

SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

October 20, 1983

AGENDA

- I. Reading/Approval of Minutes of October 6, 1983
- II. Announcements/Correspondence
- III. Directors Report
- IV. Review of Draft Planned Light Industrial Designation Area Standards.
- V. Next Meeting Agenda.

Note: Commissioners are reminded to bring Part 3 of the Community Development Code and the previously distributed copy of Washington County's Special Industrial District Standards.

2.17 PLANNED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION AREA (PLI)

A. Purpose

The purpose of the Planned Light Industrial Designation area is:

1. To protect and enhance development opportunities for industrial uses which may require large sites in a planned campus industrial park setting;
2. To provide the opportunity for small and medium size industrial uses to locate in proximity to large single user industrial uses;
3. To provide an opportunity for the market place to demonstrate actual development through the industrial lot size requirements demanded by industrial uses.
4. To preserve large lots for single major industrial uses until such a time as there is no demonstrated demand or need for such large lots.
5. To attract and sustain capital and labor intensive industrial activities that create minimal adverse environmental effects on surrounding uses.

B. Standards

1. Minimum Area for PLI Designation
The minimum area that may be designated PLI shall be 50 contiguous acres.
2. Access/Parcelization
Areas designated PLI shall have adequate and convenient access to an arterial street and should have relatively few separate ownerships to facilitate consolidation.
3. Peripheral Setbacks
Building setbacks along the outside periphery of the PLI designation area shall be as follows:

<u>ABUTTING PROPERTY</u>	<u>MINIMUM SETBACK</u>
Residential Designation Area	50 feet
Non-Residential Designation Area	20 feet
Roadways	20 feet

4. Master Plan
Prior to the issuance of any development permit within the PLI designation area, a Master Plan must be processed and approved for the entire area so designated. The Master Plan shall consist of the following:

- a. Plan Map showing:
- (1) Surrounding area within 1,000 feet of the boundaries of the PLI designation area boundaries.
 - (2) Relationship between the PLI area uses and adjoining existing and planned uses.
 - (3) Natural features of the area including topography; water ways; significant vegetation and natural hazards.
 - (4) Major existing and planned roadways serving the area.
 - (5) Major existing and planned water, sewer, drainage, and private utility facilities serving the area.
 - (6) Existing parcelization, ownership information, easements and other development restrictions present on the site.
 - (7) PLI development subarea boundaries including minimum site area size limitations for industrial planned unit developments and their constituent lots and other special regulations applicable to the respective subareas.

b. Written Program

Narrative description of the information depicted on the Master Plan Map including an explanation and justification for subarea site development standards in relation to the following development factors:

- b1. Compatibility of the density and use standards in the PLI area as a whole and its subareas with surrounding existing and planned uses.
- b2. Adequacy of access and utilities.
- b3. Protection of significant natural features.
- b4. Protection from natural hazards.

c. Plan Approval/Amendment

Initial approval and subsequent amendment of the PLI Master Plan shall be consistent with procedures for review of a major plan amendment contained in Chapter 1, Section 3.02 A of this Part.

5. Industrial Planned Unit Developments

a. PUD Procedure Required

No development shall be permitted except within industrial planned unit developments (PUDs) approved pursuant to Chapter 2, Section 3.00 of this part.

b. Minimum PUD area

Industrial PUDs shall have the minimum site area specified for the subarea within the PLI Master Plan.

6. Permitted Uses

The following uses are permitted within the PLI designation area provided they are sited within industrial planned unit developments approved pursuant to Section B5 above and they meet the environmental performance standards contained in Chapter 2, Section 4.02 of this Part.

- a. Development, manufacture assembly packaging and other treatment of small products prepared from finished or semi-finished materials:
- (1) Communication equipment, electronic equipment and supplies.
 - (2) Scientific and precision instruments and equipment.
 - (3) Engineering laboratory, scientific and research instruments.
 - (4) Electro-medical apparatus, bio-medical, surgical and medical instruments, artificial limbs, hearing aids, dentures, ophthalmic goods, and other medical or dental devices.
 - (5) Electrical appliances such as refrigerators, freezers, washing machines and dryers.
 - (6) Bicycles
 - (7) Cabinets
 - (8) Chainsaws
 - (9) Small electric generators
 - (10) Small electric motors
 - (11) Furniture
 - (12) Ladders
 - (13) Lawnmowers
 - (14) Marine pleasure craft
 - (15) Heating and cooling equipment
 - (16) Mattresses
 - (17) Rototillers
 - (18) Sashes and doors
 - (19) Signs and display structures
 - (20) Vending machines
 - (21) Windows
 - (22) Small products manufactured from the following materials: bone, hair, fur, leather, feathers, textiles, plastics, glass, wood, paper, cork, wire, tobacco, rubber, precious or semi-precious stones and similar small products composed of previously prepared or semi-finished materials.
 - (23) Bakery goods, candy, cosmetics, toiletries, pharmaceuticals.
 - (24) Small electrical appliances, such as radios, televisions, photographs, office machines and including the manufacture of small parts for such appliances.
 - (25) Manufacture of musical instruments, toys and novelties.
 - (26) Other similar related light industrial use if approved pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 1.05

