



**City of Sherwood  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Sherwood City Hall  
22560 SW Pine Street  
Sherwood, OR 97140  
June 22, 2010 – 7 PM**

**Planning Commission will hold a work session on June 22, 2010. Work sessions are informal. Public may attend.**

Work sessions are informal meetings where the Commission and staff can discuss topics but no formal action is taken from these meetings. Work sessions are open to the public in accordance with public meeting laws.

Planning Commission Work Session agenda items:

1. Tonquin Employment Area (TEA)
2. Code Clean-Up Discussion
  - a. Simple Fixes Divisions VI, and VII
  - b. Proposed code language for Public Notice and Application Submittal Requirements
  - c. Other

**Next Meeting:**

1. **July 13, 2010** – Public Hearing - Tonquin Employment Area (TEA)

# Memorandum

Date: June 15, 2010  
To: Heather Austin, City of Sherwood  
From: Frank Angelo  
cc:  
Re: Tonquin Employment Area Preferred Concept Plan – Committee Comments

---

The Tonquin Employment Area (TEA) Technical Advisory and Stakeholder Committees met last week to review the Review Draft of the TEA Concept Plan. Based on the discussion at both meetings, the following comments and issues have been identified as edits to the plan document:

- Provide a brief section on the Urban Reserve Decision as it relates to the TEA planning area – show location of Urban Reserve on one map.
- Provide a discussion on the City's annexation process and how it will influence future development opportunities.
- Add a section describing natural resources in the TEA planning area and how it will be important to protect them as development moves forward. Add a policy in the Policy Section for the protection of natural resources.
- Page 7, last sentence – change “northwest” to “northeast”.
- Employment Forecast Table IV-1 – remove the reference to “lodging” in the footnote.
- Edits to Concept Plan map – Figure IV-1, page 7:
  1. Add title and date.
  2. Show the extension of SW 124<sup>th</sup> as dashed black line (proposed facility).
  3. Remove the Commercial Node symbols.
  4. Note Employment Industrial zoning.
- Dahlke Road – provide discussion on what will happen to Dahlke Road, particularly its access to Oregon Street.
- Industrial Employment Zone Edits
  1. Change name of new zone to Employment Industrial (EI).
  2. Add the revised Lot Dimensions Table to the Industrial Employment Zone that provides the requirements for lots greater than 50 acres.
  3. Provide more precise language / clarity regarding commercial uses.
  4. Clarify intent for commercial nodes / centers – convey the limited nature/size of anticipated commercial uses.
  5. Provide a threshold for when commercial development can occur (can only proceed following some level of industrial development).
  6. Do not specify commercial nodes on map. Specify “up to two commercial sites of up to 5 acres each” at locations to be determined.



- 
7. All commercial uses should be conditional uses and should be included in a new section in the EI zone.
- Add a brief discussion on the status of the Tonquin Trail. Note that Metro is considering alignment alternatives and that the alignment in the TEA Concept Plan is only one concept / alternative. Amend the map to show the Tonquin Trail on SW 124<sup>th</sup> and the new Collector but not in the powerline easement and indicate that the trail alignment has not been determined.
  - Amend the infrastructure maps and text to clearly indicate that the maps are for illustrative purposes only and display infrastructure concepts for the location of the facilities. Note that actual location of the sewer, water, storm facilities will be determined as development occurs in the TEA and that these facilities will likely occur in conjunction with development of the road network.

These edits and any additional edits will be made following the discussion with the Planning Commission on Tuesday, June 22<sup>nd</sup>.



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

## MEMORANDUM

City of Sherwood  
22560 SW Pine St.  
Sherwood, OR 97140  
Tel 503-625-5522  
Fax 503-625-5524  
www.ci.sherwood.or.us

Mayor  
Keith Mays

Council President  
Dave Heironimus

Councilors  
Dave Grant  
Linda Henderson  
Lee Weislogel  
Del Clark  
Robyn Folsom

City Manager  
Jim Patterson

**DATE:** June 15, 2010  
**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager  
**SUBJECT:** Code Clean-Up Project Packet Materials

Attached (Attachment 1) are proposed amendments to Division III and IV addressing public notice and application submittal requirements. It also includes simple fixes previously reviewed by the Commission in work session.

Also attached (Attachment 2) is an inventory of the “complex” housekeeping issues for Divisions VI and VIII in addition to Divisions II, III, IV, V and VII already reviewed. We propose holding off on updates to Division I and IX until the last phase of the project.

Commissioners will be getting a separate e-mail with instructions to the City’s FTP site for accessing the word version of the “simple” housekeeping changes for Divisions VI and VIII. A PDF of each section will be placed on the web site by Wednesday morning. The packet can be located either through the Planning Commission packet page or via the newly created code clean-up page ([www.sherwoodoregon.gov/code-clean-up](http://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/code-clean-up))

Finally, Attachment 3 is an update to the comment log that includes information from SURPAC, CPO 5, and Vineyards HOA and is included for Commissioners reference.

Division III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Chapter 16.70 GENERAL PROVISIONS\*

Sections:

16.70.010 PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE

16.70.020 APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

16.70.030 APPLICATION SUBMITTAL

16.70.040 AVAILABILITY OF RECORD FOR REVIEW

16.70.050 APPLICATION RESUBMISSION

\* Editor's Note: Some sections may not contain a history.

16.70.010 PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE

Pre-application conferences are encouraged and shall be scheduled to provide applicants with the informational and procedural requirements of this Code; to exchange information regarding applicable policies, goals and standards of the Comprehensive Plan; to provide technical and design assistance; and to identify opportunities and constraints for a proposed land use action. An applicant may apply at one time for all permits or zone changes needed for a development project as determined in the pre-application conference.  
(Ord. 91-922 § 3; 86-851)

16.70.020 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

Applicants of Type III, IV and V applications are required to meet with adjacent property owners within 500 feet of the subject application and recognized neighborhood organizations prior to submitting their application to the City. Affidavits of mailing, sign-in sheets and a summary of the meeting notes shall be included with the application when submitted. The purpose of the neighborhood meeting is to solicit input and exchange information about the proposed development. Applicants for Type II land use action are encouraged, but not required to hold a neighborhood meeting.

16.70.030 APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. Form

Any request for a land use action shall be made on forms prescribed and provided by the City and shall be prepared and submitted in compliance with this Code. A land use application shall be reviewed against the standards and criteria effective at the time of application submittal.  
Original signatures from all owners must be on the application form.  
(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

B. Copies

To assist in determining the compliance of proposed land use actions with the Comprehensive Plan and provisions of this Code, applicants shall submit one (1) complete electronic copy of the full application packet, one reduced (8 ½ x 11) copy of the full application packet and the required number of hard copies as outlined on the forms prescribed and provided by the City,  
(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

C. Content

1. In addition to the required application form, all applications for Type II-V land use approval must include the following:

Deleted: 16.70.020 APPLICATION MATERIALS

Deleted: 2

Deleted: MATERIALS

Deleted: fifteen (15) copies of: the completed application form, with attachments or exhibits specifying and illustrating the proposed land use action; an existing conditions inventory; the proposed development plan; and any supplemental materials, as required by Section 16.78.010. Additional information may be required at the discretion of the City.



- a. Appropriate fee(s) for the requested land use action required based on the City of Sherwood Fee Schedule.
- b. Documentation of neighborhood meeting per 16.70.020.
- c. Tax Map showing property within 300 feet with scale (1"=100' or 1"= 200') north point, date and legend.
- d. Two (2) sets of mailing labels for property owners of record within 500 feet of the subject site, including a map of the area showing the properties to receive notice and a list of the property owners, addresses and tax lots. Ownership records shall be based on the most current available information from the Tax Assessor's office.
- e. Vicinity Map showing the City limits and the Urban Growth Boundary.
- f. A narrative explaining the proposal in detail and a response to the Required Findings for Land use Review for the land use approval(s) being sought.
- g. Two (2) copies of a current preliminary title report.
- h. Existing conditions plan drawn to scale showing: property lines and dimensions, existing structures and other improvements such as streets and utilities, existing vegetation, any floodplains or wetlands and any easements on the property.
- i. Proposed development plans that adequately demonstrate the proposal sufficiently for the Hearing Authority to determine compliance with the applicable standards. Checklists shall be provided by the City detailing information typically needed to adequately review specific land use actions.
- j. A trip analysis verifying compliance with the Capacity Allocation Program, if required per 16.108.070.
- k. A traffic study, if required by other sections of this code.
- l. Other Special Studies and/or Reports may be identified by the Planning Director or the City Engineer to address unique issues identified in the pre-application meeting or during project review including but not limited to:
  - 1) Wetland assessment and delineation
  - 2) Geotechnical report
  - 3) Traffic study
  - 4) Verification of compliance with other agency standards such as CWS, DSL, Army Corps of Engineers, ODOT, PGE, BPA, Washington County, ..
- m. Plan sets must have:
  - 1) The proposed name of the development. If a proposed project name is the same as or similar to other existing projects in the City of Sherwood, the applicant shall be requested to modify the project name.
  - 2) The name, address and phone of the owner, developer, applicant and plan producer.
  - 3) North arrow,
  - 4) Legend,
  - 5) Date plans were prepared and date of any revisions
  - 6) Scale clearly shown. Other than architectural elevations, all plans must be drawn to an engineer scale.
  - 7) All dimensions clearly shown.
- n. Exemptions can be made when plans are not necessary in order to make a land use decision, such as for text amendments to the development code. Additional written

documentation may be necessary to adequately demonstrate compliance with the criteria.

