

City of Sherwood, Oregon  
Planning Commission Meeting  
October 6, 1992

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call:** Vice-Chairman Ruehl called the meeting to order at approximately 7:30 p.m. Commission members present were: Marjorie Stewart, Marty Ruehl, Ken Shannon, and Glen Warmbier. Chairman Birchill was absent due to illness, and Ms. Hosler was absent on vacation. Planning Director Carole Connell and Secretary Kathy Cary were also present.

2. **Minutes of August 4, 1992, and September 15, 1992 meetings:**

Ms. Stewart noted that on Pages 6 and 13, Mr. Turner's name is Wilton.

Ms. Stewart moved, seconded by Mr. Warmbier, that the minutes of the August 4, 1992, meeting be approved. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Warmbier stated that he had questions regarding the minutes of the September 15th meeting. He inquired as to whether the City had gotten a ruling from the State Water Resources regarding the Claus property. Ms. Connell responded that she had brought all their questions to the attention of City Manager Rapp. Mr. Rapp was confident the State permits already received were adequate.

Ms. Stewart questioned when the houses are built on the side of the Claus' property, what happens because we have not required sidewalks be installed on Claus' development. Ms. Connell responded that approved preliminary subdivision plans include sidewalks.

Mr. Warmbier moved, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that the minutes of the September 15th meeting be approved as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

3. **Public Hearings:**

**A.SP92-6, Sherwood Business Park Site Plan review for an industrial business park on North Highway 99W:**

Mr. Ruehl opened the hearing, read the Hearing Disclosure Statement, and called for a staff report.

- Ms. Connell reported that this Site Plan review was continued from the September 15th Commission meeting at the applicant's request to allow them time to meet with ODOT to resolve problems with street improvements, shared access driveways, acceleration lanes, etc.
- Ms. Connell noted that this is a six-acre parcel on Highway 99W, which is zoned light industrial. The applicant proposes to build a business park to serve light industries, such as contractors and small incubator business who will become tenants of the complex. Under consideration at this time are Phases I, II and III. A future series of building additions will have to come back before the Commission for site plan approval.
- Ms. Connell stated that one concern is that there is no off street loading. Loading for each business is to occur in front of the garage door, which will create problems when someone is trying to back out of a parking space where there is insufficient space to do so because of the vehicle being unloaded.
- Regarding highway access, Ms. Connell pointed out that ODOT requested the applicant provide a transportation impact study, one-half street improvements and initially a design which will allow a shared access to the north. However, after meeting with ODOT, Ms. Connell said the applicant and ODOT should use an access at the southern end of the development. This will require traffic to utilize a median left turn, proceed south, and then exit the highway using a right turn lane.
- Ms. Connell noted that the City has previously not required sidewalks and curbs on Highway 99; however at the discretion of the Commission, sidewalks and curbs may be required. New State transportation rules will require the City to consider alternative pedestrian routes as well as bike paths. Therefore, the Planning Staff recommends that the applicant be required to provide sidewalks, which may be phased in as the property develops.
- Ms. Connell indicated that how the property is to be maintained and managed has not been determined. It is assumed there will be an on-site manager. She suggested the Commission consider requiring the applicant to provide a title report when a change of ownership occurs. She then recommended that SP 92-6 be

approved with the conditions outlined in the staff report, as verbally amended.

Vice-Chairman Ruehl opened the hearing for proponent testimony.

Mr. Brian Keicher, 3801 SW Olson Court, Lake, Oswego, addressed the Commission. Mr. Keicher stated that it is the desire of the owner to construct a nice-looking business park at the entrance of the City limits of the City of Sherwood. The 25-foot landscaped corridor is designed to include a grass berm. The applicant wishes to develop the site to accommodate a 75,000-square foot complex, which can hold 70,000 square feet of building. He noted that the reason for phasing is confusing, the applicant will build a 960-square foot complex as Phase I, and as the market demands, will expand.

Mr. Keicher indicated that the complex is designed to attract small contractors, but individual units can be expanded into larger areas if the need arises and the market indicates the venture will be successful.

In answer to Ms. Connell comment regarding loading docks, Mr. Keicher stated that tenants will back into the garage door bay to unload. He also stated that the drainage sewer is expected to run through the building to a septic tank, then to an effluent tank and eventually be pumped into the drain field. The drain field will be developed as the square footage of the buildings are added.

Mr. Keicher noted that ODOT wants the tenants to utilize a joint approach since ODOT is trying to limit access areas to every 800 feet. It seems logical to have access after seeing and passing the building. Criteria for access at 99W is very restrictive because of sight distances. Mr. Keicher indicated that the applicant is comfortable utilizing the turn-around through the median, then exiting Highway 99 via a right-turn exit. He noted that ODOT's approval is required prior to working on the highway, and requested that the Commission authorize some flexibility in the requirement for improving the full 1000-foot strip with sidewalks and curbs.

In response to Ms. Stewart's inquiry as to whether the applicant intended to utilize the development as storage units, Mr. Keicher advised that the applicant intends to have an on-site leasing agent and manager in the front office, which will control the complex. Tenants will be required to sign a lease, which will control the use of the units. Mr.

Keicher indicated that the target-market for the complex will

be the small architectural firms or contractors who are not able to afford larger office space. He noted that the buildings will be of masonry and not conducive to use as storage units.

