	20' on both sides
2. Uncontrolled intersection	30 feet
b. A private access of more than 20 feet in width shall be treated as a public street for the purposes of this section.	
c. Where no yards are required, buildings may be constructed within the clear vision area.	

\* need to decide on which one, right of way or paving line

# **APPROVED MINUTES**

Sherwood Planning Commission  
Minutes  
April 19, 1984

The meeting of the Sherwood Planning Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Arthur J. Horne, Jr. at 7:35 p.m. Present were Mo Turner, Dave Crowell, Dwight Minthorne and Bob Price.

Dave Crowell made a motion to approve the minutes of February 27, 1984. Dwight Minthorne seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously passed.

Mr. Price stated that he had not made a table of the various clear vision requirements because the codes from most of the cities were short enough that he could include copies of them. Mr. Price then reviewed his memo with the commission. Mr. Price stated that the planning commission needs to decide on whether some changes need to be made on the clear vision requirements. He felt that as far as future development, most developers would be able to work with the present requirements. He felt that there was not much of a problem with regard to the clear vision requirements and could not recommend that a change be made.

Mr. Dave Crowell felt that the rules could be improved and since so much time had been spent on reviewing the clear vision requirements he would like to proceed to make some changes to make the rule better. He felt that drawing the triangle similar to the one used by Lake Oswego might be better.

Mr. Mo Turner stated he had checked the property in question and felt that by changing the triangle Mr. Garand would lose two feet of hedge.

Mr. Dwight Minthorne was not sure that a change was necessary but agreed that a lot of time had been spent on the issue and some improvements could be made.

Discussion was held as to whether the code applies to existing properties. It was agreed that the code cannot affect existing situations.

Mr. Turner was concerned about controlled and uncontrolled intersections and felt that they should be spelled out in the code.

Mr. Price suggested that a change in subsection 3(a) or some subparagraphs might be needed with regard to controlled and uncontrolled intersections.

Discussion was held as to what procedures need to be followed to make a change in the code. Mr. Price explained

that it would take approximately two public hearings and about three months time.

Mr. Minthorne felt that a simple change would be to change the wording from "lot line" to "pavement line or curb line". Discussion was held as to the different types of triangles that could be used and whether to measure from the curb line or the lot line. Mr. Horne felt that the lot line was less likely to move and would be a more stable line to use.

Mr. Price asked if the changes discussed so far would be for subsection 3(a) only or are there problems with the commercial and industrial area setbacks. Discussion was held as to whether the same rules could apply in those areas.

Mr. Price suggested that a report/minutes should be submitted to the remaining planning commission members on some alternatives so that those people could give their reactions.

After further discussion on where to measure from it was decided to use the following language: "All clear vision dimensions shall be measured from the curb line, if such is in existence. If no curb line exists, then measurements shall be from the edge of the right of way." Mr. Turner felt that the measurement should be from the paving line instead of the right of way. It was decided to list both alternatives for a vote at a future meeting.

Mr. Horne questioned whether they were in agreement as to the triangle shapes for subsection 3(a), as follows:

<u>Type of Intersection</u>	<u>Measurement</u>
1. Controlled intersection (stop sign or signal) two way four way	15' stop side, 60' on other 20' on both sides
2. Uncontrolled intersection	30 feet

Discussion was held as to whether to make some changes in Section 3 b and 3 c. It was decided to expand subsection 3(a) to include "residential, commercial and industrial" designations. Add a new subsection 3(b) as follows: "A private access of more than 20 feet in width shall be treated as a public street for the purposes of this section." Subsection 3 (c) will remain the same.

Discussion was held as to the definition of an alley. Mr. Price read the definition of an alley as defined in the code. It was decided to add the words, "street and alley" to the end of the first sentence of 5.01 E.

Mr. Price reviewed the take over by the city of some of the county roads. He explained the procedure for doing this.

Dave Crowell made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Dwight Minthorne seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

---

Mary L. Holland,  
Minutes Secretary