



**City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Masonic Hall, 60 NW Washington Street
Tuesday, January 20, 1998
7:00 PM**

A G E N D A

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. Approval of Minutes - January 6, 1998**
- 3. Agenda Review**
- 4. Community Comments:** are limited to items NOT on the printed agenda under Public Hearings.
- 5. Consent Agenda - no applications scheduled.**
- 6. Public Hearings:** (Hearing Disclosure Statement. Also, declare conflict of interest, ex-parte contact, or personal bias)
 - A. (Continued from January 6, 1998) MLP 97-3 Lot 12 Industrial Park of Sherwood:** a request by Development & Construction Services to divide a 3.98 acre parcel into 2 lots. Tax Lot 600, Map 2S 128BC.
 - B. SP 97-12/CUP 97-4 Sherwood Community Friends Church Addition Site Plan:** a request by Brittell Design for site plan and conditional use approval of a 4,959 sf addition to existing facility. Tax Lot 3100, Map 2S 1 32CA.
- 7. Other Business**
 - A. Conditions of Approval for Pacific Lumber (SP 93-4).**
- 8. Adjourn**

**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 20, 1998

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Vice-Chair Susan Claus called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

Commission Members present:

George Bechtold
Susan Claus
Scott Franklin
Angela Weeks

Staff:

Greg Turner, City Planner
Jason Tuck, Assistant Planner
Roxanne Gibbons, Recording Secretary

Commission Members absent:

Bill Whiteman

2. Minutes of January 6, 1998 Regular Meeting

Vice-Chair Claus asked if there were any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes of January 6, 1998. There were none.

**George Bechtold moved the Planning Commission accept the January 6, 1998
Planning Commission minutes as presented. Seconded by Susan Claus.**

Vote for Passage of Motion: 4-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

3. Agenda Review

Greg Turner stated that Staff had prepared a memo regarding the Edgewood Subdivision. This could be discussed under Other Business. The Commission placed this item under Other Business. There were no other changes.

4. Community Comments

Vice-Chair Claus called for comments from the audience. There were none.

5. Consent Agenda

There were no items scheduled.

6. Public Hearings

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

There were no Commissioner disclosures.

6A. MLP 97-3 Lot 12 Industrial Park of Sherwood (cont'd from January 6, 1998)

Vice-Chair Claus opened the public hearing and called for the Staff Report. Jason Tuck referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated January 6, 1998, a complete copy of which is contained in the Planning Commission's minutes book. He noted:

- The property is located at 14100 Galbreath Drive, Tax Lot 600, Map 2S 1 28BC.
- The applicant is requesting a minor land partition to divide a 4 acre lot into two lots, both of which will be approximately 2 acres in size.
- Proposed Parcel 2 (the northern parcel) has an industrial building on it. Proposed Parcel 1 is currently vacant.
- The site is zoned General Industrial (GI) and the minimum lot size is 20,000 sf. The partition plat conforms to the standards of the zone.
- A minor land partition for the site was approved on November 7, 1995 by the Planning Commission. The one year approval expired on November 7, 1996. The applicant has resubmitted for a new minor land partition approval.
- The applicant has addressed and met the required findings for approval. These are discussed in more detail in the Staff Report.
- He referred the Commission to a memo from Staff regarding Condition #5 and the easement. Staff recommends revising Condition #5 as follows:
 - “Record with Washington County a 25-foot drainage easement for the benefit of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. There shall also be a joint maintenance agreement for the easement which covers all aspects of the drainage facility. Note that this drainage facility is not approved for both lots at this time. It may be possible that the existing facility can be modified or that a separate water quality/quantity facility will be required for proposed Parcel 1.”
- Staff and the applicant have agreed to this reworded condition.

In conclusion, based on a review of the applicable code provisions, agency comments and Staff review, Staff recommends approval of MLP 97-3 Lot 12 Industrial Park of Sherwood with the conditions as revised.