16.70.040 APPLICATION SUBMITTAL

Deleted: 3

**A. Acceptance**

An application for land use will not be accepted by the City without the required forms, the required fee(s) or the signature of the applicant and authorization from the property owner of record.

**B. Completeness**

Within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of initial submission, the City shall determine whether the application is complete and so notify the applicant in writing. The application will not be deemed complete unless the minimum application requirements are met as described on the application form provided by the City. Applicants will receive written notification of any application deficiencies. Information outlined in an incompleteness letter must be submitted within 180 days of the date of the letter. Alternatively, within 14 days of the date of the letter, the applicant may submit a statement indicating refusal to submit the required items. If a refusal statement is provided, the applicant is considered complete on the 31<sup>st</sup> day from the date the application was submitted.

(Ord. 98-1053 § 1; 91-922)

Deleted: Incomplete applications will not be accepted by the City. Incomplete applications shall be returned to the applicant along with a written notification of the application's deficiencies. The application fees submitted are non-refundable. Provided however, that incomplete applications may be resubmitted when the noted deficiencies have been corrected to the City's satisfaction

Deleted: 4

Deleted: AVAILABILITY

16.70.050 AVAILABILITY OF RECORD FOR REVIEW

**A. Public Inspection**

1. Except as provided herein, all application materials to be relied upon in public hearings on land use actions required by this Code shall be available for public inspection twenty (20) calendar days in advance of the initial hearing before the Commission or Council. If two (2) or more hearings are required on a land use action, all application materials shall be available for public inspection at least ten (10) calendar days in advance of the initial hearing before the Hearing Authority. All application materials to be relied upon for Type II decisions as indicated in Section 16.72.010 shall be available for public inspection fourteen (14) calendar days in advance of the staff decision on the application.
2. Application materials shall be available to the public for inspection at no cost. Copies of application materials will be provided to the public, upon request, at a cost defined by the City's fee schedule.

(Ord. 99-1079 § 3; 98-1053; 91-922)

Deleted: of miscellaneous fees and charges

**B. Continuance**

If additional materials are provided in support of an application later than twenty (20) calendar days in advance of the initial hearing before the Hearing Authority, or later than ten (10) calendar days in advance of the initial hearing before the Commission or Council if two (2) or more hearings are required, or if the City or the applicant fails to meet any requirements of Chapter 16.72, any party to the application or party notified of the hearing as per Section 16.72.020, may make request to the City, either verbally at the

Deleted: .

Deleted: 1

initial hearing or in writing at any time before the close of the hearing, for a hearing continuance. Any continuance or extension of the record requested by an applicant shall result in a corresponding extension of the time limitations. If, in the City's determination, there is a valid basis for the continuance request, said request shall be granted.  
(Ord. 99-1079 § 3; 98-1053)

**16.70.060 APPLICATION RESUBMISSION**

A land use application denied in accordance with this Code, shall not be accepted for resubmission for one-hundred eighty (180) calendar days following the date of the denial, unless the application has been sufficiently modified to abrogate the reason for denial, as determined by the City. All applications resubmitted after being denied in accordance with this Code shall be required to provide new application materials, pay new fees, and shall be subject to the review process required by this Code for the land use action being considered.  
(Ord. 98-1053 § 1)

Deleted: 5



Chapter 16.72 PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING DEVELOPMENT PERMITS\*

Sections:

16.72.010 GENERALLY

16.72.020 PUBLIC NOTICE AND HEARING

16.72.030 CONTENT OF NOTICE

16.72.040 PLANNING STAFF REPORTS

16.72.050 CONDUCT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

16.72.060 NOTICE OF DECISION

16.72.070 REGISTRY OF DECISIONS

16.72.080 FINAL ACTION ON PERMIT OR ZONE CHANGE

\* Editor's Note: Some sections may not contain a history.

16.72.010 GENERALLY

**A.** Classifications

Except for Administrative Variances, which are reviewed per Section 16.84.020, and Final Development Plans for Planned Unit Developments, which are reviewed per Section 16.40.030, all quasi-judicial development permit applications and legislative land use actions shall be classified as one of the following:

**1.** Type I

The following quasi-judicial actions shall be subject to a Type I review process:

- a.** Signs
- b.** Property Line Adjustments
- c.** Interpretation of Similar Uses
- d.** Temporary Uses
- e.** Final Subdivision Plats
- f.** Final Site Plan Review
- g.** Time extensions of approval, per Sections 16.90.020; 16.124.010
- h.** Type II Home Occupation Permits
- i.** Interpretive Decisions by the City Manager or his/her designee

Deleted: 1

Deleted: A

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 6

Deleted: 7

**2.** Type II

The following quasi-judicial actions shall be subject to a Type II review process:

- a.** Land Partitions
- b.** Expedited Land Divisions - The Planning Director shall make a decision based on the information presented, and shall issue a development permit if the applicant has complied with all of the relevant requirements of the Zoning and Community Development Code. Conditions may be imposed by the Planning Director if necessary to fulfill the requirements of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, Transportation System Plan or the Zoning and Community Development Code.
- c.** "Fast-track" Site Plan review, defined as those site plan applications which propose less than 15,000 square feet of floor area, parking or seating capacity of public, institutional, commercial or industrial use permitted by the underlying zone, or up to a total of 20% increase in floor area, parking or seating capacity for a land use or structure subject to conditional use permit, except as follows: auditoriums, theaters, stadiums, and those applications subject to Section 16.72.010D, below.

Deleted: B

Deleted: 1

Deleted: Minor

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

d. "Design Upgraded" Site Plan review, defined as those site plan applications which propose between 15,001 and 40,000 square feet of floor area, parking or seating capacity and which propose a minimum of eighty percent (80%) of the total possible points of design criteria in the "Commercial Design Review Matrix" found in Section 16.90.020.4.G.4.

Deleted: 4

3. Type III

The following quasi-judicial actions shall be subject to a Type III review process:

Deleted: C

a. Conditional Uses

Deleted: 1

b. Variances, including Administrative Variances if a hearing is requested per Section 16.84.020.

Deleted: 2

c. Site Plan Review -- between 15,001 and 40,000 square feet of floor area, parking or seating capacity except those within the Old Town Overlay District, per Section 16.72.010D, below.

Deleted: 3

d. Subdivisions -- Less than 50 lots.

Deleted: 4

4. Type IV

The following quasi-judicial actions shall be subject to a Type IV review process:

Deleted: D

a. Site Plan review and/or "Fast Track" Site Plan review of new or existing structures in the Old Town Overlay District.

Deleted: 1

b. All quasi-judicial actions not otherwise assigned to a Hearing Authority under this section.

Deleted: 2

c. Site Plans -- Greater than 40,000 square feet of floor area, parking or seating capacity.

Deleted: 3

d. Subdivisions -- More than 50 lots.

Deleted: 4

5. Type V

The following legislative actions shall be subject to a Type V review process:

Deleted: E

a. Plan Map Amendments

Deleted: 1

b. Plan Text Amendments

Deleted: 2

c. Planned Unit Development -- Preliminary Development Plan and Overlay District. (Ord. No. 2009-005, § 2, 6-2-2009; Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119; 99-1079; 98-1053)

Deleted: 3

B. Hearing and Appeal Authority

Deleted: 2

1. Each Type V legislative land use action shall be reviewed at a public hearing by the Planning Commission with a recommendation made to the City Council. The City Council shall conduct a public hearing and make the City's final decision.

2. Each quasi-judicial development permit application shall potentially be subject to two (2) levels of review, with the first review by a Hearing Authority and the second review, if an appeal is filed, by an Appeal Authority. The decision of the Hearing Authority shall be the City's final decision, unless an appeal is properly filed within fourteen (14) days after the date on which the Hearing Authority took final action. In the event of an appeal, the decision of the Appeal Authority shall be the City's final decision.

3. The quasi-judicial Hearing and Appeal Authorities shall be as follows:

a. The Type I Hearing Authority is the Planning Director and the Appeal Authority is the Planning Commission.

Deleted: A

(1). The Planning Director's decision shall be made without public notice or public hearing. Notice of the decision shall be provided to the applicant.

Deleted: 1

~~(2)~~ The applicant may appeal the Planning Director's decision.  
~~b.~~ The Type II Hearing Authority is the Planning Director and the Appeal Authority is the Planning Commission.

Deleted: 2  
Deleted: B

~~(1)~~ The Planning Director's decision shall be made without a public hearing, but not until at least fourteen (14) days after a public notice has been mailed to the applicant and all property owners within 500 feet of the proposal. Any person may submit written comments to the Planning Director which address the relevant approval criteria of the Zoning and Development Code. Such comments must be received by the Planning Department within fourteen (14) days from the date of the notice.

Deleted: 1  
Deleted: 1

~~(2)~~ Any person providing written comments may appeal the Planning Director's decision.

Deleted: 2

~~c.~~ The Type III Hearing Authority is the Hearings Officer and the Appeal Authority is the Planning Commission.

Deleted: C

~~(1)~~ The Hearings Officer shall hold a public hearing following public notice in accordance with Sections 16.72.020 through 16.72.080.

Deleted: 1

~~(2)~~ Any person who testified before the Hearings Officer at the public hearing or submitted written comments prior to the close of the record may appeal the Hearings Officer's decision.

Deleted: 2

~~d.~~ The Type IV Hearing Authority is the Planning Commission and the Appeal Authority is the City Council.

Deleted: D

~~(1)~~ The Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing following public notice in accordance with Sections 16.72.020 through 16.72.080.

