

APPROVED MINUTES

SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA
MAY 18, 1982

- I. Reading and Approval of Minutes of May 11, 1982

- II. Announcements and Correspondence

- III. CASE NO. MP-82-02
A request by Jühr and Sons for a partition of Tax Lots
2S1 29C : 300 and 400 into 3 lots, said parcel being located
on No. Sherwood Blvd.

- IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS
 - A. CASE NO. PMA-82-01
A request by Jühr and Sons for a Plan Map Amendment
Changing a 1.68 Ac (M.L.) portion of Tax Lots
2S1 29C : 300, 400 from CC (Community Commercial) to
HDR (High Density Residential), said parcel being
located on No. Sherwood Blvd.

 - B. CASE NO. PMA-82-02
A request by Murray and Jones Landscaping for a Plan
Amendment changing a .69 acre portion of Tax Lot
2S1 30A : 2000 from MDRH (Medium High Density
Residential to CC (Community Commercial) said parcel
being located on W. Edy Rd.

 - C. CASE NO. V-82-02
A request by Eugene Bigham for a front yard setback variance
on Tax Lot 2S1 32BC : 6400, said parcel being located on
Park St.

- V. Next Meeting Agenda

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

May 18, 1982

Chairman Gene Stewart called the meeting to order. The Minutes of May 11, 1982 were approved as presented.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Dugdale discussed the Washington County Urban Comp Plan process. A meeting will be held in Tualatin on May 25 to consider Tualatin and Sherwood plans.

Mrs. Gothie explained the Design Review Board action in turning down the C.G.O. Enterprise landscape plans for Gregory Park Estates. She said they felt the Board should be looking at their plan as a whole, the entire concept. Mr. Dugdale said the Board's concern was about reduced street standards, dead end street sections without cul de sacs. They felt the streets were not functional.

III. CASE NO. MP-82-02 - A request by Juhr and Sons for a partition of Tax Lots 2S1 29C : 300 and 400 into 3 lots, said parcel being located on No. Sherwood Blvd.

It was pointed out that the applicant had modified their plot plan. John Aarands, representing Juhr and Son said Washington County Housing Authority also concurs with the new concept. Architects for the project pointed out the entrance has been changed to across from Gleneagle. The Commercial area is .56 acres, the HUD financed area is 1.32, and Washington County Housing Authority area is .34 acres in the new plot plan. The approach will consolidate curb cuts and access to one location. The 30' access is a private drive. The present house will be removed. Mr.

Mr. Langer moved to accept the Minor Land Partition, MP-82-02 as modified, with staff findings and the following conditions. The curb cut at the northwest corner will be eliminated at the time of development and access will be shared; approval contingent upon Council approval of the Plan Map Amendment, PMA-82-01; Cancellation of Tax Lot 300 and consolidation with Tax Lot 200. Mr. Tobias seconded. The motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- IV. A. CASE NO. PMA-82-01 - A request by Juhr and Sons for a Plan Map Amendment Changing a 1.68 Ac. (M.L.) portion of Tax Lots 2S1 29C : 300, 400 from CC (Community Commercial) to HDR (High Density Residential), said parcel being located on No. Sherwood Blvd.

Mr. Stewart opened the hearing and called for Proponent testimony.

Mr. Aarands stated he felt the situation had been previously covered and offered no additional testimony.

Mr. Stewart called for opposition testimony. There was none. Mr. Stewart closed the hearing.

Mr. Tobias moved the request by Juhr and Sons for a Plan Map Amendment changing a 1.66 acres portion of Tax Lot 2S1 29C : 300 and 400 from CC to HDR be granted based on staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Langer seconded. The motion carried 4-1.

- B. CASE NO PMA-82-02 - A request by Murray and Jones Landscaping for a Plan Amendment changing a .69 acre portion of Tax Lot 2S1 30A : 2000 from MDRH (Medium High Density Residential to CC (Community Commercial) said parcel being located on W. Edy Rd.

Mr. Stewart opened the hearing and called for proponent testimony.

Mr. Greg Jones referred to Plan findings and said he felt they would not have an effect on the commercial center at 6 Corners. He explained they are in the landscape maintenance business and all business will be conducted off site. A portion of the house will be used for an office and the garage for equipment storage. They will not effect the demand on utilities. Jerry Burge, owner of the property, stated Dennis Murray is living in the house. Mr. Burge pointed out only .69 acres of the property was being requested for amendment. Applicants said they were agreeable to staff conditions.

Mr. Stewart called for opponent testimony. There was none. Mr. Stewart closed the hearing.

Mr. Tobias moved PMA-82-02 requested by Murray and Jones be granted with staff recommendations and findings. The motion was seconded and carried.

- IV. C. CASE NO. V-82-02 - A request by Eugene Bigham for a Front Yard setback variance on Tax Lot 2S1 32BC : 6400, said parcel being located on Park St.

Mr. Stewart opened the public hearing and called for proponent testimony.

Mr. Bigham explained he was requesting the variance in order to build a garage. The lay of the land would make construction more expensive without the variance. The type of foundation needed was discussed.

Mr. Stewart called for opponent testimony.

Mr. Dan Reber said he was not in opposition but he would like some clarification. Mr. Reber asked if the garage would be used for a commercial enterprise. Mr. Bigham said no. Mr. Dugdale explained Applicant had enquired about a home occupation. Mr. Bigham said he understood that a commercial enterprise would not be possible but he wanted to build a garage regardless. Mr. Reber was also concerned about future car access to the park should Park St. be extended. It was pointed out that if the street right of way was narrowed to current standards, a variance would not be necessary. City has a 60' right of way on Park St., current standards are 48'.

The hearing was closed.


Mrs. Gothie questioned the size of garage. She felt with a reduction in size, the variance would not be necessary. Mr. Bigham explained he wished to put a workshop in the building.

Mr. Tobias moved in light of the fact there was no opponent testimony, and variance would not interfere with future street extension the request for variance be granted. The motion was seconded and carried 4-1.

V. Next Meeting Agenda.

The June 1 meeting will be on the planning review process and fees. SCPAC will be invited.

The meeting was adjourned.


Polly Blankenbaker, Recorder

The minutes transcribed from tape.