- b. Light metal fabrication (involving finished or semi finished metals) including sheet metal fabrication or stainless steel fabrication machine shop.
- c. Research and Development:
 - (1) Research and development laboratories.
 - (2) Industrial trade of skill schools and training centers.
- d. Processing
 - (1) Photographic laboratories, blue printing, photoengraving, photocopying, printing, publishing and bookbinding, including on-site commercial service associated with said use.
- e. Ancillary Uses:
 - (1) Cafeteria, cafe, restaurant or auditorium for employees, contained within the same business premises, accessory and incidental to the permitted use.
 - (2) Parcel delivery service.
 - (3) Administrative, professional, and business office uses accessory to and associated with permitted industrial uses on the site.
 - (4) Retail outlets for warehousing or manufacturing operations, limited to 10% of total floor area.
 - (5) Recreation facilities solely for employees.
 - (6) Government and special district facilities.
 - (7) Temporary Uses as provided for in Chapter 2, Section 11.00
 - (8) Day care for employees' families.
 - (9) Transit stations or park and ride lots.

7. Lot Dimensions

- a. The minimum lot area within approved PUDs shall be that lot size specified for the appropriate subarea in the Master Plan.
- b. Minimum lot widths at the front property lines and building lines shall be 100 feet.

8. Setback Requirements

- a. Peripheral Setbacks
 - Building setbacks within PUDs along the outside periphery of the PLI Master Plan Designation Area shall meet the requirements in Section B3 above.
- b. Interior Setbacks
 - b1. Front yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 20 feet.

- b2. There shall be no minimum rear or side yard setback except that buildings on adjoining lots shall maintain a minimum separation of 10 feet.
- b3. Building setbacks on streets facing sides of corner lots shall be a minimum of 20 feet.

c. Building Separation
Buildings on a single lot shall maintain a minimum separation of 10 feet.

9. Height of Structures

Except as otherwise provided, the maximum height of structures shall be 50 feet except that structures within 100 feet of a residential designation area shall be limited to the height requirements of the residential area.

10. Community Design Standards

Except as provided in this section, parking, loading, access and egress, signs, landscaping and site design shall conform to standards contained in Chapter 2, Section 9.00 of this Part.

11. Flood Plain District.

Areas within the 100 year flood plain shall be subject to the supplementary standards and procedures contained in Chapter 2, Section 4.03 of this Part.

APPROVED MINUTES

Sherwood Planning Commission
Minutes
October 20, 1983

The meeting was called to order by the Vice Chairman, Dave Crowell. In attendance at the meeting were Dave Crowell, Dwight Minthorne, Arthur J. Horne, Jr., Sally Howard, Cathy Navarra, Gene Stewart and Todd Dugdale.

The minutes of the previous meeting of October 6, 1983 were approved as presented.

Todd Dugdale stated that there were no announcements or correspondence. He did advise the members of the planning commission that an advertisement had been placed for a planning consultant for the city. Mr. Dugdale invited any of the commission members to sit in on the interviews and to address any questions or the qualifications of any of the applicants. The scope of work for the consultant would be to provide staff work on routine development applications submitted to the city, conduct pre-application interviews, distributing application materials, interpreting code, preparation of staff reports and follow-up on decisions made by the planning commission and the council. Mr. Dugdale made the suggestion that the commission identify some special projects it would like undertaken by a consultant. Sally Howard offered to sit in on the interviews as a representative of the planning commission.

Mr. Dugdale advised that the construction projects previously reported on were moving along towards completion. The Cedar Creek trunk is almost completed, the Murdock Road easements have been finalized and should proceed in the next 30 - 60 days. The Willamette Street project will probably have a spring start up. A new well site acquisition is proceeding in conjunction with the Murdock Road project. Mr. Dugdale further advised that he had not had any new reports from Metro on the Southwest Corridor Study regarding the Norwood By-pass route.