Scott Franklin asked for clarification regarding the “sensitive area”. Mr. Tuck identified the location on the map. Following discussions with USA, Staff concluded that USA was looking at an old map which did not show the Industrial Park subdivision improvements when referencing this sensitive area. The old drainage course has been rerouted and mitigated. Greg Turner said the City has received verbal comments from USA, but does not have anything in writing which states the “sensitive area” has been rerouted.

Vice-Chair Claus asked if the applicant wished to provide testimony.

Warren Johnson, PO Box 1208, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Mr. Johnson said Jim Hirte, Colamette Construction, was in attendance. Mr. Hirte had discussions with City Staff and he may wish to provide testimony.

Jim Hirte, Colamette Construction, 13990 SW Galbreath Drive, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Mr. Hirte said the Staff Report and conditions of approval, including revised Condition #5, are acceptable. These are also acceptable to the future developer of Parcel

2. Mr. Hirte said the sensitive area does not exist. USA will review this part of the general application again.

John Peterson, Development & Construction Services, 339 W. Main Street, Hillsboro, Oregon 97123-3947, addressed the Commission. He did not have anything to add, but would answer specific questions from the Commission. They did not have a problem with Condition #6 as written. They have received verbal confirmation from USA that the sensitive area no longer exists.

Vice-Chair Claus asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in favor of MLP 97-3. There was no further proponent testimony. Vice-Chair Claus asked if there was anyone who wished to testify in opposition to the application. There being no opposition testimony, Vice-Chair Claus dispensed with the rebuttal portion of the hearing and closed the public hearing on MLP 97-3 for discussion by the Commission.

Angela Weeks asked if it was necessary to include Condition #6. Mr. Franklin said he did not feel the condition was necessary and deferred to the applicant. If the condition is included, it should be reworded.

Vice-Chair Claus reopened the public hearing on MLP 97-3 for a response from the applicant and their representatives.

Rex Russell, 1527 Maple Street, Forest Grove, Oregon, addressed the Commission. Mr. Russell said he works for Mr. Peterson. If the sensitive area does not exist, they do not have a problem with the condition. The City has approved the plat as it was platted and the water courses have been modified and engineered.

Vice-Chair Claus closed the public hearing on MLP 97-3 for further discussion by the Commission.

The Commission discussed the “sensitive area”. There was no concurrence that Condition #6 be removed. Scott Franklin suggested Condition #6 be reworded. Mr. Turner read the following revised condition:

6. Based upon comments from Unified Sewerage Agency of Washington County, a “sensitive area” may exist. If a sensitive area does exist, the developer shall preserve a 25-foot corridor as described in R&O 96-44 separating the sensitive area from the impact of development and identify the sensitive area on the plans.

There being no further discussion,

Scott Franklin moved the Planning Commission approve MLP 97-3 Lot 12 Industrial Park of Sherwood based on findings of fact, agency comments, public testimony and the conditions as modified (Conditions #5 and #6). Seconded by George Bechtold.

Vote for Passage of Motion: 4-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

6B. SP 97-12/CUP 97-4 Sherwood Community Friends Church Addition Site Plan

Vice-Chair Claus opened the public hearing and called for the Staff Report. She noted the Commission had received a letter from Clarke and Susan Miller which would be read into the record. Jason Tuck referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated January 20, 1998, a complete copy of which is contained in the Planning Commission's minutes book. He noted:

