



**City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Stewart Senior/Community Center
855 N. Sherwood Boulevard
January 4, 2000 - 7:00 PM**

A G E N D A

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
2. **Approval of Minutes – December 21, 1999 (may not be available until Jan 18, 2000)**
3. **Agenda Review**
4. **Public Hearings:** (Hearing Disclosure Statement. Also, declare conflict of interest, ex-parte contact, or personal bias) **Public Hearings** before the City Council and other Boards and Commissions shall follow the following procedure (Resolution 98-743, adopted June 9, 1998):
 - Staff Report--15 minutes
 - Applicant--30 minutes(to be split, at the discretion of the applicant, between presentation and rebuttal.)
 - Proponents—5 minutes each (applicants may not also speak as proponents.)
 - Opponents—5 minutes each
 - Rebuttal—Balance of applicant time (see above)
 - Close Public Hearing
 - Staff Final Comments—15 minutes
 - Questions of Staff/Discussion by Body—no limit
 - Decision (Note: Written comments are encouraged, and may be submitted prior to the hearing, at the hearing, or when the record is left open, after the hearing for a limited time. There is no limit to the length of written comment that may be submitted)
 - A. **SUB 99-3 Woodhaven Phase 8C Preliminary Plat:** a request by Genstar Land Co for approval of a 55-lot single family residential subdivision located in the Woodhaven PUD, south of Sunset Blvd and west of railroad tracks. Tax Lot 300, Map 2S 1 31. *City Council remanded the appeal by the applicant to the Planning Commission. There have been no major changes to the originally submitted plat.*
5. **New Business**
6. **Community Comments** *are limited to items NOT on the printed Agenda.*
7. **Adjourn to Work Session to discuss City of Sherwood Street Standards.**

**ITEMS NOT COMPLETED BY 11:00 PM WILL BE CONTINUED
TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING**

APPROVED MINUTES

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes
January 4, 2000

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Angela Weeks called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM.

Commission Members present:

Adrian Emery
Sterling Fox
Keith Mays
Jeff Schroeder
Ken Shannon
Angela Weeks

Staff:

Carole W. Connell, Planning Consultant
Terry Keyes, City Engineer
Roxanne Gibbons, Recording Secretary

2. Minutes of December 21, 1999

Chair Weeks announced these minutes would be available at the January 18, 2000 Regular Commission meeting.

3. Agenda Review

There were no comments.

4. Public Hearings

Chair Weeks read the hearings disclosure statement and requested that Commission members announce any conflict of interest, ex-parte contact or bias regarding any issues on the agenda.

Chair Weeks said in the distant past she had spoke to several citizens about the Woodhaven PUD. She did not believe any of this conversation would affect her decision-making and she planned to fully participate in the public hearing tonight. Mr. Emery and Mr. Mays reiterated Chair Weeks disclosure.

There were no other Commissioner disclosures.

4A. SUB 99-3 Woodhaven Phase 8C Preliminary Plat

Chair Weeks opened the public hearing and called for the Staff Report. Carole Connell referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated December 21, 1999, a complete copy of which is contained in the Planning Commission's minutes book. She highlighted the main points of the report and noted:

- This application has a long history and is the final phase of the Woodhaven PUD. The Staff Report provides a very detailed history.
- The Commission's denial of this plat was based on the fact that it could not be approved until a park site had been identified and agreed upon by all parties.