~~(2)~~ Any person who testified before the Planning Commission at the public hearing or submitted written comments prior to the close of the record may appeal the Planning Commission's decision.

~~e.~~ The Type V Hearing Authority is the City Council, upon recommendation from the Planning Commission and the Appeal Authority is the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

Deleted: E

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119)

**C. Approval Criteria**

~~1.~~ The approval criteria for each development permit application shall be the approval standards and requirements for such applications as contained in this Code. Each decision made by a Hearing Authority or Appeal Authority shall list the approval criteria and indicate whether the criteria are met. It is the applicant's burden to demonstrate to the Hearing Authority and Appeal Authority how each of the approval criteria are met. An application may be approved with conditions of approval imposed by the Hearing Authority or Appeal Authority. On appeal, the Appeal Authority may affirm, reverse, amend, refer, or remand the decision of the Hearing Authority.

Deleted: 3  
Deleted: A  
Deleted: r  
Deleted: B  
Deleted: paragraph  
Deleted: A

~~2.~~ In addition to [section 1](#) above, all Type IV quasi-judicial applications shall also demonstrate compliance with the Conditional use criteria of Section 16.82.020.

Deleted: A. For Type II, III and IV actions on zoning map amendments, conditional uses, variances, site plans, planned unit developments, minor land partitions, subdivisions, annexations, landmarks, private access to streets and other land use action specific to a property or group of properties, the City shall send written notice by regular mail to owners of record of all real property within one hundred (100) feet from the property subject to the land use action, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Metro and the applicable transit service provider. If the subject property is located adjacent to or split by a railroad crossing ODOT Rail Division shall be sent public notice.  
1

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3)

**16.72.020 PUBLIC NOTICE AND HEARING**

**A. Newspaper Notice**



Notices of all public hearings for Type III, IV, and V land use actions required by this Code shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the City in each of the two (2) calendar weeks prior to the initial hearing before the Hearing Authority.

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 99-1079; 98-1053; 91-922; 86-851)

Deleted: and  
Deleted: , VI

**B. Posted Notice**

1. Notices of all Type II, III, IV and V land use actions required by this Code shall be posted by the City in no fewer than five (5) conspicuous locations within the City, not less than fourteen (14) calendar days in advance of the staff decision on Type II applications or twenty (20) calendar days in advance of the initial hearing before the Hearing Authority for Type III, IV and V applications.

Deleted: 2

2. Signage shall be posted on the subject property, fourteen (14) calendar days in advance of the staff decision on Type II applications and twenty (20) calendar days in advance of the hearing before the Hearing Authority for Type III, IV and V applications. The location, size and content of the sign shall be subject to the approval of the City Planner.

Deleted: Additionally, s  
Deleted: either  
Deleted: or

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 99-1079; 98-1053; 91-922; 86-851)

**C. Mailed Notice**

1. For Type II, III, IV and V actions specific to a property or group of properties, the City shall send written notice by regular mail to owners of record of all real property within five hundred (500) feet from the property subject to the land use action. Written notice shall also be sent to Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Metro, the applicable transit service provider and other affected or potentially affected agencies. If the subject property is located adjacent to or split by a railroad crossing ODOT Rail Division shall be sent public notice.

Deleted: 3

Deleted: A

Deleted: on zoning map amendments, conditional uses, variances, site plans, planned unit developments, minor land partitions, subdivisions, annexations, landmarks, and other land use action

Deleted: one

Deleted: I

Deleted: ,

Deleted: .

Deleted: B

Deleted: Except

Deleted: as otherwise provided herein, w

Deleted: Written notice to property owners for Type II actions shall be mailed in accordance with this Chapter at least fourteen (14) calendar days in advance of the Planning Director's Decision.

Deleted: C

2. Written notice to property owners shall be mailed at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to a decision being made on a Type II land use action and at least twenty (20) calendar days in advance of the initial public hearing before the Hearing Authority. If two (2) or more hearings are required on a land use action, notices shall be mailed at least ten (10) calendar days in advance of the initial hearing before the Commission or Council.

3. For the purposes of mailing the written notice, the names and addresses of the property owners of record, as shown on the most recent County Assessor's records in the possession of the City, shall be used. Written notice shall also be mailed to homeowners associations when the homeowners association owns common property within the notification area and is listed in the County Assessor's records.

4. For written notices required by this Code, other than written notices to property owners of record, the City shall rely on the address provided by the persons so notified. The City shall not be responsible for verifying addresses so provided.

Deleted: D

5. If a zone change application proposes to change the zone of property which includes all or part of a manufactured home park, the City shall give written notice by first class

Deleted: E

mail to each existing mailing address for tenants of the manufactured home park at least twenty (20) days but not more than forty (40) days before the date of the first hearing on the application. Such notice costs are the responsibility of the applicant.

~~6.~~ **In addition to the requirements in this section,** if a project is proposed for review under the Infill Development Standards (Chapter 16.68), the developer shall send public notice to all owners of property within the same area indicated on the Sherwood Infill Notification Map in which development is to occur.  
(Ord. 2006-021; 2003-1148 § 3; 99-1079; 98-1053; 91-922; 86-851)

Deleted: F

Deleted: I

Deleted: Alternatively, the developer may send notice to all property owners within 250-feet of the subject site. The Planning Department shall maintain a map of the Established Neighborhoods

Deleted: 4

Deleted: A

**D. Failure to Receive Notice**

~~1.~~ The failure of a property owner or other party to an application to receive notice of a public hearing as provided in Code of this Chapter or to receive notice of continuances and appeals as provided by this Code due to circumstances beyond the control of the City, including but not limited to recent changes in ownership not reflected in County Assessors records, loss of the notice by the postal service, or an inaccurate address provided by the County Assessor or the party to the application, shall not invalidate the applicable public hearing or land use action. The City shall prepare and maintain affidavits demonstrating that public notices were mailed, published, and posted pursuant to this Code.

~~2.~~ Persons who should have received notice of a proposed land use action but can prove, to the City's satisfaction that notice was not received due to circumstances beyond their control, may be permitted, at the City's discretion, to exercise the right to appeal the action as per Chapter 16.76. All appeals filed under such conditions shall cite the circumstances resulting in the non-receipt of the notice.

Deleted: B

(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

**16.72.030 CONTENT OF NOTICE**

Public notices shall include the following information:

- A. The nature of the application and proposed use(s).
- B. A list of the applicable Code or Comprehensive Plan criteria to be applied to the review of the proposed land use action.
- C. The location and street address of the property subject to the land use action (if any).
- D. The date, time, place, location of the public hearing.
- E. The name and telephone number of a local government representative to contact for additional information.
- F. The availability of all application materials for inspection at no cost, or copies at reasonable cost.
- G. The availability of the City planning staff report for inspection at no cost, or copies at a reasonable cost, at least seven (7) calendar days in advance of the hearing.
- H. The requirements for the submission of testimony and the procedures for conducting hearings, including notice that failure to raise an issue accompanied by statements or evidence sufficient to offer the City, applicant or other parties to the application the opportunity to respond, will preclude appeal on said issue to the Council or to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

Deleted: 1. Public Notices



(Ord. 98-1053 § 1; 91-922)

16.72.040 PLANNING STAFF REPORTS

Recommended findings of fact and conditions of approval for each land use action shall be made in writing in a City planning staff report. Said staff report shall be published seven (7) calendar days in advance of the initial required public hearing before the Hearing Authority. Copies shall be provided to the applicant and the Hearing Authority no later than seven (7) calendar days in advance of the scheduled public hearing. Staff reports shall be available to the public for inspection at no cost. Copies of the staff report shall be provided to the public, upon request, at a cost defined by the City's schedule of miscellaneous fees and charges.

(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

16.72.050 CONDUCT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Hearing Disclosure Statements

The following information or statements shall be verbally provided by the Hearing Authority at the beginning of any public hearing on a land use action:

- 1. The findings of fact and criteria specified by the Code that must be satisfied for approval of the land use action being considered by the Hearing Authority.
- 2. That public testimony should be limited to addressing said findings of fact and criteria, or to other City or State land use standards which the persons testifying believe apply to the proposed land use action.
- 3. That failure to raise an issue, or failure to raise an issue with sufficient specificity so as to provide the City, applicant, or other parties to the application with a reasonable opportunity to respond, will preclude appeal on said issue to the Council or to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).
- 4. The rights of persons to request, as per this Code, that a hearing be continued or that the hearing record remain open.
- 5. That all persons testifying shall be deemed parties to the application, and must provide their name and full mailing address if they wish to be notified of continuances, appeals, or other procedural actions as required by this Code.

(Ord. 99-1079 § 3; 91-922)

B. Persons Testifying

Any person, whether the applicant, a person notified of the public hearing as per Section 16.72.020, the general public, or the authorized representative of any of the foregoing persons, may testify at a public hearing on a land use action. Testimony may be made verbally or in writing. The applicant, the applicant's representative, or any person so testifying, or that person's authorized representative, shall be deemed a party to the application, and shall be afforded all rights of appeal allowed by this Code and the laws of the State of Oregon.

(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

C. Hearing Record

- 1. Prior to the conclusion of the initial evidentiary hearing, any participant may request an opportunity to present additional evidence or testimony regarding the application. The local Hearing Authority shall grant such request by continuing the public hearing

Deleted: 1

Deleted: A

Deleted: B

Deleted: C

Deleted: D

Deleted: E

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

Deleted: A

pursuant to paragraph (B) of this section or leaving the record open for additional written evidence or testimony pursuant to paragraph (C) of this section.