- The applicant is proposing to construct a 4,959 sf addition to the existing 14,120 sf church. The proposal includes 25 off-street parking stalls and site landscaping.
- The site is located on east side of South Sherwood Boulevard, Tax Lot 3100, Map 2S 1 32CA. He identified the area on the map.
- The site is zoned Institutional Public (IP) and is utilized as a church which requires a conditional use. The applicant is applying for site plan and conditional use approval.
- The applicant has addressed and met the required findings for site plan approval with some exceptions.
- One of the issues is parking. Referencing Section 5.300 of the Development Code, a parking space generally means a minimum stall 9 feet in width and 20 feet in length. Up to 25% of required parking spaces may have a minimum dimension of 8 feet in width and 18 feet in length so long as they are signed as compact car stalls.
- The applicant submitted a letter dated December 17, 1997 explaining their interpretation of the Code relative to parking stalls. This letter was made a part of the record.
- The applicant requests to use 3 feet of overhang into the landscaped and sidewalk areas as part of the parking stall dimensions. The Code states that a 90 degree stall is 20 feet long by 9 feet wide. Staff relied on the literal language of the Code for their interpretation. In this case the stall is 20 feet in length, from the landscaping to the end of the stall. It does not seem reasonable for a stall to be measured into a landscape area or sidewalk. Based on Code requirements, Staff included a condition of approval requiring the applicant to comply with parking stall standards.
- The applicant's December 17, 1997 letter also discussed wheel stops. The Code states parking spaces along the boundaries of a parking lot or adjacent to interior landscaped areas or sidewalks shall be provided with a wheel stop at least 4 inches high, located 3 feet back from the front of the parking stall (Appendix G in the Code). The submitted site plan does not include wheel stops located along the boundaries of the parking lot adjacent to landscaped areas. The interpretation provided by the applicant is not supported by Staff. A condition of approval has been included to assure compliance with the Code.
- With reference to Code Section 5.400, on-site circulation, required private sidewalks shall extend from the ground floor entrances or the ground floor landing of stairs, ramps or elevators to the public sidewalk or curb of the public street which provides required ingress and egress. Access to the facility shall be provide by means of a private sidewalk which shall connect the ground floor entrances to the public sidewalk or curb of the public street. A condition has been included which requires this connection.
- The applicant has addressed and met the findings for conditional use approval.

In conclusion, based on a review of applicable code provisions, agency comments and Staff review, Staff recommends approval of SP 97-12/CUP 97-4 with the conditions contained in the Staff Report.

Greg Turner read the letter from Clarke and Susan Miller, representing 345 and 385 Sunset Court, into the record as follows:

“Our two properties are side by side along the fence line of the church property. We propose a french drain be installed along the cyclone fence on the church property to handle the run-off of surface and spring water that bails out of the uphill property. As you are well aware, water drainage coming down the hillside from the once filbert orchard, and across the church property has always been a problem and concern for the homes on Sunset Court. The construction of the new housing development where the filbert orchard stood was hopefully going to bring us some relief but sadly the surface and underground flow continues to boil out of the ground. At one time, with the advice and counsel of our professional excavator, we had an agreement with the church that the best solution was to install a french drain on the church property following the cyclone fence line down to the storm drain on South Sherwood Boulevard. The church agreed to pay one-half if the property owners would pay for the other half. Unfortunately we couldn't get that cooperation from all residences and the project fell by the wayside. The problem has increased and we have personally invested \$9,000 in our 2 properties for new drainage work to take the water flow out to the street as was the approved process for our development. Still we are dealing with the surface water coming diagonally across the church property onto our yards. This is not a problem that is going to go away and it needs to be corrected. Please read this into the record of testimony for this public hearing.”

Mr. Franklin asked what South Sherwood Boulevard was classified as, and whether there is a visual corridor requirement. Mr. Tuck said Sunset is probably a minor collector and there would be a visual corridor requirement. Mr. Franklin asked if this was addressed in the Staff Report. Mr. Tuck said South Sherwood Boulevard is already landscaped. Mr. Franklin asked about the City's capital improvement project (CIP) and whether it would take out all of the landscaping. Mr. Tuck said the CIP for South Sherwood Boulevard would include the street, curbs, planter strip and a bike path. In discussions with the church representatives, it was indicated they would be receptive to providing an easement, if needed, or working out the landscape requirements. Mr. Franklin asked if it was Staff's understanding that the existing landscaping meets the requirements of the Code. Mr. Tuck said he would look up the Code requirements.

Vice-Chair Claus asked if the applicant wished to provide testimony.

