

SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

December 15, 1981

I. Reading and Approval of Minutes of December 1, 1981.

II. Announcements and Correspondence.

III. PUBLIC HEARING

PD-81-02

- . A request by Charles Ortiz for approval of a PD District, General Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for phase 1 of a 3 phase single family planned unit development on a 22 acre site located on Sunset Blvd.

IV. Discussion of the Joint-Role of the City and School District in Community Development Activities.

V. Next Meeting Agenda.

APPROVED MINUTES

SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
December 15, 1981

I. Reading and Approval of the Minutes of December 1, 1981

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Present were Commissioners Norma Borchers, Joe Galbreath, Diane Gothie, Clyde Sanders and Ron Tobias. Chairman Stewart arrived at 8:45 p.m. Also present was Director Dugdale. Commissioner Sanders acted as Chairman.

Motion

Commissioner Tobias moved that the minutes of December 1, 1981 be approved as read; Commissioner Gothie seconded the motion. Motion carried.

II. Announcements and Correspondence

Commissioner Sanders mentioned that bids were recently opened up for improvements on Washington Street and he observed that construction on that street cannot take place until Spring.

Director Dugdale announced that a hearing was scheduled for 1:00 p.m. Wednesday, December 16, for the Chemical Waste Recycling Plant.

Commissioner Galbreath expressed concern that the proposed recycling plant would not be an aesthetically-pleasing structure and would look like a "scrap-yard."

III. Public Hearing

PD-81-02. A request by Charles Ortiz for approval of a PD District, General Development Plan and Preliminary Plat for Phase 1 of a three-phase single-family planned unit development on a 22-acre site located on Sunset Blvd.

Commissioner Sanders opened the hearing at 7:42 p.m.

Proponent Testimony

Carl Jensen of Alpha Engineering, representing Charles Ortiz, stated that the Staff report is in conformance with Mr. Ortiz' objectives, and that he wished to center discussion tonight around the following three items: 1) a 20-foot buffer strip, 2) street standards, and 3) any plan modifications that the Commission recommends.

[delete] Director Dugdale responded that an additional 8-foot right-of-way will cause a tight squeeze. He added that the development could accommodate a 34-foot street, with a 40-foot right-of-way more easily than an 8-foot right-of-way.

Mr. Jensen stated that he had no further objections to the staff recommendations at this time.

Sherwood Planning Comm.

Page 2

December 15, 1981

The hearing was closed at 7:45 p.m.

Opponent Testimony

Mr. Phil Settecase of Salem, Oregon, a property owner of undeveloped land adjacent to the proposed development, expressed concern about Item No. 3 of the Staff recommendations for installing a standard local street indicated as "Orchard Street"; he asked whether it would be a major street.

Director Dugdale answered no, that this street would connect with South Sherwood Blvd. and is less than a collector street.

Commissioner Sanders added that the proposed Orchard Street would be stubbed off.

Mr. Settecase then asked if there were provisions for access to the project.

Director Dugdale answered that there were two accesses on Sunset Blvd.

Mr. Settecase said that the construction of Orchard Street would be poor planning due to the topography of the area, and also the proposed street would use valuable land. He added that the proposed intersection of Orchard Street with Sherwood Blvd. would create a dangerous traffic situation.

Mr. Jensen stated that since Mr. Settecase had not submitted any formal development plan of his own to the Commission, he has no right to make any objections to the existing plan. Mr. Jensen conceded that there is some grade at the intersection with Sherwood Blvd. but that definite construction plans had not been determined yet. He added that before construction of the road begins, Mr. Settecase could be consulted and the Planning Commission could make the final decision.

Mr. Settecase stated that his other concern about the proposed street was that the whole future development of surrounding property would be channeled through Orchard Street, which would add up to 118 residents using the street as an access.

Mr. Settecase emphasized that he will not pay for this proposed Orchard Street accessing Sherwood Blvd.

Mr. Dugdale answered that Orchard Street should be aligned in some way to South Sherwood Blvd. because east-west access was needed.

Mr. Settecase said that a more southerly east-west street would be better than the one currently proposed.

Mr. Settecase then clarified his three objections to the proposed construction of Orchard Street: 1) the bad design of the street, 2) who will pay for the street, and 3) concern about 180 families using the street.

Sherwood Planning Comm.
Page 3
December 15, 1981

Mr. Jensen responded that he would agree to stubbing off Orchard Street in exchange for being allowed to build 120 lots on the development instead of the current allowance of 118 lots.

Director Dugdale responded that the center street could be stubbed off easily.

Mr. Settecase asserted that he does not want to provide access through his property for a future development.

Commissioner Galbreath asked what Staff thinks about giving up the additional two lots to Mr. Jensen.

Director Dugdale answered that this would allow the street sections to be matched east and west.

Commissioner Galbreath asked what the objections there were to a 40-foot rather than 48-foot roadway.

Another commissioner asked whether a 34-foot street could accommodate utilities and sidewalks, etc.

Commissioner Sanders asked what objections there were to running the utilities underground down the middle of the road.

Director Dugdale answered that Staff is obligated to follow standard utility placements unless otherwise designated by the project engineers.

Mr. Jensen added that utilities are usually placed behind the sidewalks. He said that a 34-foot street section with a 5-foot sidewalk on one side would suffice.

Director Dugdale ^{requested} stated that this discussion be deferred to the City Engineer.

Motion

Commissioner Galbreath moved that the Commission approve the planned unit development for a 22.07 acre site on Sunset Blvd. to be combined with the underlying medium-high, residential (MDRH) designation resulting in a MDRH-PD designation. Commissioner Borchers seconded the motion. Motion carried with no objections.