2. If the hearing authority grants a continuance, the hearing shall be continued to a date, time and place certain at least seven (7) days from the date of the initial evidentiary hearing. An opportunity shall be provided at the continued hearing for persons to present and rebut new evidence and testimony. If new written evidence is submitted at the continued hearing, any person may request, prior to the conclusion of the continued hearing, that the record be left open for at least seven (7) days to submit additional written evidence or testimony for the purpose of responding to the new written evidence.
3. If the Hearing Authority leaves the record open for additional written evidence or testimony, the record shall be left open for at least seven (7) days. Any participant may file a written request with the local government for an opportunity to respond to new evidence submitted during the period the record was left open. If such a request is filed, the Hearing Authority shall reopen the record pursuant to subsection F of this Section.
4. A continuance or extension granted pursuant to this section shall be subject to the limitations of ORS 215.427 or 227.178, unless the continuance or extension is requested or agreed to by the applicant.
5. Unless waived by the applicant, the local government shall allow the applicant at least seven (7) days after the record is closed to all other parties to submit final written arguments in support of the application. The applicant's final submittal shall be considered part of the record, but shall not include any new evidence.
6. When a Hearing Authority reopens a record to admit new evidence or testimony, any person may raise new issues which relate to the new evidence, testimony or criteria for decision-making which apply to the matter at issue.

(Ord. 99-1079 § 3; 91-922)

**D. Ex-parte Contacts**

Ex-parte contacts with a member of the Hearing Authority shall not invalidate a final decision or action of the Hearing Authority, provided that the member receiving the contact indicates the substance of the content of the ex parte communication and of the right of parties to rebut said content at the first hearing where action will be considered or taken.

(Ord. 99-1079 § 3; 91-922)

**16.72.060 NOTICE OF DECISION**

Within seven (7) calendar days of a land use action by the Hearing Authority, the City shall notify the applicant in writing of said action. This notice of decision shall list the terms and conditions of approval or denial, and explain the applicant's rights of appeal.

(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

**16.72.070 REGISTRY OF DECISIONS**

The City shall maintain a registry of all land use actions taken in the preceding twelve (12) months. This registry shall be kept on file in the City Recorder's office and shall be made available to the public for inspection at no cost. Copies of the registry shall be provided to the public, upon request, at a cost defined by the City's fee schedule,

(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

Deleted: B

Deleted: C

Deleted: D

Deleted: E

Deleted: leave

Deleted: F

Deleted: 4

Deleted: of miscellaneous fees and charges

**16.72.080 FINAL ACTION ON PERMIT OR ZONE CHANGE**

Except for plan and land use regulation amendments or adoption of new regulations that must be submitted to the Director of the State Department of Land Conservation and Development under ORS 197.610(1), final action on a permit, appeal, or zone change application shall be taken within one hundred and twenty (120) days of the application submittal. The one hundred and twenty (120) days may be extended for a reasonable period of time at the request of the applicant. An applicant whose application does not receive final consideration within one hundred and twenty (120) days after the application was accepted by the City may seek a writ of mandamus to compel issuance of the permit or zone change or a determination that approval would violate the City's Comprehensive Plan or land use regulations.  
(Ord. 91-922 § 3)

Chapter 16.74 APPLICATION FEES\*

Sections:

16.74.010 FEES

16.74.020 EXCEPTIONS

\* Editor's Note: Some sections may not contain a history.

16.74.010 FEES

Fees for land use actions are set by the "Schedule of Development Fees", adopted by Resolution of the Council. This schedule is included herein for the purposes of information, but is deemed to be separate from and independent of this Code.  
(Ord. 91-922 § 3; 86-851)

16.74.020 EXCEPTIONS

Except when a land use action is initiated by the Commission or Council, application fees shall be paid to the City upon the filing of all land use applications. Full or partial waiver **required by Section 16.74.010** or refund of the fees **in excess of that identified in the fee schedule** may be granted by the Council, based on a written request by the applicant showing cause for such reduction.  
(Ord. 86-851 § 3)

**Deleted:** required by Section 16.74.010

Chapter 16.76 APPEALS\*

Sections:

16.76.010 GENERALLY

16.76.020 APPEAL DEADLINE

16.76.030 PETITION FOR REVIEW

16.76.040 APPEAL AUTHORITY ACTION

\* Editor's Note: Some sections may not contain a history.

16.76.010 GENERALLY

A. **Issues on Appeal** - The only issues which may be raised on appeal are those issues which were raised on the record before the Hearing Authority with sufficient specificity so as to have provided the City, the applicant, or other persons with a reasonable opportunity to respond before the Hearing Authority.

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119)

Moved down [1]: Issues on Appeal¶

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: ¶

B. **Persons Eligible to Appeal** - Except as otherwise provided in this Code, only those persons who submitted written comments or appeared in person before the Hearing Authority may appeal the decision of the Hearing Authority.

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119)

Moved down [2]: Persons Eligible to Appeal ¶

Moved (insertion) [2]

Deleted: ¶

C. **Dismissal on Appeal** - If the Appeal Authority determines that the appellant was not a person to the action before the Hearing Authority, or the issue(s) that are the basis of the appeal were not properly raised per this Section, then the Appeal Authority shall dismiss the appeal of that appellant or those issues, in writing.

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119)

Moved down [3]: Dismissal on Appeal

Moved (insertion) [3]

D. **Exception** - If the City either takes a land use action without providing a hearing as required by this Code, or takes a land use action which is substantially different than indicated in notice of the proposed action as per Section 16.72.030, an aggrieved person may, as provided by the laws of the State of Oregon, appeal directly to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119; 99-1079; 91-922)

Moved down [4]: Exception¶

Moved (insertion) [4]

Deleted: ¶

16.76.020 APPEAL DEADLINE

Land use actions taken pursuant to this Code shall be final unless a petition for review is filed with the Planning Director not more than fourteen (14) calendar days after the date on which the Hearing Authority took final action on the land use application, and written notice of the action has been mailed to the address provided by the person in the record. If the person did not provide a mailing address, then the appeal must be filed within fourteen (14) calendar days after the notice has been mailed to persons who did provide a mailing address.

(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119; 91-922)

16.76.030 PETITION FOR REVIEW



Every petition for review shall include the date and a description of the land use action, including adopted findings of fact, a statement of how the petitioner is aggrieved by the action, the specific grounds relied upon in requesting a review, and a fee pursuant to Section 16.74.010. The land use decision, supporting findings and conclusions, and evidence available upon the close of the record of the land use action and any City Staff review of the issues subject to the appeal shall be made a part of the record before the Appeal Authority.  
(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119; 91-922)

#### 16.76.040 APPEAL AUTHORITY ACTION

~~Except as otherwise provided or required by state law, the review of the appealed land use action shall include a public hearing conducted by the Appeal Authority, as determined by Section 16.72.010, at which time only those persons who testified before the Hearing Authority or submitted written comments may present evidence and argument relevant to the approval criteria. The record before the Appeal Authority shall include only the evidence and argument submitted on the record before the Hearing Authority (including all testimony, all materials submitted at any previous stage of the review, staff reports and audio tape or transcript of the minutes of the public hearing. New evidence may not be entered into the record. Except for the hearing being on the record and no new persons being allowed, the public notice and hearing procedures for appeals shall be identical to the procedures used in initially taking the land use action which is being appealed. The Appeal Authority may act to affirm, reverse, remand, or amend the action being reviewed. The action of the Appeal Authority shall be the final City of Sherwood action on the application, unless remanded to the Hearing Authority. Upon remand, the decision of the Hearing Authority shall be the final City of Sherwood action.~~  
(Ord. 2003-1148 § 3; 2001-1119; 99-1079; 91-922)

Deleted: T

Chapter 16.78 (Note - This section modified and relocated to 16.70.030.C)

**Deleted:** APPLICATION INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS\*¶

Sections:¶

16.78.010 Application Content ¶

\* Editor's Note: Some sections may not contain a history.¶

16.78.010 Application Content¶

This Chapter sets forth the application contents generally required for the review of proposed land use activities. The City Manager or his or her designee is authorized to waive information require additional materials as needed in order to review the land use application and for a decision to be made. ments .that are clearly not material or relevant to the specific proposal being made. In addition to these requirements, Divisions V, VI, and VII of this Code must be reviewed for other applicable requirements.¶ (Ord. 86-851 § 3) .

