

SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

NOVEMBER 4, 1982
7:30 p.m., City Hall

- I. Reading and approval of minutes of October 21, 1982.
- II. Announcements and Correspondence.
- III. Discussion of Plan Compliance Review Process and Fee Revisions, City Case No. PTA-82-01.
Presentation of Staff Report that Presents Text Amendments for Commission Approval.
- IV. Next Meeting Agenda

APPROVED MINUTES

MINUTES
SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
November 4, 1982

I. The Minutes of the meeting of October 21, 1982, were read and approved.

II. Announcements. Todd Dugdale spoke on the Old Town economic development plan. He said the consultants had completed the first part of their study and would be presenting their findings regarding land use and development, economics, transportation, public facilities and implementation of financing. Mr. Dugdale said the Planning Commission at a future date would be presented with a request for recommendation to the City Council of appointment of an economic development advisory committee constituted of representatives from the business community, industrial use owners, property owners, financial institutions, the school district, the City and the Planning Commission to assist in carrying out the process started on the Old Town area. He also indicated that there was need for such a group to provide continuity in reviewing the consultants' work and further to assist in reviewing questions such as the SW light industrial proposal and development of the central business district at Six Corners.

Chairman Stewart announced that there had been a meeting at 6:30 p.m. that evening of concerned citizens regarding the SW light industrial proposal and that they were going to meet again on November 11 to look at the factors involved. The Planning Commission will rehear the SW light industrial proposal on November 18 and it was brought to the meeting's attention that there is a conflict as there is also a meeting being held at Rock Creek regarding funding for the Cedar Creek sewer project and many of the people concerned about the light industrial proposal would want to be at both meetings. Discussion was held regarding possible change of hearing time and notice requirements for same and it was decided to retain the scheduled hearing date. It was noted that concerned citizens could provide testimony in writing to be presented to the Planning Commission if they chose not to attend the hearing.

III. Discussion of Plan Compliance Review Process and Fee Revisions, City Case No. PTA-82-01. Presentation of Staff Report that presents text amendments for Commission approval.

Todd Dugdale gave the staff presentation and noted that there are two major concepts involved in the text amendments: (1) An audit was done by staff to determine the actual cost to

the City processing certain types of actions and that an amendment to the code be made to reflect the actual cost; and (2) that Conditional Use applications, PUD's and certain Plan Amendments now require a two hearing process, one before the Planning Commission and one before the City Council, and that an amendment be made to go to a one hearing process.

Mr. Dugdale said that language on page 5 of the staff report regarding Conditional Use and on page 6 of the report on PUD's be changed as follows: "The changes authorize the Planning Commission to conduct the public hearing and to execute the action by ~~ordinance~~ (deleted) resolution and order (inserted). It was noted that the Planning Commission has authority to act on quasi-judicial matters by resolution and order but not on legislative matters requiring action by ordinance.

Discussion was held regarding the proposed amendments. It was noted that all matters acted on by the Commission would be subject to Council review by appeal or by the Council's taking jurisdiction. The one hearing process would shorten the time involved to 30 to 40 days instead of 60 to 90 days and would eliminate the cost to the City of having the City Attorney prepare ordinances. It was further noted that on controversial or complicated matters the Commission could continue a hearing, reconsider a decision or hold another hearing if necessary. Notice requirements and staff procedures regarding notice were discussed.

Ron Tobias questioned the cost of variances being raised from \$100.00 to \$150.00 which he thought too costly for simple variance applications. Mr. Dugdale said the fee was based on actual cost to the City and raised the question of who should pay -- the property tax payers or the person who stands to benefit from the process. Discussion was held regarding the possibility of differentiating on major and minor procedures and it was noted that there is a waiver procedure on fees if the applicant can show good cause why the fee should be waived.

Joe Galbreath said that alot of cost and time could be eliminated by the applicant being able to go straight to City Hall and getting a permit. Mr. Dugdale indicated that some procedures could be handled by staff without requiring a hearing process, such as minor land partitions, and that a plan amendment could be proposed accordingly. Norma Oyler asked if such staff actions would be subject to appeal by the Commission and Mr. Dugdale indicated that he could notify the Commission of such administrative actions by including them in his report of findings and decisions.

The foregoing matters will be brought before the Commission at a future meeting for further discussion and action.

The meeting was adjourned.