- The packet included Resolution #99-789 accepting the designation of a 6-acre park site for the Woodhaven PUD.
- Three other documents were also included in the packets for the record:
 - November 5, 1999 letter from Jack Orchard, Ball Janik to Derryck Dittman regarding settlement of the Woodhaven Park Site.
 - November 9, 1999 letter from Derryck Dittman to Mr. Orchard responding to the November 5, 1999 letter from Mr. Orchard.
 - November 9, 1999 letter from Doug Draper, Genstar to Mr. Dittman accepting the terms of the November 9, 1999 letter from Mr. Dittman.
- The PUD Amendment regarding the park site location must occur prior to the final plat for Phase 8C being recorded. The final plat for Phase 7B must also be reviewed and accepted by the City Council.
- These issues are all moving forward simultaneously, but they are contingent upon the agreement of the park site being settled and deed in hand by the City of Sherwood.
- In response to Mr. Shannon's question, the bonding for the Meinecke improvements is part of the Phase 7B approval conditions and is also in the Phase 8C conditions of approval. It is also contained in the Revised Conditions of Approval dated March 26, 1997, Condition #9, "The applicant shall fund a share of the cost of rebuilt approaches to intersection improvements and signalization for Meinecke Road at Highway 99W. Such share shall be determined based on a proportionate share of traffic generated within the study area as defined for the Wyndham Ridge Subdivision and prepared by Kittelson & Associates letter to Mr. Jim Rapp (dated February 18, 1994), or as otherwise determined by the City. The applicant shall provide payment for its proportionate share to the City by the date of the last building permit issuance or at the time improvements are constructed, whichever is sooner."
- It is not perfectly clear to the City who made the dollar determinations. The amount of \$31,782 is referred to in the letter from Mr. Dittman.
- The Commission will be reviewing the merits of the Phase 8C preliminary plat based on the criteria. The final plat for Phase 8C will be reviewed by the City Staff.
- The request is for a 55-lot single family subdivision with lot sizes ranging from 5,000 sf to 9,600 sf. The Commission has a copy the modified final plan. There are an additional four lots in this subdivision.
- The original Woodhaven PUD was approved for 1148 units. With the completion of Phase 8C there will be 975 units and an additional 65 townhouses in the southwestern corner of the PUD.
- She reviewed the approval criteria for the application.
- Initially Phase 8C had a looped street. The applicant is requesting that this be changed to two cul-de-sacs as shown on the map submitted with the application. There are benefits to the cul-de-sac street configuration.
- A sketch was included in the packets showing the length of the proposed cul-de-sac being shortened to meet City standards. This will be a condition of approval.
- The setbacks from the garages should be 20 feet, not 18 feet as written in the narrative. This should be a condition of approval.

- There is an 18-inch storm drainage line proposed with a system of catch basins to convey the storm water from the site and a water quality detention pond on the east side of Lot 38. She identified the area on the map.

Terry Keyes, City Engineer, said the water will flow from the wetland area, go across the railroad tracks in an existing culvert, across Steel Tek's property through the Abney Revard subdivision to Cedar Creek. Steel Tek is concerned about the water runoff to their property. A condition has been included addressing this concern.

Ms. Connell continued her review and noted:

- The Woodhaven PUD was approved prior to the adoption of the Tree Ordinance in 1995 and therefore, the applicant is not required to submit a full tree survey. Each lot will be reviewed at building permit issuance to determine which trees will remain. A tree inventory has been submitted for the Ponderosa Pine area with limits of not more than 5% of these trees being removed. The tree inventory illustrates approximately 1.9% of these trees will be removed. A condition of approval regarding tree removal has been included in the report.
- The Revised Conditions of Approval dated March 26, 1997 are available if the Commission wished to review them further.
- Another condition that is applicable to Phase 8C is the requirement to install a sound attenuation wall and/or a berm along the rear lots (prior lots #719 and #720) to buffer the noise from the industrial use to east of this property. This is now identified as Lot 37 as well as the cul-de-sac. There will also be additional landscaping to increase the buffered area. A condition has been added which states the overall design of the wall as well as the landscaping shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer and Planning prior to approval of the final plat.

The Commission asked what the definition of a "sound attenuation wall" would be. Ms. Connell said this would probably not be a wood fence, per se, but something thicker that would buffer the sound. Mr. Keyes said the type of wall would be based on noise parameters and this typically would be a masonry wall.

Ms. Connell and Mr. Keyes reviewed each of the conditions as presented in the Staff Report and recommended the following:

- Revise Condition #9, regarding the tree inventory. "A tree survey shall be completed in open space areas proposed for pedestrian paths and utilities. Utilities and pedestrian paths shall be designed to minimize removal of trees." The Commission discussed whether any tree mitigation should be applied to this application. The Staff Report states this phase is not subject to the Tree Ordinance standards. Phase 7B did not require a tree inventory.
- Revise Condition #20 regarding the downstream conveyance system to Cedar Creek for full build-out.
- Address the issue of islands in the cul-de-sacs.
- Determine whether the bike and pedestrian paths for this phase should be concrete or asphalt.

In conclusion, based on the findings of fact and agency comments, Staff recommends approval of SUB 99-3 Woodhaven Phase 8C Preliminary Subdivision Plat with the conditions as revised.