**Deleted:** TABLE INSET:¶

¶

INDEX

... [1]

## TABLE INSET:

| INDEX            |                              |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| REFERENCE NUMBER | TYPE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT |
| 1                | Annexation                   |
| 2                | Plan Map Amendment           |
| 3                | Variance                     |
| 4                | Conditional Use              |
| 5                | Minor Partition              |
| 6                | Subdivision/Major Partition  |
| 7                | Planned Unit Development     |
| 8                | Site Plan                    |

TYPE OF APPLICATION  
(See Index)

## TABLE INSET:

| TYPE OF INFORMATION           |     | INFORMATION ITEM   |
|-------------------------------|-----|--|
| EXISTING CONDITIONS INVENTORY |     |  |
| General Information           | 1-8 | A tax map showing property within 300 feet with scale (1"=100' or 1"= 200') north point, date and legend.  |
|                               | 1-8 | A current preliminary title report or lot book search.   |
|                               | 1-8 | Name, address and phone numbers of all owner(s) and applicants. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| Citizen Involvement           | 1-  | A list of tax lots, owners and their addresses within the following distances from the property subject to a land use action for which a public hearing is required: Wholly or partially |

|                                   |     |   |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---|
| <hr/>                             |     |   |
| Growth Management                 | 1-8 | Vicinity Map of property showing City limits and Urban Growth Boundary (Ord.86-851 § 3)   |
| <hr/>                             |     |   |
| Land Use                          | 1-8 | Acreage of property, lot lines and dimensions.  |
|                                   | 1-8 | City and County zoning designations.  |
|                                   | 1-8 | Maximum allowable density.  |
|                                   | 1-8 | Existing land use including nature, size and location of existing structures within 300 feet.   |
|                                   | 1-8 | Map location, purpose, dimensions and ownership of easements. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |
| <hr/>                             |     |   |
| Environmental Resources & Hazards | 4-8 | Topography map showing 5 foot contours.   |
|                                   | 2-8 | SCS Soil Information Map the following:   |
|                                   |     | 1) Areas with severe soil limitations for buildings, roads and streets, and the nature of the limitation including weak foundation, slopes above 10%, slide hazards, etc. |
|                                   |     | 2) Areas with adverse soil characteristics including rapid run-off, high erosion hazard and poor natural drainage.  |
|                                   |     | 3) Agricultural capability classes.   |
|                                   | 2-8 | Flood Plains - Map all 100-year flood plain and floodway lines.   |

|                        |     |   |
|------------------------|-----|---|
|                        |     |   |
|                        | 2-8 | Significant vegetation - Map general location, size and species of trees.   |
|                        | 2-8 | Distinctive natural areas - Indicate views, historic sites, rock outcroppings, etc.   |
|                        | 2-8 | Sun and wind exposures - Map general orientation. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |
| <hr/>                  |     |   |
| Environmental Quality  | 3-8 | Air, Water, Land Pollution, Noise Sources - Indicate the location of existing uses producing significant levels of air, water, land or noise pollution. (Ord. 86-851 § 3) |
| <hr/>                  |     |   |
| Recreational Resources | 3-8 | Existing Facilities - Map the location, size and distance to nearest park and open spaces. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| <hr/>                  |     |   |
| Transportation         | 1-8 | Street Locations and Dimensions - Map centerline and pavement locations and rights-of-way within 300 feet.  |
|                        | 1-8 | Traffic Volumes - Indicate existing volumes for all streets on and within 300 feet.   |
|                        | 2-8 | Access Points - Indicate access points to property within 300 feet.   |
|                        | 3-8 | Street Condition - Map general condition of streets within 300 feet of property.  |
|                        | 3-8 | Street Improvements - Indicate any committed street improvement projects within 300 feet and projected completion date (if known).  |
|                        | 3-8 | Public Transit - Indicate routes and stops within 300 feet  |



|          |     |  |
|----------|-----|--|
|          | 8   |  |
|          | 3-8 | Traffic Impact Analysis (for developments likely to generate more than 400 average daily trips (ADT)). (Ord. 2005-009 § 3) |
| <hr/>    |     |  |
| Water    | 1-8 | Existing Facilities - Map locations, sizes and distances to water mains.   |
|          | 3-8 | Existing Services - Describe service levels, capacity, pressure and fire flow characteristics of water mains.              |
|          | 1-8 | Planned Improvements - Indicate sizes and locations of planned improvements. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)                             |
| <hr/>    |     |  |
| Sewer    | 1-8 | Existing Facilities - Map locations, sizes and distances to the nearest sewers.  |
|          | 1-8 | Existing Services - Describe flow characteristics, capacity and condition of sewers.                                       |
|          | 1-8 | Planned Improvement - Indicate sizes and locations of planned capital improvements. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)                      |
| <hr/>    |     |  |
| Drainage | 3-8 | Existing Facilities - Map locations, sizes and distances to drainage facilities or natural drainage-ways.                  |
|          | 3-8 | Existing Service - Describe capacity and condition of on-site and downstream drainage courses and facilities.              |
|          | 3-8 | Runoff Analysis - Indicate SCS soil permeability ratings.  |
|          | 2   |  |

|                   |     |   |
|-------------------|-----|---|
| Private Utilities | 3-8 | Existing Facilities and Services - Describe availability of utilities. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)                          |
| Schools           | 3-8 | Existing Facilities and Services - Indicate location, type, enrollment, capacity and distance to nearest schools. |
|                   | 3-8 | Planned Improvements - Describe planned improvements. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

TABLE INSET:

|                     |     |   |
|---------------------|-----|---|
| General Information | 1-8 | A plat or plan map depicting the proposed land use or change, showing properties within 300 feet, with scale appropriate to Project size, north point, date and legend. |
|                     | 1-8 | Name of Development - Indicate name of proposed development.  |
|                     | 1-8 | Vicinity map showing Property within one-half mile. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |
| Citizen Involvement | 1-8 | Describe contacts with citizens or agencies including the Fire District, public and private utilities, schools, etc. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)                                  |
| Land Use            | 5-8 | Proposed Lots - Map lot lines, dimensions, average and minimum lot sizes, block and lot numbers.  |
|                     | 2-8 | Setbacks - Indicate all setbacks.   |

|                                   |     |   |
|-----------------------------------|-----|---|
|                                   | 3-8 | Proposed Land Use - Indicate the location of all proposed land uses. Show relationship to existing land use to be retained. Provide tables with total acres, densities, dwelling units, floor area, percentage distribution of total site acreage by use, and percentage dwelling unit distribution by dwelling type. |
|                                   | 2-8 | Map location of proposed structures.  |
|                                   | 2-8 | Proposed Easements - Map location, purposes, and widths. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| <hr/>                             |     |   |
| Environmental Resources & Hazards | 5-8 | Topography - Map topography at 2 foot contours.   |
|                                   | 6-8 | Landscaping Plan - Provide plan in accordance with Chapter 16.92.   |
|                                   | 4-8 | Streams, Ponds, Wetlands - Indicate location and any measures to avoid environmental degradation.   |
|                                   | 5-8 | Natural Hazards - Provide soil analysis by a registered Soils Engineer or Geologist and any measures protecting against hazards.  |
|                                   | 3-8 | Significant natural areas - Indicate how areas are protected and preserved.   |
|                                   | 5-8 | Energy Conservation - Indicate relationship of site design to sun and wind exposure. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| <hr/>                             |     |   |
| Environmental Quality             | 4-8 | Provide certification by a Registered Engineer that the proposed uses meet or exceed City environmental performance standards. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| <hr/>                             |     |   |
| Designation                       | 4-  | Describe how proposed uses will address energy conservation   |

|                |     |   |
|----------------|-----|---|
|                | 8   | maintenance provisions. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |
| <hr/>          |     |   |
| Transportation | 5-8 | Proposed Facilities - Provide general circulation plan showing location, widths and direction of existing and proposed streets, bicycle and pedestrian ways and transit routes and facilities. Describe the proposed circulation plan's conformity to Chapter VI, Community Development Plan. |
|                | 5-8 | Indicate estimated curve and curb radii and typical street cross sections.  |
|                | 5-8 | Emergency Access - Show emergency access.   |
|                | 5-8 | Lot Access - Show the location and size of accesses, sight distances and any fixed objects on collectors or arterials.  |
|                | 3-8 | Future Rights-of-Way - Indicate distances from property lines to street centerlines and pavement.   |
|                | 5-8 | Traffic Volumes - Indicate existing and future traffic volumes.   |
|                | 5-8 | Street Profiles - Map profiles and indicate cuts and fills for roads with grades of 15% or more.  |
|                | 5-8 | Parking - Indicate the location, number and size of off-street parking spaces and loading and maneuvering areas. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| <hr/>          |     |   |
| Water          | 5-8 | Proposed Facilities - Indicate the location and size of the proposed water distribution system and fire hydrants. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |
| <hr/>          |     |   |
| Sewer          | 5-8 | Proposed Facilities - Indicate the location and size of the proposed sewage collection systems. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |

|                                    |     |   |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|
| Drainage                           | 5-8 | Proposed Facilities - Indicate proposed runoff control and conveyance system. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)   |
| <hr/>                              |     |   |
| Private Utilities                  | 5-8 | Lighting Plan - Indicate location, height, and sizes of street lighting structures and their connection points to power lines.(Ord. 86-851 § 3)                                     |
| Economic Development               | 4-8 | Industrial and Commercial Uses - Indicate number of new jobs to be created, the ratio of employees to site acreage, anticipated capital investment and tax impact.                  |
|                                    | 4-8 | Commercial Uses - Provide evidence of local markets for the service or product to be marketed.  |
|                                    | 4-8 | Residential Uses - Provide evidence of local markets for type of housing proposed. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)  |
| <hr/>                              |     |   |
| Structural Design and Construction | 8   | Proposed Structures - Provide architectural sketches and elevations of all proposed structures as they will appear upon completion.   |
|                                    | 8   | Construction Materials - Provide a description of external structural design including materials, textures and colors. Describe compatibility with other uses and natural features. |
|                                    | 8   | Energy Conservation - Show the relationship of building orientation and sun and wind exposures. Describe how structures address energy conservation.                                |
|                                    | 8   | Hazard Protection/Resources Preservation - Show how proposed structures relate to natural features and hazards.   |
|                                    | 8   | Signs - Indicate the locations, sizes and design of proposed signs.   |
|                                    | 8   | Solid Waste Storage - Indicate the location and design or storage facilities.   |
|                                    | 8   | Privacy - Describe how privacy is protected.  |
|                                    | 8   | Construction Measure - Describe how erosion, siltation and noise  |