Dwayne Brittell, representing the Sherwood Friends Church, Brittell Design, 602 N. Main, Newberg, Oregon 97132, addressed the Commission. Mr. Brittell said the project was well defined by Mr. Tuck. He referenced the issues in their December 17, 1997 letter and noted:

- As a whole the church is very satisfied with the Staff findings. They did have a question regarding Condition #2, in particular the sanitary sewer. Many of the items contained in Condition #2 were covered in the findings. There will not be any change in the signage.

- Referencing Condition #2A, the applicant is proposing to utilize the existing sanitary sewer service. Adequate capacity is available within the system to accommodate the new development. He asked if there were any additional requirements needed for this project.
- Mr. Turner said this condition is a boilerplate condition and if what is there is adequate, that would be sufficient.
- He asked if the Commissioners had sufficient time to review the December 17 letter. The Commission responded that this letter was included with their planning packets. No Commissioners asked for clarification of the letter.
- The applicant has made their own interpretation of the Development Code Section 5.302.03C, wheel stops. Within the jurisdictions of over 150 churches they have designed in the states of Oregon and Washington, the interpretation contained in the appeal letter was made.
- He did not agree with the indication they did not have wheel stops. There is a six inch wheel stop in both cases, on the landscaping as well as against the sidewalk against the building. The wheel stop is 3 feet in from the front of the parking stall and this is essentially what the Code requires. The only difference is the wheel stop does not have asphalt in front of it, it is concrete. According to Staff, the applicant would need to have a wheel stop, then asphalt and then concrete for the sidewalk. The applicant added 3 feet to the sidewalk so the wheel stop is 3 feet inside the required sidewalk. On the other side where there is landscaping, they have a curb wheel stop and then grass.
- The applicant was concerned with the Staff's strict interpretation of the Code and there not being any flexibility.
- The applicant's survey of existing facilities, especially the newer facilities in Sherwood, resulted in they could not find one parking stall in the City that meets the standard, as interpreted by the City Staff. He understands the Staff is fairly new and their interpretation could just be changing and there would not be any examples at this time. Many jurisdictions have restricted the use of asphalt and imposed on the applicant to have shade trees, plantings and grass. The overall direction of the state of Oregon is to have less asphalt and parking and more landscaping.
- The requirement to have a 3 foot strip of asphalt, and in the applicant's case, a 6 foot strip of asphalt for no apparent reason is really bothersome.
- If the applicant meets the Staff's interpretation, they would have to cut down a very substantial tree and retro-fill additionally into the landscape area. The cost and unsightliness is a real concern. They have a double loaded corridor which would require 3 feet on both sides.
- If the Staff could justify the design as important for a specific reason, they would definitely respond to it.

Mr. Turner said Staff reviews the application by looking at the Development Code. They review each section to assure the plan complies. Referencing the wheel stops, the Code states the wheel stops should be 3 feet out from the edge of the landscape area or sidewalk. Staff made a literal interpretation that this is what should be done. Staff recognizes that, in the past, there are some cases that were conditioned for wheels stops and it was enforced. There were also cases where there was no mention of wheel stops. It is a matter of interpretation whether the Commission would like to make the 3 foot area over a concrete area or over asphalt. Most of the recent

applications which were required to have wheel stops are in industrial areas. In response to Mr. Franklin's question, Mr. Turner advised that Appendix G is located at the end of Chapter 5 of the Code.

Mr. Brittell continued his testimony noting:

- He asked if Staff could show that their interpretation was the intent of the Code. It would be extremely important to have more diagrams showing parking stalls and wheel stops, both diagonal and 90 degree parking.
- There are some conflicts in the ordinance and he would recommend if the Commission desires to follow the recommendations of Staff, that they continue to look at the ordinance requirements, make the reasons known to the developer and assure the minimum standards are very clear in the diagrams.
- The applicant is appealing Condition #3 to the Commission.
- He referenced Condition #4, access to the facility by means of a private sidewalk. The applicant would like to add a provision that this could be deferred until the City's public sidewalk is constructed on South Sherwood Boulevard. This would be after completion of the City's capital improvement plan. Mr. Turner said Staff did not have a problem with deferring this condition.
- A copy of the Miller's letter was faxed to the applicant's representative.