Chair Weeks asked if the applicant wished to provide testimony.

Jacki Herb, Genstar Land Co NW, 11515 SW Durham Road, Suite E-9, Tigard, Oregon 97224, Jerry Offer and Mike Peebles, OTAK, 17355 SW Boones Ferry Road, Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035, addressed the Commission. Ms. Herb said they have reviewed the Staff Report and are basically in agreement with some minor changes and clarification. Mr. Offer noted:

- The initial change from the looped street that was shown in the PUD Master Plan was to keep rear yards from facing Sunset Boulevard. The cul-de-sacs will provide some additional open space and landscape open space along Sunset Boulevard.
- The cul-de-sacs have been redesigned to meet Code requirement of 600 foot maximum length. The applicant does not see this as a substantial change from the plan showing a looped street. The cul-de-sac design is a positive change.
- They had an acoustical engineer set up some sound recording instruments for one week to record the noise from the Steel Tek site. The study found there were no violations of the City or DEQ noise standards. He said a wood fence with landscaping was adequate treatment for buffering. They have used wood fences in a number of locations. One is being installed next to the DuraMetal steel fabricating plant in Tualatin where they are developing a multi-family and townhome site. They are using 4 x 4's for the fence at this site. At this site there were some significant violations of the noise standards. This situation does not exist with Steel Tek.
- There is a psychological effect with a fence and landscaping which keeps people from seeing the source of the noise. The applicant feels the fence and landscaping will adequately buffer the noise as well as address the security concerns Steel Tek raised in previous testimony.
- The open space along Sunset Boulevard would be dedicated to the City.

Mike Peebles addressed some of the engineering conditions and noted:

- The trains using the railroad tracks along the site were also a part of the noise study.
- The Woodhaven development has an extensive series of bike paths and they are all asphalt, 8 feet wide. The original PUD showed the pathways as being asphalt. The applicant requests that Phase 8C be conditioned to have asphalt bike paths. The connection point from the cul-de-sacs to Sunset Boulevard would be concrete.
- From a construction standpoint, using asphalt would have less of an impact on the trees and vegetation. Asphalt is easier to repair and maintain.
- They had a supplemental plan for the sanitary sewer for Phase 8C. The original plan for the upper lots would run the sewer line adjacent to the railroad to tie into an existing bore underneath the railroad tracks. A second option would be to run the sewer for the upper lots through an easement between two lots, cut across Sunset Boulevard and tie into an existing storm manhole. There is sufficient capacity to do this especially since the density of the townhome site is not going to be at that location. They would propose to cut across Sunset only because the final lift has not been placed yet.

- The City adopted new construction standards in November 1999 and one of these included a landscape island in cul-de-sacs. This was a condition of approval for Phase 7B. The applicant is requesting not to place these islands in the cul-de-sacs of Phase 8C. From a design standpoint and in discussions with the Fire Marshal, the islands decrease the turning radius in the cul-de-sac and at times they become a maintenance problem. The islands also cut down on sight distance.
- The applicant agrees with the condition provided by Engineering regarding the storm drainage in terms of designing the storm system to Unified Sewerage Agency standards. The City standards would follow USA standards. Their analysis would consider existing conditions with the understanding that Phase 8C and Steel Tek have to comply with USA standards for provided detention. They are providing detention with the storm pond as well as water quality and would be discharging to existing wetlands and would analyze the culvert system and drainageway across the Steel Tek property downstream pipes to the Cedar Creek outfall. They have the storm report from the Abney Revard plat that details their assumptions for the areas. A 25-year storm is the standard design storm for City of Sherwood and USA. When you get above that to the 100-year storm, the design theory is that you design for emergency overflow of a 100-year storm. So these pipes may not carry that flow, but you make sure there is a route to the discharge point that won't affect structures or cause damage. Water flowing between houses or water flowing down the gutter into the street is an acceptable design during those storm events.
- They have met with Steel Tek three times to look at some options for routing storm water and pipes on their property, but have been unable to come to an agreement with regard to an easement as well as the City's requirements for maintaining flows to the wetlands. The one thing they don't want to do is bypass the wetland in the adjacent drainage areas so that they are pulling all of the water out. This is a natural feature and a wetland and they have to continue to put water into it at the same rate.
- The storm ponds are being designed to USA standards.