## Inventory of Complex Housekeeping Issues 5-4-10 (updated June 14, 2010)

| Code Section                                  |                                   | Issue   | Could be addressed with:       |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>Division I – General Provisions</b>        |                                   |   |                                |
|   |                                   | To be completed   |                                |
| <b>Division II – Land Use and Development</b> |                                   |   |                                |
| General                                       |                                   | Density for residential zones is captured in the purpose section. It would be more clear to identify it as a standard.<br><br>Clarify density is based on net vs gross acre | Minimum lot size clarification |
| 16.20.040.B.2                                 | HDR Side yard setbacks            | Corner street side yard setback is larger than the front yard setback. Is this really needed?   | Minimum lot size clarification |
| 16.24.030.D                                   | OR - conditional use, Restaurants | Limits restaurants to 100 feet from residential property but doesn't contemplate mixed use PUD (16.24.020.J)  | Use classifications            |
| 16.24.060                                     | OR – Special criteria             | Special criteria limiting uses between 6:30 AM-11:00PM ignores uses allowed in the zone (hotels, residential and hospitals)   | Use classifications            |
| 16.26.030.C                                   | NC – Conditional use, restaurants | Define differently? All restaurants allow take-out, even the finest   | Use classifications            |
| 16.42.030.A                                   | HOP exemptions                    | Modify exemptions to be consistent with business license  | Use classifications            |
| 16.42.030.B                                   | HOP exemptions                    | Provisions out of date?   | Use classifications            |
| 16.42.050.3                                   | HOP criteria                      | Clarify if this percentage cap includes or excludes storage of materials  | Use classifications            |
| 16.42.070                                     | HOP Type II criteria              | Criteria don't consider residential uses in commercial zones like Old town or Woodhaven Crossing PUD  | Use classifications            |
| 16.46   | Manufactured homes                | Evaluate current construction practices to determine if this is up to date or if changes are warranted  |                                |
| 16.50.010.B                                   | Accessory uses                    | Clarify accessory structures can't be in <u>corner</u> side yard setback (vs. any side yard setback) to be consistent with 16.50.010.C                                      | Fences                         |
|   |                                   | Clarify/confirm that pools, hot tubs ,etc are considered accessory structures.  | Fences                         |
| 16.56   | Other land use actions            | This is an odd standard. As far as we know, it was never been used, The code should provide a clear process for any land use action.  |                                |
| 16.58   | Supplementary standards           | Re-organize standards in this section to a more logical location as they often get lost or overlooked initially   |                                |
| 16.58.030                                     | Fences, Walls and Hedges          | Multiple issues under fences  | Fences                         |

| <b>Code Section</b>                             |   | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Could be addressed with:</b>     |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 16.58.040                                       | Lot sizes and dimensions                                    | In general, this section should be moved to the zoning and dimension standards of each zone.  | Subdivisions/partitions             |
|   |   | It is not clear if or how this is different from the non-conforming use section. In addition, the 3,200 sq. ft. absolute minimum lot size is inconsistent with the HDR min. lot size of 1,500 sq. ft. after 1 <sup>st</sup> 2 units | Minimum lot size clarification      |
| 16.60   | Yard requirements   | Need to have thorough review of definitions to ensure consistency. Also consider moving to residential zone sections. These do not appear to be applicable to commercial or industrial zones.                                       | Residential use classification      |
|   |   | Clarify that all these standards are superseded by easements which must be kept free of permanent structures.   | Fences                              |
|   |   | Is the 3 foot minimum setback acceptable? We hear from many people wanting to go closer but rarely hear from people who are complaining about them being too close  | Fences                              |
| 16.62.010                                       | Chimneys, spires, antennas and similar structures – height  | Review list of things allowed up to 200 feet high and determine if additions or deletions are appropriate.  | Residential use classification      |
| 16.64   | Dual use of required space                                  | Should this be moved to community design standards?   | Site Plan modifications             |
| <b>Division III – Administrative Procedures</b> |   |   |                                     |
| 16.70.010                                       | Pre-application conference                                  | Clarify if pre-apps are required. We have interpreted this as if they ask for one, it SHALL be scheduled but it clearly could be interpreted differently  | Application submittal requirements  |
| 16.70.020                                       | Application materials                                       | Submittal requirements will be addressed through separate issue   | Application submittal requirements  |
| 16.70.030                                       | Application submittal acceptance of materials               | We do not currently return applications when they are deemed incomplete. This would be inefficient. Need to change.   | Application submittal requirements. |
| 16.70.040                                       | Availability of records                                     | Review in detail to confirm dates are fully compliant with current state law  |                                     |
| 16.72.010.B.3                                   | Procedures for processing Type II applications – Fact Track | Clarify that residential site plans would fall here too or adjust the other sections.   | Site plan modifications             |



| Code Section                             |  | Issue  | Could be addressed with:                       |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | Confirm intent is to review parking lot area versus if there was a “stand alone” parking lot.  | Site plan modifications                        |
| 16.72.010.3.B                            | Approval criteria  | This needs to be evaluated and either moved or removed. This standard is very easy to miss.  |  |
| 16.72.020 and 16.72.030                  | Public notice and hearing                                  | Public notice will be addressed via separate issue   | Public notice                                  |
| <b>Division IV – Planning Procedures</b> |  |  |  |
|  |  | General comment about division heading and subjects within – this needs to be re-organized and/or re-labeled as the provisions provided in this section do not actually describe the “planning procedures” or at least not all of them.  |  |
| 16.82.010.2                              | Changes in conditional uses                                | Re-word for clarity  |  |
| 16.82.020.3 and 3                        | Conditional use findings of fact and additional conditions | Review Model Code provisions and discuss if there is a more clear and straight forward way to get to the same end result. It is not clear if this take the place of the site plan or is in addition (we have reviewed both). There are potentially more objective provisions that get same end result. |  |
| 16.84                                    | Variances  | Variances and adjustments will be discussed in detail under separate issue   | Variances and adjustments                      |
| 16.86                                    | Temporary Uses   | Temporary uses will be discussed in detail under separate issue  | Temporary uses                                 |
| <b>Division V – Community Design</b>     |  |  |  |
| 16.90.020.1.G                            | Site plan review criteria                                  | Reference is circular  | Site Plan Modification                         |
| 16.90.020.4.F                            | Site plan review required findings                         | Do we want to leave it to the City Engineer’s discretion or better define when a traffic study may or may not be required. Could the City Engineer ask for it more often or less often?  | Public improvements or subdivisions/partitions |
| 16.92.030.2.C                            | Parking and loading perimeter landscaping                  | Clarify if this required 10 feet on each property for a total of 20 feet. We have interpreted it this way but is this really what is needed?<br><br>Clarify how this applies when there are shared parking or access agreements among differing developments   | Parking lot configuration and landscaping      |
| 16.92.040.1 and 16.94.010.2              | Deferral of improvements                                   | Increase bond requirement to be consistent with industry standards   | Parking lot configuration and                  |

| Code Section                  |   | Issue   | Could be addressed with:                  |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                               |   |   | landscaping                               |
| 16.94.010.4                   | Off-street parking – multiple/mixed uses        | <p>This is very discretionary. Need to establish how the amount of reduction is determined.</p> <p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence is not clear in intent or outcome</p>  | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.94.020 – parking table     | Off street parking standards                    | <p>Add or clarify uses to update and reflect current needs.</p> <p>Describe parking zone A and B and include map</p>  | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.94.020.1.B                 | Miscellaneous parking standards - dimensions    | <p>Appendix G provides dimensions for spaces and aisles with angles parking which is not consistent with other standards (dimensions, aisle width, etc) – update or modify the standards so the 2 are consistent.</p> <p>Move appendix into the code and modify references accordingly</p>  | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.94.020.1.C                 | Miscellaneous parking standards – Wheel stops   | Consider allowing area between the wheel stop and the end of the parking space to be pervious (low growing landscaping)   | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.94.020.2                   | Bicycle parking facilities                      | <p>Need to evaluate uses. This must be consistent with Metro but we need to explore if more clarify is possible. Also need to look at industrial uses and others with little to no customer bicycle traffic.</p> <p>Ord 2005-009 specifies the bicycle parking is required (not recommended) however; a concern has been expressed that perhaps covered bicycle parking should be only recommended. This needs to be discussed.</p> | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.94.030.1.B and 16.94.030.2 | Off-street loading                              | Consider modified loading requirement for smaller uses and/or allowing use of parking spaces if loading doesn't conflict with hours of operation  | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.96.030.1                   | Min. non-residential standards – driveways      | Maximum driveway width?   | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
| 16.96.030.2.B                 | Non-residential standards - sidewalks and curbs | <p>Why allow the subjectivity? What is the intent of this standard?</p> <p>Aren't curbs always part of sidewalks?</p>   | Parking lot configuration and landscaping |
|                               |   |   |   |