LeRoy Powell, builder for the project, Powell Built Homes, 1709 Villa, Newberg, Oregon 97132, addressed the Commission. Mr. Powell testified regarding the parking lot issue and noted:

- In other cities and towns where they have done work, trees are extremely important. If the applicant is required to follow the Staff Report, they would lose one of their major trees, a 24-inch Pine located in the parking lot. This is one concern the church has. He identified the location of the Pine tree on the map. Mr. Brittell said the tree would be in the middle of the driveway.
- The applicant continues to work on the site drainage. They have an engineer working on this and he is in communication with the City Engineering Department. The Miller's letter is accurate. The church and the Millers have been working on this problem for quite some time. He just received a copy of the letter, so he could not address it tonight.
- The site drainage and run-off would be part of the building permit application.
- They would work with the adjacent property owners. There are some issues which they could not address tonight and they would need to have the engineers work with Staff. As in the past, the church was willing to work with the Millers.
- With regard to the easement on South Sherwood Boulevard for the bike path, the church is willing to address this issue. In a pre-construction meeting with the City, it was indicated South Sherwood Boulevard would be developed through a capital improvement project and there would be no cost to the church. The applicant would like to have a letter in writing from the City in this regard. After they receive a letter, they would be more than happy to address the use of land.

Vice-Chair Claus asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in favor of the application. There being none, Vice-Chair Claus asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition to the application.

Charles Estes, 485 SW Sunset Court, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Mr. Estes said he was not against the application, but he did have a concern. He identified the location of his property on the map. The property is located along the fence line.

- His main concern is all of the runoff coming off of the parking lot will come straight downhill onto his lot. He did not see any drainage. As the Miller's letter stated, they get all of the runoff and he can't use about one-third of his yard because of the water. The water is bubbling out of the ground and it is getting worse each year.
- His concern with this proposal is that he did not see any information regarding where the water is going to go when it rains on the church parking lot.

Vice-Chair Claus asked if the applicant wished to provide rebuttal testimony.

Dwayne Brittell, representing the Sherwood Friends Church, Brittell Design, 602 N. Main, Newberg, Oregon 97132, addressed the Commission. Mr. Brittell said the engineers are working on a swale which will handle all of the runoff of the new impervious roofs and parking area. He said Mr. Estes was welcome to review the engineering drawings for this project. The drainage from the upper church parking lot goes to existing drywells. He identified the area where the use of a french drain has been discussed.

Mr. Estes said he could identify areas in the church lawn where there are bubbling springs and cannot be mowed by the church.

Ken Vandenhoeck, 605 SE Highland Drive, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. There had been discussions between church representatives and adjoining property owners about water problems and a possible sharing in the costs for some type of solution. The only owners willing to do this were the Millers.

Steve Eck, South Pine Street, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Mr. Eck said he built homes in Crestwood Heights which is on the other side of Sunset Boulevard. Hawk Street runs parallel to Sunset Boulevard and there are a huge amount of springs coming from Crestwood Heights. One spring the size of water hose was percolating up through a driveway on Hawk Street. He thought there is a fair amount of water coming from this area, in addition to water coming off of the hill from Cinnamon Hills. There are a lot of water springs in the Ladd Hill area.

LeRoy Powell reiterated that the church is addressing the parking drainage. The water from the new parking area will go directly to the storm drain on South Sherwood Boulevard. They are required to add retention for the water runoff.

There being no further testimony, Vice-Chair Claus closed the public hearing on SP 97-12/CUP 97-4 for discussion by the Commission.