Mr. Dugdale advised that the Urban Services Study, which cities in Washington County and other special districts had undertaken with the help of Portland State University, had its first draft complete. He felt that when this study is released it could have a significant impact. The first phase of the study compares cost between jurisdictions for providing certain services. They are compared by dollars spent for delivered services, dollars per assessed valuation and dollars per capita.

Gene Stewart brought up the fact that Multnomah County had their adult business ordinance rejected by the Land Use Board of Appeals because of unreasonable standards between the adult business and other uses. Mr. Dugdale stated that the Sherwood ordinance was going to have to be carefully written.

The meeting was then turned over to Gene Stewart. He questioned whether the city or state had plans to do something about the traffic problems at six corners. Mr. Stewart felt that maybe the planning commission could make a recommendation to the city council that something be done with the traffic problem at that intersection.

Discussion was then had on the draft of the planned Light Industrial Designation Area standards. Mr. Dugdale explained that there was a need by the city to develop its own standards to be applied to the Couthwest Industrial Area upon its annexation to the city. The area in question is the area that has been designated as a Special Industrial District by Washington County under their urban plan process. He felt that Sherwood needed their own version of standards that were consistent with the city council's process and decision in supporting the redesignation of that property. The concern expressed by many was the effectiveness of controls in that area in terms of the type of uses permitted and the community design criteria that was used to assure compatability with adjoining uses. Mr. Dugdale further stated that commission members were previously given the county's special industrial district overlay and those regulations were quite complex. He felt that these regulations needed to be simplified and that was the purpose of the draft that was being reviewed tonight. The purposes listed are very similar to the county plan and there are a couple of additional purposes. Mr. Dugdale then read over his plan with the commission.

Dave Crowell questioned who would be writing the master plan for the area. Mr. Dugdale explained that anyone who could initiate a planned amendment could initiate a master plan proposal such as a property owner or a group of property owners or even the city.

Gene Stewart questioned whether the plan could be written so a condominium approach could be taken. Mr. Dugdale explained that the plan was designed for separate ownerships; on the order of an industrial park.

Mr. Dugdale explained that he had broadened the scope of uses in the types of industries allowed. In allowing the manufacture of products from prepared and semi-finished materials the process would be done inside and there would be no outside storage of materials. They would also have to meet the environmental performance standards which are specified in the existing code.

Mr. and Mrs. Craig Keeler introduced themselves to the commission. Mrs. Keeler explained that they were the owners of American Hardwoods and that they were interested in expanding in the Sherwood area and in fact were looking at the property being discussed tonight. They explained their manufacturing process and felt that they could qualify as a light industrial

manufacturer.

Mr. Dugdale explained that he invited the Keelers to come so that the commission could get a private firms' view and concerns in looking at the city as a place to locate a business.

Mr. Keeler explained that what they would be looking for would be a water supply, sewer system, railroad access and affordability.

Mr. Lee Gensman questioned why it was not possible to write goals as to what is desired in the community as far as appearance, noise, traffic, employees per acre, what services might be required and then determine the level of effect of those various criteria and not worry about whether the product produced was small, medium or large as long as it was entirely built in a factory. He felt that the type of planning that determines what types of products and uses are allowed would be an impossible task.

Mr. Dugdale then introduced Mr. Lee Gensman as a professional engineer, real estate broker and had been involved in Tualatin planning for many years. Mr. Gensman stated that he felt the wrong approach was being taken in planning when you try and tell people what they can do.

Mr. Dugdale then finished reviewing the draft of the planned light industrial designation area.

Discussion was had as to whether the uses mentioned in the draft would be the only uses allowed or whether other uses similar to those mentioned would be allowed. It was felt that there should be some requirement as to whether outside storage would be allowed, how waste would be disposed of, common wall buildings, maintenance of landscape area and the possible requirement of a sprinkler system.

Mr. Gensman stated that he felt this plan had some attraction and several limitations in attracting the type of business that was desired. He felt that there were some problems because of Sherwood's location and the fact that there was no close freeway, lack of airport, railroad and truck facilities. If Sherwood wants industrial growth they have to have standards that this type of industry can live with.

Sally Howard stated that this special industrial zone was a compromise between the people in the area and the city and she agreed with the points that Mr. Gensman had brought out.

Mr. Keeler stated that not every industry could be a "Tektroniz" and what was wrong with other industry as long as all environmental standards were met.

Mr. Stewart thanked everyone for coming out and speaking to the commission. It was decided that the commission should have additional discussion on the points brought out at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Stewart questioned if the school district could be pushed into picking out their future school sites and maybe it would help if the planning commission would send them a letter.

Meeting adjourned.



Mary Holland