| Code Section   |  | Issue  | Could be addressed with: |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| <b>Division VI – Public Improvements</b> – note - the identified issues in this section will be reviewed as an issue. Additional modifications will be identified during the course of discussion of the Public Improvement issue. |  |  |                          |
| 16.106   | Improvement Plan review                  | Recommend deleting this entire section and simply referencing that public improvements must be reviewed and improved in accordance with the Engineering Design and Construction Manual and the Engineering permit process.   | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.010.3.A.2   | Street renaming                          | The fee is very open ended – there is nothing in the fee schedule. Should we be more specific in terms of how the costs are calculated and charged?  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.030.2   | Required improvements – existing streets | The limit to no more than 30 required for street improvement may be inconsistent with the TSP – need to evaluate and determine if alternate language is recommended to allow for circumstances when more is needed (but credits also available)  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.030.3.A   | Required improvements – proposed streets | The limit to no more than 40 required for street improvement may be inconsistent with the TSP – need to evaluate and determine if alternate language is recommended to allow for circumstances when more is needed (but credits also available)  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.030.5.B.1 and 2   | Street modifications                     | The process for the administrative modifications seems unclear and unnecessary. Most of the standard identified for potential modification are not even in the development code so why does there need to be a process in the development code to modify?  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.030.5.C   | Procedures for street modifications      | Consider changing the administrative modification to a Type I process. Since these are all technical engineering issues that are not even in the code, it seems unnecessary to require a public land use process to modify standards that are not even in the code.  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.1   | Reserve strips                           | This says they are always supposed to be dedicated to the City but Washington County or ODOT may require them to be dedicated to them. We need to consider amending the language to reflect this as well.  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.3   | Future extension                         | The section referenced for cul-de-sac design standards (16.108.060) is regarding sidewalks where they only have to be on one side if it is a cul-de-sac serving fewer than 15 homes – not sure that it is relevant to the “design”. It appears that the reference should actually be to 16.108.050.5 (Cul-de-sacs) | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.3   | Future extensions                        | References specific language that must be included on sign including phone number of contact. The requirement is now in the  | Public Improvements      |

| Code Section        |                               | Issue  | Could be addressed with: |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|                     |                               | Design manual and it is suggested that this technical detail not be included in the code. In addition, having a phone number that is subject to change should also not be included in the code.  |                          |
| 16.108.050.4        | Intersection angles           | This is a technical element that probably should come out of the code  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.5        | Cul-de-sacs                   | Need to make sure this is consistent with the design manual. Also the standards essentially make it impossible to ever do a cul-de-sac. Need to look at more closely.  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.6        | Grades and curves             | This is a technical element that probably should come out of the code  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.8        | Buffering of major streets    | This section discusses required buffers. It appears that this is for residential developments but it is not clear.   | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.10       | curbs                         | This is a technical element that probably should come out of the code  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.12       | Traffic controls              | Need to discuss – why is the threshold tied to size of the development and not the number of trips? Need to clarify if improvements are required prior to building or engineering construction permits.  | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.14       | Vehicular access management   | <p>This section needs to be reviewed to determine what belongs in the code and what belongs in the design manual. The diagram is not real clear and hard to use.</p> <p>There is no minimum spacing standards for local streets – is this OK?</p> <p>Subsection 3 on collectors does not speak to residential access whereas there are situations where residential zoning has frontage on collectors.</p> | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.14.C.2   | Exceptions to access criteria | Discusses an application for access management plan but it is not clear if this is a land use action, what the process is, what the fee would be, who makes the decision or based on what criteria   | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.050.14.C.3.e | Exceptions to access criteria | Discusses notice of a proposed access management plan to owners within the study area, but again, it does not discuss how comments or concerns are heard, who makes the decision, etc.   | Public Improvements      |
| 16.108.060.2        | Sidewalk design standards     | Does not discuss standards for neighborhood routes. This section should reference the Design Manual.   | Public Improvements      |

| <b>Code Section</b>                               |                                       | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Could be addressed with:</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 16.108.060.3                                      | Pedestrian and Bicycle paths          | Need to identify the width   | Public Improvements             |
| 16.108.070  | CAP                                   | This is an issue of discussion on its own so detailed review was not done.<br><br>Need to clarify within this section that it does not apply to residential development.   | CAP                             |
| 16.108.080  | Bike Paths                            | This is technical design data that should be in the Design Manual and referenced in the code.  | Public Improvements             |
| 16.110.020  | Sanitary sewers                       | Referenced appendix needs to be included or reference modified.<br><br>Technical details are identified in the Design Manual   | Public Improvements             |
| 16.114  | Storm water                           | Need to reference the Design Manual  | Public Improvements             |
| <b>Division VII – Subdivisions and Partitions</b> |                                       |  |                                 |
| 16.124  | Final plats                           | Make it clear that this section only applies to subdivisions   | Subdivisions/partitions         |
| 16.124.020.7                                      | Final plat review – required findings | Need discussion – recent case law and legislation has made it clear that a final plat is not a land use decision, therefore making “findings” especially findings that are not reviewed as part of the preliminary plat needs to be evaluated. | Subdivisions/partitions         |
| 16.126  | Design standards                      | Need to have applicability statement as it is not clear if partitions are included in this as well.  | Subdivisions/partitions         |
| 16.126.040.3                                      | Double frontage lots                  | This only speaks to residential subdivisions but there are situations in commercial and industrial areas where you may want to create double frontage lots.  | Subdivisions/partitions         |
| 16.128.020  | Subdivision compliance – generally    | May or shall?  | Subdivisions/partitions         |
| 16.130.020  | Property line adjustments             | There is no time limit for the filing of a lot line adjustment.  | Subdivisions/partitions         |
| <b>Division VIII – Environmental Resources</b>    |                                       |  |                                 |
| 16.134.020  | Floodplain                            | This whole section discusses what needs to be shown but not what the approval process or criteria area   |                                 |
| 16.134.020.2                                      | Greenways                             | This references Division V and 16.142 as the governing policies. There do not appear to be clear policies in either of these sections.   |                                 |

| Code Section       |  | Issue   | Could be addressed with: |
|--------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 16.134.020.3.A     | Development application                              | References section on “greenways” as potentially requiring dedication but there is nothing in this section that requires dedication.  |                          |
| 16.134.020.3.C     | Floodplain development application                   | References that an architect can certify flood elevations and flood proofing methods. Does this comply with FEMA requirements?  |                          |
| 16.134.020.3.C     | Floodplain development application                   | References 16.40.010C however there is no such section. Cannot locate a logical typo to correct.  |                          |
| 16.134.020.4       | Floodplain – permitted uses                          | References section on “greenways” as potentially requiring dedication but there is nothing in this section that requires dedication.  |                          |
| 16.134.020.7 and 8 | Floodplain development/ floodplain structures        | What is difference? Can these be combined into one section that is easier to understand?  |                          |
| 16.134.020.7.A.4   | Floodplain Development - alterations                 | Requires site plan but all the information on cited as required cannot be shown on a site plan, but rather supporting reports and documents.<br>Allows for an architect to certify – confirm this is compliant with FEMA  |                          |
| 16.134.020.7.A.5   | Floodplain Development - alterations                 | References section on “greenways” as potentially requiring dedication but there is nothing in this section that requires dedication.  |                          |
| 16.134.020.7.A.5   | Floodplain development – subdivisions and partitions | Requires that if base flood data is not available and the subdivision is at least 50 lots or 5 acres that they must generate the data. Does this mean that if it is less than 50 lots or 5 acres that they don’t need to provide any information? Need to address this.           |                          |
| 16.134.020.9       | Floodplain overlay – additional requirements         | Certain “additional conditions” have nothing to do with impacts to the floodplain. It is suggested that we remove “off street parking” from B.1 and remove all of B.4. This doesn’t mean these standards can’t still be applied elsewhere – just not appropriate in this section. |                          |
| 16.136.010         | Procedures   | Define what applicable portions of Chapter 5  |                          |
| 16.140             | Solid Waste  | This whole section appears to be its own unique procedure. What is the land use type? Review procedures are not consistent with review procedures for other land use actions in regard to acceptance, completeness, notice, hearing and decision. It is also                      |                          |

| <b>Code Section</b>                     |  | <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Could be addressed with:</b> |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
|   |  | not clear if these standards are in addition to a site plan or if they supersede.  |                                 |
| 16.142.030.D                            | Visual corridors                                     | States that trees shall “in no case” be removed from within a visual corridor. It is suggested that we add an “unless otherwise permitted” or something like that.   | Tree removal                    |
| 16.142.040                              | Park reservation                                     | There is no clear process for this standard. Is this a criteria for land use or a suggestion for policy development? It is not clear.  | Open Space                      |
| 16.142.050                              | Trees along public streets and other public property | This section will be reviewed as its own issue. Specific comments at this time include: appears to prohibit native trees (16.142.050.B.1) and the process results in Parks Board making Type I land use decisions, takes the decision making out of planning. Parks Board does not make findings, send notices of decision or even inform planning of decisions that have been made for maintaining notices of decisions made. | Street tree removal             |
| 16.142.050.B.2                          | Trees along public streets and other public property | Prohibits English ivy, holly and Himalayan blackberry on public property. This standard is out of place in the tree removal section. This should be in the municipal code or at least another more obvious section of the code.  | Street tree removal             |
| 16.144.020.A.1                          | Wetland, habitat and natural area standards          | There is no connection between A.1 and A.1.a-A.1.b. As a result it is unclear what the standard is and how it is to be evaluated.  |                                 |
| 16.150.010                              | Air Quality  | References OAR 340-21-060 and OAR 340-25-850 through 340-25-905 however there is no such section   |                                 |
| 16.154                                  | Heat and Glare                                       | Consider glare from lights that might impact wildlife habitats and ways to minimize light pollution in general.  |                                 |
| <b>Division IX – Historic Resources</b> |  |  |                                 |
|   |  | To be completed  |                                 |
|   |  |  |                                 |

General notes:

Appendix documents need to be either clearly placed in code or references removed

Either reference the lot sizes and dimensions section in each residential zone or MOVE the standards or 16.58.040 to the residential zones – there are modifications to some lot sizes hidden in 16.58



