

SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA

July 15, 1980

1. Slide Presentation on Growth Management by Washington County Extension Service.
2. Reading and Approval of Minutes of July 1, 1980.
3. Announcements and Correspondence.
4. Request by Willard L. Martin to continue the use of a non-conforming structure under the provisions of the Sherwood Zoning Ordinance Section 7.04(2).
5. MP-80-01
A request by William Mason for a Minor Land Partition on Tax Lot 2S132AB: 1500.
6. PUBLIC HEARING
AN-80-02
A request by Ed Walden for the annexation of 26.94 acres in tax lot 2S1 31D: 200 located on Wilsonville Road by triple majority petition.
7. Draft City/County Urban Planning Area Agreement.
8. Next Meeting Agenda.

Call for Exh.

APPROVED MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 15, 1980

Planning Commission members Clyde List, Paul Clayton, Clyde Sanders, Jr., Norma Borchers, Joe Galbreath, Rick Demings, and Gene Stewart were present.

Mr. Dugdale introduced Mr. Dick Beck, Washington County Extension agent. Mr. Beck showed a film strip on Growth Management. He explained another film strip on implementing zoning was available.

Various methods of growth control were discussed. Mr. Beck felt a moratorium should only be used as a temporary planning pause.

2. Reading and Approval of Minutes

Mr. Clayton moved that the minutes of July 1 be accepted. Mr. Stewart seconded. The motion carried. Mr. Sanders moved and Mr. Demings seconded that the minutes of July 8, 1980 be accepted. The motion carried.

3. There were no announcements or correspondence.

4. Request by Willard L. Martin to continue the use of a Non-Conforming Structure Under the Provisions of the Sherwood Zoning Ordinance Section 7.04(2).

Mr. Martin explained that this structure had always been used in a woodworking, or welding, or similar manner. Mr. Martin explained that he was retired and if he was unable to rent this building it would constitute a hardship for himself.

Mr. Martin introduced Mr. Stillwell, of Stillwell Mfg., the prospective tenant. Mr. Martin said he had assumed that as long as he continued to use this building for the same types of operation he didn't have any problem.

Mr. Clayton commented he didn't have any objections to this continued use as long as the neighbors didn't object.

Mr. Stillwell was asked by Mr. Sanders what type of business he would be operating. Mr. Stillwell explained that it would be a small recut operation. They would utilize saws and the air compressor. They would only operate an 8-5 shift and the only truck traffic would be freight types not tractor trailer.

Mr. Stewart moved that the Planning Commission find this structure is only suitable for another non-conforming use, and that this use is no more detrimental than the use it replaces. Mr. Sanders seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

5. A Request by William Mason for a Minor Land Partition on Tax Lot 2S 132AB : 1500. MP-80-01

Mr. Dugdale explained the County Assessor has partitioned the lot and Mr. Mason has sold the lot fronting Lincoln St. and the house. Mr. Mason now wishes to obtain a building permit for a duplex on the lot fronting the 20' right of way, Highland St.

Mayor Stewart, present in the audience, commented that we need to have a better understanding with the County. They are creating lots we know nothing about.

Mr. Mason explained we need to get access to our lot; we would like to put in a gravel road.

Mr. Dugdale explained the City would need an additional 20' dedicated from center in order to comply with the Transportation Plan. The right to construct the duplex would not be lot in the dedication of the right of way.

Mr. Mason stated he was willing to deed the 20' across his 100' of frontage and he was willing to participate in the street improvement when it was feasible.

Mr. Galbreath commented that if Mr. Mason dedicates the right of way to the City and he wants to run on a gravel road, I can't see any sense holding up an 80' x 100' lot that is buildable.

Mr. Stewart felt the Commission should uphold the Transportation Plan. He point out So. Sherwood Blvd. as an example of the mess we can have.

Mr. Sanders explained what a non-remonstrance agreement was.

Mr. Demings moved that we postpone a decision until the next regular meeting and in the interim, the City find out what the neighbors' feelings are on an LID for the street. Mr. Stewart seconded. The motion carried with Mr. Sanders voting no.

6. PUBLIC HEARING - A Request by Ed Walden for the Annexation of 26.94 acres in Tax Lot 2S1 31D : 200 Located on Wilsonville Rd. by Triple Majority Petition.

Mr. List opened the Public Hearing and explained the nature and location of the request. Mr. List invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Walden asked the Commission if there was any question about the location of his property. He explained it is the old Kluzer or Kuthill property. Mr. Walden explained the whole east side of the property is adjacent to the City boundary. It is bounded on the South by the Wilsonville Rd., the future design is for 90'. The west and south sides are bounded by the railroad tracks. He explained there are no neighbors except for the people across the street. Mr. Walden explained his main reason for annexation is that the land is a part of the Sherwood planning area and he felt Sherwood would be best served by controlling the developed useage of it. He said the land has no farming potential. There are three creeks running through it and a large amount of the property is flood plain. Mr. Walden said he had more faith in the planning capabilities of the City than the County. He said this property is vital to the Cedar Creek sanitary sewerage basin. Sewer and storm drains would have to go through that area on a gravity system in order to serve land in the City limits. Mr. Walden explained he wished to sell part of the property and he felt the future owners would like to have sewer and water available. He said annexation would have no immediate impact to the City. And when the land is developed, it will be an asset rather than a liability. He said he can't think of any reason why the City shouldn't annex it.

Mr. Demings asked if this were approved, how soon would this be for sale. Mr. Walden said he would like to dispose of a portion of it right away. Mr. Walden stated he had signed the Cedar Creek Sewer LID petition.

Mr. Walden reiterated the reasons he felt the annexation would be advantageous to the City. It would protect the interests of the City when the land was developed. Annexation of the land would be an asset in the extension of the City facilities to land that are already in the City limits and are ready to develop. It can not be a liability to the City because there are no facilities that the City would have to take over and maintain.

Mr. List invited any other testimony. There was none. The hearing was closed.

Mr. List commented that he felt this would bring us closer to the extension of the Cedar Creek trunk line.

Mr. Dugdale reviewed the staff report and findings. He pointed out there are only about 12 acres out of the 26 that are out of the 100 year flood plain and only about 6 of the 12 that are tillable. He also pointed out this land is outside the Immediate Growth Boundary and is part of the specially regulated land. Mr. Dugdale believed this land was not necessary for the Cedar Creek LID. He stated if it was necessary to lay the line on the property he felt that would be a compelling reason for annexation.

Mr. Stewart commented that there has been no proof brought forward that the rest of that area in the City is ready for development. Mr. Stewart said it appears to me we are not listening to what we have said on the plan before. There's been no demonstration of need for additional properties for housing. It has not been demonstrated that there are plans to develop it to the density it is planned for.

Mr. Stewart moved the annexation be postponed until findings about where the Cedar Creek trunk line would run are available and until findings are made as to what property owners are willing to share in the cost of the trunk. There has also been an inadequate showing of need for additional housing within the immediate growth boundary. Mr. Demings seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Sanders opposed.

The next Planning Commission meeting is Tuesday, July 22 to continue the review of Part 3 of the Comprehensive Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.