Mr. Bechtold asked if Staff had any further comments regarding parking. Mr. Turner said Staff has made an interpretation regarding the wheel stops and twenty feet to be within the parking lot area itself. There are past examples where part of the parking area included the sidewalk or landscape area. As the architect pointed out, the parking diagram in the Code does show angled parking.

Mr. Franklin said the interpretation could be made either way regarding the overhang of the cars. A clarification of this section of the Code is probably warranted.

Vice-Chair Claus asked if it was accurate that for the last year or so Staff has been requiring the wheel stops at the edge of pavement with no overhang on a sidewalk or landscaping. Mr. Turner said this was correct. Mr. Franklin said if the applicant could provide enough sidewalk outside to allow for an overhang of the vehicle and not impede pedestrian traffic or ADA accessibility, it would make sense to allow the applicant's interpretation.

Angela Weeks said parking requirements and wheel stops would be more of a visual thing to her in relation to being consistent with the existing parking area.

Vice-Chair Claus reopened the public hearing for additional comments from the applicant.

Mr. Brittell said the applicant would desire the edge of the pavement to have a curb and wheel stops. According to Staff's interpretation, they would need to have the curb and then 3 feet of asphalt running out into the landscaping. Instead of grass they would have asphalt or two curbs. For what purpose would you have two curbs? The applicant recommends there only be one curb. If Staff's interpretation prevails, they would have broken wheel stops three feet in the asphalt. Drainage is important and the water has to drain naturally down to the swales. They propose the area closest to South Sherwood Boulevard be curb with cut-outs occasionally for the drainage.

Mr. Bechtold said they are talking about two different areas, one area with sidewalks and one area with landscaping. Mr. Brittell said this was correct. Against the building would be with sidewalks.

Vice-Chair Claus closed the public hearing for further discussion by the Commission.

The Commission discussed at length whether it would be appropriate to continue this application to allow the applicant and Staff to come to a consensus regarding the parking standards. Vice-Chair Claus asked the Commission if they wanted further clarification from Staff regarding the parking. The Commission decided to continue with their deliberations.

The Commission discussed modifying the Code to make the parking standards more clear. Staff said any changes to the Development Code would go through the plan text amendment process.

Mr. Franklin said Staff has provided their interpretation of the Code and it is incumbent upon the Commission to deal with the application, either agreeing with Staff or agreeing with the applicant. Vice-Chair Claus said the intent of the wheel stop is to keep a vehicle from going off of the pavement and doing any damage. Mr. Franklin said the applicant is willing to build an additional 3 feet of sidewalk and visually, he felt this would look a lot better. He would rather see landscaping than a parking lot.

Vice-Chair Claus said the Commission is dealing with the Code and there does not seem to be a lot of flexibility. To change the Code would require two separate public hearings. Mr. Brittell said the Code does allow an applicant to appeal the Planning Director's decision, based on interpretation, to the Commission.

Mr. Bechtold said the water runoff in the area surrounding the church area is a problem. Vice-Chair Claus said the application is for an addition to an existing building. The contributory runoff being created by this addition is being handled by the swale which the church will be providing. Mr. Turner said this development is not really impacting the area. Mr. Bechtold said the water problem is a dilemma and he did not have a solution for it. Mr. Franklin agreed that the current application is not contributing to the water runoff, and probably the existing, upper parking lot does increase the water runoff. Mr. Bechtold said his question is whether the surrounding property owners are being adversely affected by the project. Mr. Turner said the Staff Report findings are that this addition is not adversely affecting surrounding property owners. Vice-Chair Claus said the City cannot solve these kinds of civil disputes. It is different if it is directly related to a development problem and is a part of the application procedure. This does not seem to be the case with this addition to the church. Representatives from the church said they are willing to work with the adjoining property owners. The water runoff is a problem in the area and it not directly attributable to the church addition.

The Commission agreed that they could not condition the water runoff problem on this application.