Mr. Offer said the applicant concurs with the recommended changes to Condition #9, which Ms. Connell suggested tonight. They have not been required to do a tree inventory since the PUD amendment in 1997. They would ask that the Commission be consistent with earlier decisions, but they do not have a problem with doing a tree inventory for the pathway and utility construction in the open space.

Ms. Connell said the storm water facility would be on a separate tract, which will be dedicated to the City. The applicant said that the landscape corridor as shown on the plans would also be dedicated to the City. Ms. Connell said that the City would strongly recommend that there be a pedestrian connection from Inkster to Sunset. She asked the applicant to describe the trees on the site.

Mike Peebles said the trees on site within the wetland area include a couple of small cottonwoods. They will not be disturbing any of these because they are within the 25-foot buffer area. The only significant tree vegetation is the line of 15-18 Fir trees which look like they were planted for a nursery or wind break. These would be removed for the storm water pond and development of Lots 39 and 40.

Ms. Connell clarified that the landscape corridor along Sunset Boulevard is to be maintained by the Woodhaven Homeowners Association.

Mr. Keyes made modifications to Conditions #20 and #22.

Chair Weeks asked if there was any proponent testimony. There being none, Chair Weeks asked if there was any opponent testimony.

Tim Voorhies, Steel Tek, PO Box 908, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He clarified that the memo to the file which was included in the packets dated June 8, 1999 from Scott Clark, Assistant Planner should be corrected, "...Marilyn stated that they have **not** given Genstar right-of-way and have basically put up with enough from them." He noted:

- He was concerned with the rain runoff going through Steel Tek's property. He asked if he could receive more information on the grading. What is considered private and public drainage and how that would affect him.
- He was concerned about the storm flow coming from an 18-inch pipe and going into a 12-inch pipe.
- He asked if he could receive a copy of the Staff Report prior to the meeting. (*note: the public notice states, "Application materials are available for review or can be copied for a reasonable cost at City Hall, 20 NW Washington Street. The City Planning Staff report on this matter will be available for review at least seven (7) days in advance of the hearing."*)
- He identified where the drainage flows through the Steel Tek property on the map and down to the wetlands. The development behind Steel Tek put in a water detention system large enough to handle their storm runoff. Did they put in a big enough detention pond to handle the additional flow which will be coming off of Phase 8C? Mr. Keyes said he expected this not to be the case.
- Every time a new developer comes in and wants something the wording gets changed and he loses a bit more of his property. Right now it is not a wetland, but he can see it turning into a wetland. They say it is a natural drainage. Granted this is a natural drainage, but for how long a period of time?
- He has hired a consultant to look at the storm drainage issue, but he would not relay what the consultant has told him. It really is not up to his consultant to have the City design a good system for everybody. It is up to the City and the developers.

Mr. Keyes said until OTAK does the analysis, and he cannot comment whether the 18-inch pipe is oversized and the 12-inch is undersized. The issue is covered under Condition #22. The detention pond is a part of Phase 8C.

Mr. Shannon asked Mr. Voorhies what would make him happy to do this right. Mr. Voorhies said he had no idea, but he would like to see them direct the flow up to Sunset and out Sunset and keep it off of his property. He has already granted the fire department access and this turned into an easement.

Mr. Keyes said the storm water analysis usually comes in with the construction plans. All of these things are reviewed prior to final plat review and approval. In response to Mr. Fox's question, he said the water flows underneath the railroad tracks in a pipe and flows across Mr. Voorhies' property on the back side in an open field or channel, to a catch basin and into Cedar Creek. He identified the area on the map.

Mr. Voorhies asked when the sound study was done. Steel Tek keeps their doors shut until about 9:00 AM as a good neighbor policy. He would like to get a copy of the noise study done by the applicant.

Chair Weeks asked if there was any further opponent testimony.