## Code Clean Up Project Comment Log

| Date    | Name/primary interest             | Topic                           | Comment   |
|---------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 4-28-10 | Jacquelyn Kirscht / Vineyards HOA | Priority of issue, tree removal | <p>We have folks in our HOA that have removed them and not replaced them. We also have issues with side walk panels lifting and water pipes breaking as a result of the tree roots.</p> <p>For the Code Clean up Project, I would like to the section on Tree Removal moved up the priority list if possible. It seems like this issue is getting more attention now.</p> <p>My HOA would definitely benefit right away from knowing more about the Tree removal and Fences for sure.</p> |
| 4-29-10 | Chamber ( Board )                 |                                 | <p>General Conversation about the project and priorities list.</p> <p>They would be interested in more information about what the code is.</p>  |
| 5-3-10  | Parks Board                       |                                 | <p>General conversation about project.</p> <p>Provided initial input that they would like to see open space requirements for high density and potentially pocket parks for all development.</p> <p>Discussion of need to review the street tree removal and replacement standards.</p> <p>The tree removal and mitigation should be addressed sooner rather than later.</p>   |
| 5-18-10 | Woodhaven HOA Board of Directors  |                                 | <p>General overview of the project and invitation to the listening session.</p> <p>There was not a lot of feedback however when asked about 2/3 of the group had heard about the community development code.</p>  |

| Date    | Name/primary interest                  | Topic                              | Comment  |
|---------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 5-19-10 | Sherwood Village HOA                   | Project, Open Space, Public Notice | <p>Five people attended the meeting of the HOA Board Members. All had various issues about open space and the responsibility of the HOA for maintenance of the park/area. Specifically, Sherwood Village HOA must maintain Langer Park and are concerned about the financial obligations of HOAs in the maintenance of the park when ALL of the City's residents use the park. When asked about the size of the space and what they thought was important about it, all seemed to agree that it is used quite a bit and like the flat surface to throw the ball in a closer, large area.</p> <p>Regarding the public notice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thought that 100 feet proximity for mailed notice was not a large enough area for those impacted by development in their neighborhood</li> <li>• Some thought the notice signs were not large enough</li> <li>• Questioned why not put the notice in the paper or Archer.</li> <li>• Liked the idea of a neighborhood meeting or open house</li> </ul>   |
| 5-25-10 | PC Listening Session comments received | Public Notice                      | <p>Jacqueline Kirscht</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build on the functionality of the website</li> <li>• Wants to see more announcements on front page of website</li> <li>• Encourage HOAs to post notices on their websites</li> <li>• Increase mailed notice radius to 500 feet</li> <li>• Add an additional page to the Archer to really focus on things that are happening</li> <li>• Supplement Archer information with notice in the Gazette</li> <li>• Neighborhood meetings would be good, especially for people without an HOA</li> </ul> <p>R. James Claus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be no ex-parte contact and impartiality, which he does not see</li> <li>• Questions what good notice does if staff is in competition with developers</li> <li>• States that Sherwood notice does not comply with Federal law</li> </ul> <p>Tim Voorhies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Medford Code is a good example of a good public notice policy</li> <li>• Discussed his own experiences with development in Sherwood and found</li> </ul> |

| Date    | Name/primary interest                  | Topic          | Comment   |
|---------|--|----------------|---|
|         |  |                | <p>that Steel Tek was told many things over the years and did not get needs met until lawsuit was threatened</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not support using The Times for published notice - The Times circulation in Sherwood zip code (97140) is 450, in addition to 250 copies in box by Shari's</li> <li>• Prefers notice be in the Gazette and Archer, with Archer published on 15<sup>th</sup> of every month</li> </ul>   |
| 5-25-10 | PC Listening Session comments received | Open Space     | <p>Tim Voorhies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't understand why we need open space- just more spaces for kids to be unsupervised</li> <li>• Open space in commercial areas is good but not in heavy industrial due to liability and theft</li> <li>• Open space raises maintenance fees for HOAs, which is hard with the present economy</li> <li>• Wants to know if open space proposed is privately or publicly maintained</li> </ul> <p>R. James Claus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The National Wildlife Refuge sets Sherwood apart nationally- it is a unique urban experience</li> <li>• Does not like the Planning Commission or staff because they don't think the Refuge is open space</li> <li>• The Refuge made sewer service free- the water from the city ran into the refuge to be cleaned before going to the Tualatin River and water from the refuge recharged aquifers</li> </ul> |
| 5-25-10 | PC Listening Session comments received | Prioritization | <p>J. Robert Claus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public policy issues should be a priority. Suggests that the PC should never let anyone set your purpose and your goal and this is what is being done by allowing public comment on prioritization</li> <li>• The priority of Open Space should be the Refuge</li> <li>• How much are you going to let PUDs run this town?</li> <li>• The PUD has become the method of robbing the city</li> </ul>  |

| Date    | Name/primary interest                  | Topic                     | Comment   |
|---------|--|---------------------------|---|
|         |  |                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protected open space means sustainable, kid-friendly city</li> </ul> <p>Tim Voorhies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public notice- we need to get more people to come out</li> <li>• We need a process for confidential input. He states that some business owners won't give input because they are afraid of retaliation by staff</li> <li>• The entire Code Clean Up needs a Common Sense update</li> </ul> <p>Jacqueline Kirscht</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Notice- the Planning Commission should have an e-newsletter or the Planning Department a monthly e-mail update</li> <li>• Fences/tree removal should be high priority</li> <li>• Parking should be added (duration cars can stay on public street)</li> <li>• Sidewalk maintenance/trees</li> <li>• Accessory structures</li> </ul> |
| 5-25-10 | PC Listening Session comments received | Other/simple housekeeping | <p>Tim Voorhies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sidewalks- Sherwood will have a big bill in 5-10 years because the trees on Sunset are ripping up the sidewalks</li> <li>• Who is responsible to maintain the right-of-way in front of your property? More education needs to be done on that and it should be in the code</li> </ul> <p>R. James Claus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sherwood is in violation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment</li> <li>• Suggest that staff not be involved in this type of meeting because it prevents citizens from providing input.</li> </ul>   |
| 5-25-10 | Jacquelyn Kirscht                      | Multiple                  | <p>Comment form submitted - Regarding public notice - Encourage use of HOA's to facilitate discussions about issues; Provide notice to HOA websites of available; use city web site to share info and take feedback; provide a list of frequently asked questions with answers about topics in the planning area of the web site; take questions from homeowners not in HOA's and bring back to staff and the PC to share; create a Planning Commission newsletter or e-mail notices from Commission or Staff.</p>  |

| Date    | Name/primary interest | Topic              | Comment   |
|---------|-----------------------|--------------------|---|
|         |                       |                    | <p><i>On back of comment form – not sure if these are intended to be formal comments:</i><br/>           Public notice (PC newsletter or monthly e-mail), fences, tree removal, additional structures (sheds, play structures, flag poles), parking (align with HOA's) sidewalk maintenance (panels raising up). Priorities: with summer approaching and HOA's concerns</p>   |
| 5-27-10 | Tim Voorhies          | Public Notice      | <p>Provided information to Commissioner Jean Lafayette regarding an Oregonian news ad about the Clackamas County budget process. Felt it was well placed in the paper and worded well.</p>  |
| 5-28-10 | BOOTS                 | Priority of issues | <p>At BOOTS meeting staff shared the project overview, informed them of the website, survey, etc and asked for any initial feedback or questions. General comments discussed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning process is difficult to understand and can scare potential business owners away.</li> <li>• Façade grant program is not well known (this is not administered by Planning) and there have been reports of people considering applying for a Façade grant but are scared away when they see the planning process for Old Town</li> <li>• Concern that the process does not adequately address Goal 1 by not having an avenue for property owners who are not residents to participate. Look at PC make up for compliance with Goal 1</li> <li>• Suggest more interactive way to share public feedback such as a blog where people can see what others have said and respond to that.</li> <li>• Temporary Signs are a big concern for many business owners               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It was suggested that there be an informational tool provided for new business owners describing how they can advertise their business and orienting them to the City programs and policies.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |



| Date    | Name/primary interest | Topic                              | Comment   |
|---------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| 5-28-10 | Rotary Club           |                                    | <p>General overview of the project. (with powerpoint) invited them to take the survey on the website</p> <p>The group was very receptive and appeared to be interested in the project.</p> <p>General comments:<br/>           -Is affordable housing being considered?<br/>           -Sprinklers in apartments? – explained that this is part of the building code<br/>           -Recommended the PC meetings be televised so that people know who they are.<br/>           -How is the code enforced?<br/>           -YMCA would be a good location for public meetings</p>   |
| 6-10-10 | SURPAC                | Improvement of Development Process | <p>Generally, the members were in favor of the Code Clean up project and efforts to make the Code easier to understand. As a result, when a developer came in the door, he understood the requirements and the process could run more smoothly. Anything that could be done in that regard, SURPAC was in favor of accomplishing.</p>   |
| 6-10-10 | CPO # 5               | Code Clean Up-general              | <p>Participants asked general questions, such as where they could find information on the website, what the timeframe for the project was, and why the city was doing this (and why are we doing it now).</p>   |
| 6-14-10 | Vineyards HOA meeting | Project, residential focus         | <p>Discussion primarily focused on street trees. It was questioned why the residents were responsible for the cost of removal and replacement. One person noted that Tualatin will remove and replace street trees for no cost and questioned why we can't do something similar. Several are having issues with the tree roots causing lifting of the sidewalk. They suggested making it easier to proactively remove trees if there is a concern about the sidewalk. There was support for evaluating the tree list.</p> <p>It was suggested that the code cleanup project include an evaluation or review of CC&amp;Rs.</p> <p>When asked about whether chickens might be a good thing to evaluate for residential uses, the general sentiment was "no" that they were loud and smelly and not permitted in the HOA per CC&amp;Rs anyway.</p> |