Mr. Tuck said South Sherwood Boulevard is a collector which would have a 10-foot visual landscape corridor. The Code states, "In residential developments where fences are typically desired adjoining the above-described major streets, the corridor may be placed in the road right-of-way between the property line and the sidewalk." The City's capital improvement project will include a landscape strip, trees and bike path. Staff determined this would be ample for a visual landscape corridor. The church site also has extensive landscaping. Mr. Franklin said there are sites on either side of the institutional/public zoned property, and if these sites were further developed they would be required to provide a landscape corridor separate from the City's capital improvement project. Staff is saying the visual landscape corridor does not apply because the site is zoned Institutional/Public (IP). Mr. Tuck said it is not because of the zoning, but because landscaping already exists.

Mr. Franklin said he did not know what improvements are planned for South Sherwood Boulevard. Mr. Tuck said the project would include a meandering bike path with a landscape strip which would vary from a 5 to 10 feet in width. The project is not fully designed at this

time. Staff is not making a requirement for the visual corridor because of the existing landscaping, and the landscaping being provided for within the right-of-way.

Mr. Turner said Staff would check with the Engineering Department to see if a letter will be sent to the church regarding the capital improvement project for South Sherwood Boulevard.

Scott Franklin moved the Planning Commission approve SP 97-12/CUP 97-4 Sherwood Community Friends Church Addition Site Plan based on findings of fact, Staff review, agency comments, public testimony, and revisions to Condition #3 and Condition #4. Seconded by Angela Weeks.

The Commission asked that Condition #3 be read. Mr. Franklin added that no plants or other features in the 3 foot overhang shall exceed 6 inches in height. Mr. Turner read the revised Condition #3 as follows:

3. The parking stalls shall meet the minimum requirements of 9 feet x 20 feet as specified by the Development Code. A 3-foot overhang is permitted over the sidewalk so long as a sidewalk is provided that meets ADA requirements. Additionally, a 3-foot overhang is permitted over landscape areas. No landscaping or features over 6-inches high shall be permitted in the overhang area.

Scott Franklin moved to amend the original motion to include Condition #3 as read. Seconded by George Bechtold.

Vote for Passage of Amendment to Motion: 4-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain

Vote for Passage of Motion: 3-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain (Bechtold)

SP 97-12/CUP 97-4 was approved, including the following changes to Condition #4:

4. Access to the facility shall be provided by means of a private sidewalk. The private sidewalk shall connect the ground floor entrance with the public sidewalk or curb of the public street. The private sidewalk shall be deferred until completion of the capital improvement project for South Sherwood Boulevard.

Vice-Chair Claus recessed the meeting at 9:10 PM for a break and reconvened the meeting at 9:15 PM.

7. Other Business

7A. Pacific Lumber - Conditions of Approval (SP 93-4)

Vice-Chair Claus said Staff has requested direction from the Commission on how to proceed with Pacific Lumber meeting the conditions of approval, in particular the approved building facade and sewer connection. Mr. Turner said Staff met with representatives of Pacific Lumber

with no conclusion. Mr. Franklin said the City may want to allow Pacific Lumber a certain number of days to comply. This should be by a letter from the City or City Attorney.

The Commission directed Staff to contact the City Attorney regarding how to proceed with a notice to the owner of Pacific Lumber to comply. Their occupancy permit would be reviewed by the Commission at the next available meeting to meet noticing requirements.

SUB 97-6 Edgewood Subdivision

Greg Turner referred the Commission to the January 20, 1998 memo from Staff. The Edgewood preliminary plat was approved on September 2, 1997, as a 17-lot subdivision for single family detached and attached units. The applicant has approached the City with the intention of reducing the number of lots to 14 and constructing single family detached homes. The street would remain as approved. In the recent past, other subdivision final plats have been changed which are similar to this requested change. Staff would like a decision from the Commission whether a new review and public hearing would be required.

Vice-Chair Claus announced she had a business relationship with the applicant and may have a potential conflict of interest. However, she did not have any direct financial interest in this particular subdivision.

The Commission concurred that this change did not need another public hearing. The Commission would review the changes with the final plat submittal.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Department