Robert J. Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. He noted:

- The Commission is in a position where they have to approve this application. If they do not, they are simply buying a lawsuit. They are also buying a lawsuit if they don't approve it very carefully conditioned.
- The Code say you must have a new hearing on a PUD and it must be treated as a new application if you have density change, boundary line change, location change or use change. You now have all four of these.
- This position was taken by Mr. Dittman at LUBA, accepted by LUBA and ruled on by LUBA, so it is not a question we just took it, it was ruled on as part of the finding of fact in law. It is a mandatory major change that requires a new hearing.
- He does not believe it is a PUD any longer and it does not qualify as a PUD. This is simply an attempt to use a PUD to buy zoning.
- The City is trying to get a City park. Ms. Connell has pointed out the history and Terry certainly can handle the engineering features and storm water.
- If this application is not passed, the City will not get a park.
- The five conditions for a PUD are not being met; flexibility, creativity, innovation, joint decision-making and more flexible uses.
- He does not trust Genstar or Inkster or British American Tobacco or whatever they are called. There has been a history of the deals being changed. There have been changes in the street widths and changes in design standards and the islands. We all know that Mr. Bormet did not bring these changes to a public hearing and there was no noticing done.
- If it is made a part of the record and the City does not get the park, the City has the grounds to turn Genstar down at the final map and they have to prove at LUBA they have a PUD and he does not think they can.
- He does not think the Staff is going to let the Commission make a bad decision without all of the details being worked out.
- In his opinion, Condition #51 and the other conditions should be reviewed by a land use attorney.
- This is the end of an era in Sherwood. We will vote on annexations. When Millers Landing and the final phases of Woodhaven are done, you will be scratching to find enough land to build 100 lots.

Susan Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. She noted:

- With regard to sound attenuation wall, Steel Tek and the eventual surrounding residents need a buffer. Genstar's noise study seems to show they only went out one time to monitor the noise levels. She would discourage not conditioning this type of buffer unless the City was sure it was a sound piece of land use planning.
- The City needs to make sure that the private easement across Steel Tek's property is in place. The final plat should not be approved until that easement is in place. This needs to be worked out between Genstar and Steel Tek.
- If Phase 8C is gaining 4 extra lots from the master plan layout, if there is a problem with the increased runoff, these lots could be used for storm water detention, if needed. There could be additional clarifications made in the conditions.
- With regard to Condition 51, she has the same concerns as Mr. Claus. If the City thinks the condition is saying one thing that Genstar has to fulfill certain obligations, she does not know if this blanket statement in the condition is tight enough to maintain the City's interests.
- What is Genstar doing for their contribution to the Highway 99W and Meinecke Road intersection? The issues with Phase 7B need to be resolved prior to Phase 8C moving forward.
- The conditions should be reviewed by a land use attorney prior to approval of the preliminary plat.
- Historically, the City has had troubles and differences of opinion with the conditions placed on the Woodhaven PUD.
- Since the final modified plan from 1997, the road has changed and the number of lots have changed. These are potentially major changes to the PUD.

Mr. Voorhies asked for clarification regarding Condition #31 referencing site grading. Mr. Keyes said this condition is included to make sure when the site is graded that the grading does not push water from one lot onto another lot. It also serves to separate private drainage on the lots from the public system. The runoff from the Phase 8C parcel has naturally drained across Steel Tek's property prior to either Steel Tek or Phase 8C being in place. This condition tries to address the runoff the best way possible.

Mr. Voorhies asked if the grading from the development to the left and south of his property was changed so that it basically would stay off of property owned by the Mayor. Mr. Keyes said he did not know the answer to this question. Mr. Voorhies said there used to be a big swale and then it disappeared.

Mr. Keyes said one of the rules of good storm water design is you keep the water in the same channels as it always flowed. You don't move it from one basin to another. This would not be good design and it may even be illegal. If this is done and it floods someone's property, then the City or Genstar would be liable.

Chair Weeks asked if there was any further testimony. There being none, Chair Weeks asked if the applicant wished to provide rebuttal testimony.

Mike Peebles, OTAK, Inc., addressed the Commission. He responded to some of the concerns provided in the testimony and noted:

- In the stormwater management report that Genstar will provide to the City with their final construction plans, they have put together a pretty extensive preliminary report from an engineering standpoint. The stormwater plan will evaluate existing conditions, developed conditions, as well as looking at the downstream conditions and stormwater report that was done for Abney Revard subdivision. He is confident that the size of the storm pond, as shown, will meet the requirements as shown in the condition of approval and also meet USA requirements. This should be submitted in 3-4 weeks and it will become a part of the public record.
- With regard to the size of the pipes and how they go from an 18 or 24 inch to a 12 inch line, it is a combination of things. The detention pond they are providing will attenuate the flows. The capacity of the pipes are based on the diameter of the pipe and the slope of the pipe. Due to the grade, they want to keep the pipes are flat as possible so they don't get down too deep. They have to increase the size of the pipe to convey a certain runoff. The 18 or 24 inch pipe that goes into the pond will have the same capacity as the 12 inch pipe leaving the pond because it is at a different slope.