Motion

Commissioner Galbreath moved that the testimony given tonight be attached to Item No. 2, a general development plan for a three-phase residential development, and Item No. 3, a preliminary plat for a first-phase of the development consisting of 50 lots and common area, when they are later proposed for consideration. Commissioner Borchers seconded the motion. Motion carried with no objections.

Discussion of Item No. 2: A general development plan for a three-phase residential development

Commissioner Sanders opened the discussion by giving examples of how the Planning Commission could approach discussion of the general development plan, via lot size, density, etc.

Director Dugdale stated that the density proposed by Mr. Jensen is much less than that allowed: ^{The} density planned is single-family, but the area is actually zoned for multi-family units, so the developer is well within his density limits.

Commissioner Sanders asked Mr. Jensen how many attached units he proposed.

Mr. Jensen replied that 80 attached units are proposed.

Commissioner Sanders asked if they were single-wall attachments and Mr. Jensen replied that they were.

Motion

Commissioner Galbreath moved that the general development plan for a three-phase residential development be approved, subject to the limitations, findings, and changes that will be discussed under Item No. 3. The motion was seconded. Motion carried with no objections.

Discussion of Item No. 3: A preliminary plat for a first-phase development consisting of 50 lots and common area

Commissioner Sanders stated that Mr. Jensen will have to discuss the construction of the final two lots with Director Dugdale at a later date.

Commissioner Sanders described the property of the first-phase development as being the most westerly of the development.

Mr. Jensen stated that Mr. Ortiz is seeking approval of Phase No. 1. He continued that the development will take access from Sunset Blvd. and will be fronting on the greenway; he added that a bikepath will be constructed for pedestrians.

Director Dugdale announced that there are still some unresolved assessment methodology problems. He said that Staff will be directed to ^{has} utilize Unified Sewerage Agency financing for sewerage in the develop-^{the} ment, and that there is good residential support for the project, with the exception of the ^{issue of} assessment equity.

requested Cedar Creek Trunk

Director Dugdale continued that the first phase of the development ^{is a long phase. involves a lengthy dead end street and raised the question of fire access}

Commissioner Tobias observed that room must be made during the first phase to turn an engine and a truck around.

Mr. Jensen responded that his construction crew plans to utilize a "T"-type turn-around which is adequate according to the Fire District.

Director Dugdale commented that fire access be discussed with the Tualatin Fire District.

Ed Walden, of Route 3, Box 53, Sherwood, and a property owner of land adjacent to Sunset Blvd., observed that without improvements made on Sunset Blvd., any entrances onto Sunset Blvd. are dangerous.

Director Dugdale, referring to Item No. 6 of the Required Findings (Adjoining land can be developed or is provided access that will allow its development in accordance with this ordinance), stated that the applicant is aware of the problem and will construct vertical alignment addressing that problem.

Director Dugdale continued that the applicant is not proposing to improve Sunset Blvd. at this time, but improvement guarantees should be considered with the City Engineer's office. ~~Only minimum grading and paving will be done at this time under the supervision of the City Engineer.~~

The hearing was closed at 8:50 p.m.

Questions from the Commission

Commissioner Galbreath asked about street width.

Director Dugdale stated that the streets were to be 32 feet wide, curb-to-curb.

Director Dugdale added that the Commission was only looking at the general concept of the development plan.

Bruce Larson, of 1537 SE Elliot, Portland, stated a concern about sewer improvements.

Commissioner Sanders stated that sewer improvements were not the subject of this meeting's discussion; they will be discussed later at the City Council meeting under LID financing procedures.

Commissioner Tobias asked if the developer would object to a 15-foot strip.

Mr. Jensen answered that he could work out a 15-foot strip but could not accommodate a 40-foot strip.

Director Dugdale referred the Commission to 4.04, Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan for standards that would be applied to the 15-foot strip.

Sherwood Planning Comm.
Page 6
December 15, 1981

Commissioner Tobias stated that the Site Review Board would take the 15-foot strip into consideration.

Director Dugdale recommended that the Commission take the 15-foot strip matter to the Review Board.

Commissioner Tobias asked why a 15-foot strip was being specified.

Director Dugdale answered that 15 feet provides a flexible buffer to protect residences from traffic impact.

Chairman Stewart asked whether a traffic study had been discussed.

Director Dugdale answered that Staff indicated a willingness to follow that study.

Chairman Stewart questioned ^{whether} ~~that~~ the Planning Commission was progressing on this issue in an orderly way. He questioned whether needed services should be planned for undeveloped land first before leap-frogging to actual development.

Commissioner Galbreath responded that Chairman Stewart should have brought these points up earlier before the site was approved for specific development.

Commissioner Sanders commented on lack of road services in the development.

Director Dugdale responded that the connection of Murdock Road to Division Street is two years away.

Chairman Stewart asked if the Fire District had been consulted on access to the development.

Director Dugdale answered that changes might have to be recommended later, but not right now.

Chairman Stewart commented that Railroad Street will not accommodate 96 more cars.

Motion

Chairman Stewart moved to accept Staff recommendations that the PD general development plan be approved based on all the findings except Item No. 3, "That the applicant install a standard local street (48' RW 34' PV) in the proposed right-of-way indicated as "Orchard Street" on the General Development Plan in Phase III, including sidewalks on both sides," with the added condition that a bikepath be installed on the Division Street corridor.

Sherwood Planning Commission
Page 7
December 15, 1981

Amendment to Motion

Commissioner Borchers amended the motion to delete the added condition that a bikepath be installed on the Division Street corridor. Commissioner Tobias seconded the amended motion. Chairman Stewart objected. Amended motion carried.

IV. Discussion of the Joint Role of the City and School District in Community Development Activities

Commissioner Borchers moved that this discussion be deferred to a future Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Gothie seconded the motion. Motion was carried with no objections.

Respectfully submitted,
Diane Kohl
Recording Secretary