



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

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Sherwood Planning commission will meet on Thursday,
April 18, 1985 at 7:30 p.m. in the School District Board Room,
400 N. Sherwood Blvd.

Discussion will be final review of the Special Industrial
Area.

The public is invited to attend.

APPROVED MINUTES

Sherwood Planning Commission
Minutes
April 18, 1985

The meeting of the Sherwood Planning Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Dwight Minthorne at 7:35 p.m. Planning Commission members, Sally Howard, Gene Birchill, Dave Crowell and Mo Turner were also present. Sally Rose, Consulting Planner of Bekendorf & Associates was also present.

Mr. Minthorne asked for any corrections or additions to the minutes of March 7, 1985. Mr. Crowell stated that there was a statement in the first paragraph where Sally Rose was explaining the special industrial district zoning and she states that this zoning can be applied to a number of different areas in the City. Mr. Crowell stated that this was straightened out later in the meeting and this zoning only applies to the southwest industrial area and asked that the minutes reflect this. It was agreed to delete that statement made by Sally and state that this can be applied only to the southwest industrial area. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Mr. Minthorne asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of March 21, 1985. Mr. Crowell asked that the minutes be corrected on the first page, last paragraph, to clarify that he was referring to a 50' width for landscape area separating any non industrial area from surrounding uses. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Sally Rose advised that the document she mailed out was what she felt that the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council would be for a Special Industrial District. She stated that she used the draft submitted by Mr. Rick Givens, the comments from the three hearings held and the comments from LCDC and 1000 Friends. The first eight pages are the special industrial zone and the ninth page is where the PUD section of the code will have to be amended. She talked with Jim Sitzman from LCDC and Bob Stacy from 1000 Friends of Oregon. Sally Rose then reviewed the concerns brought up by 1000 Friends. On page 1, the last sentence, regarding conflicting standards; they wanted everyone to be aware that the ability of an appropriate review body to be lenient with the code has to be approved by LCDC. On page 2, Item C 3, they did not feel this was in line with the intent of the SI designation. Sally Rose advised that this was a part of Washington County's code. On page 3, in the section of ancilliary uses, they felt that some of the uses were extra emphasized. Mr. Sitzman was concerned as to how to make sure the uses are ancilliary and limit the amount of percentages. On page 6, L(1a) is a paragraph that addresses the concerns that were brought up at a meeting with LCDC, 1000 Friends and Jim Rapp as to whether large parcels of land would be available. Sally Rose explained that Washington County had the tier system which she felt was too complicated for Sherwood. 1000 Friends wanted some language to assure that these large areas would be

available for development. This paragraph states that the Planning Commission would also look at any PUD already approved and at the supporting uses that were approved for that PUD to see that 60% had been developed. Those two things would have to occur before another PUD could be granted in another thirty acre SI area.

Mr. Crowell felt that the setback requirements should be kept to 50' and parking could be in the reduced area. After discussion by the Planning Commission it was agreed that what Sally Rose had written was what they had agreed upon.

Mr. Rick Givens felt that the last paragraph on page 6 with regard to the 60% could be changed to add, "or is supported by new additional primary uses". He felt that if one person did a poor job of marketing his development the next person should not have to suffer because of that. He felt that by showing definite primary uses you should be able to allow supporting uses. Sally Rose agreed that that could be a problem and stated that she would talk with 1000 Friends about changing this language.

Mr. Givens recommended language that stated, "or demonstrate that additional supporting commercial and industrial uses are supported by a new or additional planned primary use."

Mr. Givens was also concerned about ancilliary uses being made a conditional use. He felt that there was a problem in showing that there was a public need for the use and that the public needs are best served by allowing the conditional use. The ancilliary uses are already listed and there should not be a need for additional hearing process. Sally Rose stated that she went through all the minutes and notes and she wrote what the Planning Commission had agreed upon. The fact that this district is set up for such a special purpose and Design Review is supposed to be for designs, the conditional use review would be an appropriate extra review to take. It may not be the best way to do it but it is a good extra review step. Mr. Givens recommended that the language say, "ancilliary uses are permitted subject to findings by the Design Review Board".

The Planning Commission members discussed whether they should allow some of these uses outright instead of making them ancilliary uses. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to make the following changes:

1. Move "Parcel delivery service" from Ancillary Uses to Planned Unit Development, Section 2d.
2. Government and special district facilities shall become 2e and removed from Ancillary Uses.
3. Change 2d, Planned Unit Development, to state, "..... include uses listed in b, c and d above...."
4. In Section D, Ancillary Uses, add language stating, "An ancillary use is a use that is contained within the same business premises and accessory and incidental to the uses permitted by right in Section C1, 2 and 3." Delete the last

In Section Da delete, "contained within the same business premise, accessory and incidental to the permitted use".

6. Delete the words, "storage and distribution" from the first paragraph, Section A.

7. In Section H, Height of Structures, change the word "locate" to "setback".

Sally Rose stated that she would pursue the language with regard to the requirements of 1000 Friends and LCDC. The Planning Commission members asked for a copy of the draft that will be submitted to the City Council.

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.



Mary L. Holland, Minutes
Secretary