In reply to the questions as to where the main sewer trunk line was to run and the plan for interior restroom drains, Ms. Connell answered that the trunk will run into Cedar Creek drainage. Mr. Keicher indicated that this type of operation is not meant to be a garage, it is a warehouse with a regular bathroom. He further stated that units will not be air conditioned, unless the tenant wishes to pay for it; however, the units will be insulated and if needed, the tenant can use a space heater for warmth. The tenant's lease controls their use of signs or logos.

Mr. Warmbier expressed his concern over the sewer issues and questioned what will be drained into it and where it will drain. Mr. Keicher stated that plans have been developed for the drain field and that when the City sewer is extended to that area, the owner will be required to hook into the sewer.

On the question of sidewalks and curbs, Mr. Keicher stated that when the first building is built, the owner would like to improve some frontage with the first section; improvements to the south would correspond with the development of the east side of the property. Mr. Ruehl suggested that consideration be given to the possibility of an entrance ramp or acceleration lane in front of the drainage area. Mr. Keicher stated that the state views that area as a future bike path.

Mr. Ruehl questioned whether there would be sufficient room for a 40-foot semi truck to unload in front of any of the units. Mr. Keicher responded that a semi truck should not be in the area.

Ms. Stewart questioned how the occupancy use of the units will be controlled. Mr. Keicher replied that the use will be controlled by the tenant's lease, which is more restrictive than the zoning code.

For the record, Vice-Chairman Ruehl noted that there were no opponents or proponents and closed the public hearing. He then opened the hearing for questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Warmbier inquired as to whether fences will be required. Ms. Connell responded that no fences are required as part of this project; however, when the remainder of the property is

developed the owner might consider installing fences.

Mr. Warmbier moved, seconded by Mr. Shannon, that based on the findings of facts, that SP 92-6 be approved, subject to the following conditions:

- 1.The owner shall install solid waste storage receptacles in an off-street loading area screened by a six (6) foot high sight-obscuring fence or masonry wall.
- 2.Access to the site shall be relocated to the southern end of the lot, following submittal of a traffic study to ODOT. This private street shall be at least twenty five (25) feet wide.
- 3.The owner shall develop half-street improvements along Highway 99W, including a six (6) foot wide sidewalk with curbs and catch basins meeting ODOT standards. This may be accomplished in three (3) phases as agreed upon by the applicant and the City.
- 4.No signs shall be installed until an administrative sign permit is issued by the City.
- 5.Lighting shall be installed at the entrance to the site and along all sidewalks.
- 6.Each parking stall shall include a four (4) inch tall wheel stop placed three (3) feet back from the forward end of the stall.
- 7.Upon application for building permits, the owner shall submit engineered improvement plans for all utilities, evidence of Fire District approval, an erosion control plan and an on-site water quality facility for approval by the City. Connection fees and system development charges will be assessed when improvements plans are finalized and building permits are requested.
- 8.The owner shall enter into a non-remonstrance agreement with the City to participate in a Local Improvement District (LID) for future sewer improvements.
- 9.The owner shall provide an alternative landscape plan for City staff review and approval, in the event that the proposed street trees can not be planted in the BPA easement.
- 10.To the greatest extent practicable, the owner shall

preserve the stand of maple trees along the north boundary of the site, and the four walnut trees in the southwestern corner of the site.

11.A final site plan shall be submitted to the City which includes all required conditions of approval.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. **Directors Report:**

Ms. Connell brought the following items to the attention of the Commissioners:

a. Draft of "Sherwood Comprehensive Plan Vision for the Future."

Ms. Connell provided an extensive overview of the "Vision" plan. She noted that the plan had also been discussed by the City Council at their meeting of September 23, and the Council requested that this be reviewed and expanded to include additional issues that surfaced as a result of the draft. She stated that Council President Hitchcock proposed a joint meeting with the Planning Commission in February 1992 to further discuss the "Vision" document. Ms. Connell requested that the Commissioners also provide topics of concern which should be included or expanded in the Comprehensive Plan. Suggestions were: increase density of housing (low-income and apartments), current roads do not accommodate current traffic, and allocation of greenspaces.

Ms. Connell requested that Commission Members review the document and advise of any further items which are pertinent to the study. She noted that the sign ordinance and site plan review requirements are topics which will be reviewed as will the density requirements.

b. LUTRAQ Land Use Elements.

Ms. Connell noted that the LUTRAQ Land Use Element is an ongoing project and Commission members will be updated as it continues.

5. **Director's Report:**

Ms. Connell reported that she had researched the possibility

of changing the day of the Commission meetings. However, she felt there was no other night available for the meeting because of scheduling conflicts with other Boards. It was the consensus that the Planning Commission should continue to meet on Tuesday nights.

In response to Mr. Ruehl's inquiry, Ms. Connell stated that no applications have been received to fill the vacancies on the Planning Commission.

Ms. Connell also reported that the State will be sending a letter to the City advising that Code provisions for historic preservation in Sherwood will not be accepted. She noted that this item will come before LCDC at the meeting in November.

6. FYI:

- a. "An Idea" for an Environmental Campus in Sherwood.
- b. Planning Commissioner's Journal, Fall 1992.

Ms. Connell noted that the above items were included in the packets for information purposes.

7. **Adjourn:**

There being no further items before the Commission, Mr. Shannon moved, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Cary,  
Secretary