Chair Weeks closed the public hearing on SUB 99-3 Woodhaven Phase 8C Preliminary Plat for discussion by the Commission.

Chair Weeks asked if the fire district responded regarding the cul-de-sacs. Ms. Connell said the fire district was notified and there is a letter in the packet. Mr. Offer said the cul-de-sac was proposed since February 15, 1999.

Keith Mays said he was not in favor of approving this application at this time. He thought the conditions should be reviewed by legal counsel, preferably a land use attorney.

Chair Weeks said she would agree due to the fact that in the past Genstar made promises which have not been kept. The truth and trust factor is not there. However, the Commission has to move these applications forward and get Genstar out of town.

Jeff Schroeder said he would support moving this application through the process and not hold up the applicant any longer.

Adrian Emery recommended the Commission review the conditions and send them to a land use attorney for review. The Commission concurred with this recommendation.

Ms. Connell said when the Commission is talking about changes, they are talking about changes to the whole PUD and not to one phase or parts of phases. If the Commission is saying that the addition of four lots to this phase is a major change, she was not sure this is the proper way to

look at it. She referenced the November 9, 1999 letter from Mr. Orchard, which was agreed to by the City, that states, “*All actions by the City shall be final and complete at the local level by March 1, 2000. If not complete by that date, Quinkster/Genstar can withdraw from the process described above without prejudice to any of its legal, rights. Likewise, if any action is taken by the City which implicates other property or aspects of the Woodhaven PUD (or modifies or adds conditions) beyond the simple redesignation of the Sunset-Pinehurst parcel, Quinkster/Genstar may withdraw from the process described above, without prejudice to any of its legal rights. The City likewise will not be prejudiced by this agreement and its attempt pursuant hereto to resolve this matter, and both parties will be returned to their preagreement positions.*”

Ms. Connell said the City is trying to run these applications concurrently to meet the deadlines. They are depending upon each other. There is a joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting scheduled for January 18, 2000 to hear the park property location. It is important for the Commission to relate what their issues are and how to deal with them. This PUD is a very large development and minor modifications along the way are to be expected. The expectation that nothing would change from what was discussed 10 years ago is not realistic.

Chair Weeks said she thought the applicant should be required to follow the Tree Ordinance. However, the landscape plan does show that there will be a tree placed every 30 feet. If they follow this plan, that would be acceptable.

The Commission concurred that the location of the park site is a key concern. Condition #51 should be worded so that the park site location is finalized.

The Commission agreed that the cul-de-sac design being proposed was more favorable than the looped street design. It was also their consensus that the planters in the center of the cul-de-sac not be required for this phase.

The Commission discussed the stormwater runoff and how it could affect the surrounding properties. They also discussed the sound attenuation wall and what material should be used. Ms. Connell said it should be noted in the condition that the Woodhaven Homeowners Association would maintain the wall.

The Commission agreed the bike paths should be asphalt, except where they connect directly from Inkster to Sunset they should be concrete.

The Commission reviewed each of the conditions and made changes to the following:

- Revised Condition #26 regarding the bike and pedestrian paths.
- Revised Condition #9 regarding a tree survey for open spaces for pedestrian paths and utilities.
- Revised Condition #20 regarding the downstream conveyance system.
- Revised Condition #22 regarding the sanitary sewer extensions.
- Revised Condition #24 regarding full public street improvements.
- Revised Condition #50 regarding the sound attenuation wall.

- Added Condition #52 regarding the landscape corridor and triangular piece of open space.

The Commission concurred that if the number of lots in Phase 8C were reduced, as a result of meeting condition #52 and stormwater standards, they would not need to review the application at another public hearing.

Adrian moved the Planning Commission tentatively approve SUB 99-3 Woodhaven Phase 8C Preliminary Plat and continue this application to the January 18, 2000 Regular Commission meeting so that a land use attorney can review the proposed conditions of approval. The public hearing is closed. Seconded by Sterling Fox.

Vote for Passage of Motion: 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

5. New Business

There was no new business.

6. Community Comments

There were no comments.

7. Adjourn

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 PM. The Commission adjourned to a work session to discuss the proposed Transportation System Plan and street standards.

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Department