



P.O. Box 167  
Sherwood, Oregon 97140  
625-5522                      625-5523

## PUBLIC NOTICE

The Sherwood Planning Commission will meet on Thursday, April 4, 1985 at 7:30 p.m. in the School District Board Room, 400 N. Sherwood Blvd.

The Planning Commission will continue their discussion of the Design Review Standards in the Special Industrial Area.

The public is invited to attend.

# **APPROVED MINUTES**

Planning Commission Meeting  
Minutes  
April 4, 1985

The meeting of the Sherwood Planning Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Dwight Minthorne at 7:40 p.m. David Crowell, Gene Birchill and Mo Turner were also present. Sally Rose Consulting Planner of Benkendorf & Associates was also present.

Sally Rose gave a run down of what was discussed and decided at the previous meetings with regard to the Special Industrial District. She stated that the purpose of the meeting tonight is to deal with setbacks and design standards. She stated that she reviewed the codes from several other jurisdictions and from the discussion that were previously held she tried to come up with a standard. Sally Rose then reviewed the setback that she came up with. She proposed a 50' setback with no parking. The Community Design Standards deal with the screening and buffering. No. 2 states that there is a need for setting up standards for peripheral screening and buffering. No. 3 states that in any instance where you can do less than the Design Review standards they will do the Design Review standards. No. 4 lists what material could be used for screening and buffering. In the event you plant screening that only grows 3 feet high then you need 50 feet in width. If you do something that is 6 feet high then you need 40 feet in width, etc. The last sentence states that if you choose one of the above options other than the straight 50 feet then one-half of the landscaping has to be of that maximum width. No. 5 states that any unsightly activity within an industrial area shall be located on the interior portions and shall be screened from public view. Sally Rose stated that she came up with 40 percent for lot coverage. The language under "Berms" same from one of the other codes. The slope may be too steep and might need to be changed. Nos. 2 and 3 may be all that is necessary for this section.

Mr. Birchill felt that there were codes that dealt with the amount of slope. He felt that there was some discussion about having a setback of more than 50 feet with no buffer. He also felt that the words, "at least" should be used all the way through Section G 4.

There was discussion held as to whether there should be a mixture of plantings with varying heights, and whether they should address density. The Planning Commission members then discussed whether they needed to hide the area with landscaping or whether they wanted this to be a campus style development with open areas. The general discussion was that they wanted an attractive building with landscaped area around.

Mr. Givens felt that he had envisioned that they would come up with an ordinance that had some flexibility for designers. He felt that the model of the Clackamas County ordinance with more distance was a good one. He did not feel there would be a problem with the 50' standard.

Discussion was held as to making the requirement 50' and allowing exceptions for a developer to meet. Sally Rose stated that the Design Review Board has the latitude in reviewing plans to either increase or decrease standards without making the applicant obtain a variance if the majority of the Board feel that the intent of the standards is being meant. Mr. Crowell was concerned that if you have a minimum standard that is all you will get.

Mr. Birchill was concerned with the dense screening as far as police and fire protection were concerned. He felt that they could word this so that it could be reviewed by the Design Review Board. Sally Rose stated that there are already Design Review standards that deal with buffering and screening.

Sally Rose asked what they would want as a minimum. There was agreement that the 50 feet would be the standard and this could be reduced to as little as 35 feet with the approval of the Design Review Board. It was decided to delete paragraph G 4 and substitute language dealing with the 50 foot requirement or allowing the Design Review Board to make exceptions with plantings, berms, fences and large trees down to 35 feet.

Discussion was then held as to parking lots. Mr. Crowell felt that there should be the setback, parking and then the building. Mr. Turner felt that there would be too much waste of land. Mr. Minthorne did not feel that they should state where the parking lots should be. Sally Rose suggested that the issue could be addressed when a decision was made as to whether to allow a 35 or 50 foot setback. There was consensus of the Planning Commission, with the exception of Dave Crowell, that there be a maximum 50' setback and a minimum of 35' if certain standards are met.

Discussion was then held as to the lot coverage. Sally Rose felt that the ground floor areas of the building could not total more than forty percent. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to leave this paragraph as written.

Mr. Crowell suggested they set a minimum standard for landscaping. After discussion it was the consensus of the Planning Commission to use twenty percent as a requirement for minimum landscaping of the gross site.

There was discussion as to whether it was necessary to include berms. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to delete Section I.

The Planning Commission members felt that they wanted to have a meeting to go over the draft of the Special Industrial District.

Sally Rose advised the Planning Commission that she had met with LCDC and 1000 Friends of Oregon. Sally Rose stated that in addition to those things discussed as the last three

meetings she will include suggestions made by them. Their concern is that there is a mechanism that focuses on the purpose of retaining large lots. They want something with regard to the Planning Commission reviewing absorption rates and determining the need for uses on the smaller lots.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary L. Holland, Minutes  
Secretary