

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**September 27, 2016**

---

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

Chair Jean Simson  
Vice Chair Russell Griffin  
Commissioner Chris Flores  
Commissioner Michael Meyer  
Commissioner Alan Pearson

**Staff Present:**

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director  
Bob Galati, City Engineer  
Brad Kilby, Planning Manager  
Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

**Planning Commission Members Absent: Council Members Present:**

Commissioner Rob Rettig  
Commissioner Lisa Walker

None

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chair Jean Simson convened the meeting at 7:01 pm.

**2. Consent Agenda**

None

**3. Council Liaison Announcements**

None

**4. Staff Announcements**

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, asked Commission members to save December 6, 2016 for the Annual Boards and Commissions Meeting and to consider accomplishments, lessons learned, and how the City could support the Planning Commission. He reminded Commissioners of the League of Oregon Cities training on September 29, 2016 and announced a 2016 elections candidate forum on October 5, 2016 at 6:30 pm at Sherwood High School. He stated the Hearing Officer would hold a public hearing with on October 10, 2016 at 6 pm regarding a 13 lot subdivision adjacent to Pacific Hwy, west of Meinecke Road. Mr. Kilby said there would be a public hearing on October 25, 2016 for a rezone of property on Pacific Hwy from General Commercial to Medium Density Residential High. He noted an application had been received for a hotel in Sherwood and advised the Commission to track their exposure to ex parte contact.

**5. Community Comments**

None

Chair Simson moved to the next items on the agenda.

**6. Old Business**

- a. **Public Hearing – SP 16-06 Stormwater Master Plan Update** (continued)
- b. **Public Hearing – SP 16-03 Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Update** (continued)

Note: The Sanitary Sewer Master Plan and the Stormwater Master Plan would be voted on separately, but as they were similar in purpose and proposed language they were presented together by staff.

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement for the two hearings and stated the Planning Commission was to make a recommendation to the City Council. She did not ask for ex parte, bias or conflicts of interest, because the code amendments were legislative. She asked for a staff report.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager said he had nothing new to report and turned the time over to Bob Galati, City Engineer to address the concern over wetland and open space in the Brookman area that had not been calculated into the tables and if there would be a need for additional services provided in the master plans.

Mr. Galati stated master plans were needed for long range planning for the City. He said the updates to the Sanitary Sewer and Stormwater Master Plans were done concurrently, because the process for updates was almost identical. In the last meeting the Commission had questions on Table 2-3 in each of the plans regarding how the open space was shown as zero when it was known wetlands were there. Mr. Galati referred to the memo dated September 20, 2016 and the two adjusted tables found in the packet. He said the description of how the information was garnered, generated and incorporated as well as the logic behind not changing the charts was added. He said it would not change the outcome, but made for a more conservative analysis than if the wetland areas were taken out. Mr. Galati said it did not change the outcome of the sanitary or storm systems and asked for the information to be incorporated into each master plan. He requested the Commission make a recommendation of approval of each of the master plans to City Council.

Chair Simson thanked Mr. Galati and said the clarification would help people looking at the master plan to know where the numbers came from and how they were used. She asked for questions from the Commission or public testimony for either of the proposed master plans. None were received and the public hearing was closed. Staff had no additional comments. The following motions were received.

**Motion: From Vice Chair Griffin to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for PA 16-06 Stormwater Master Plan Update based on the applicant testimony, public testimony received, and the analysis, findings and conditions in the staff report. Seconded by Commissioner Alan Pearson.**

Commissioner Pearson took the opportunity to comment that the best asset the Commission had was its chair. He said asking a probing question resulted in a better report, which would not have been done except for the meticulousness of the chair and the City was lucky to have her.

**All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor.**

**Motion: From Vice Chair Griffin to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for PA 16-07 Sanitary Sewer Master Plan Update based on the applicant testimony, public testimony received, and the analysis, findings and conditions in the staff report. Seconded by Commissioner Alan Pearson. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor.**

Chair Simson moved to the next item on the agenda.

## **7. New Business**

### **a. Public Hearing – SP 16-06/ MLP 16-02 Sentinel Storage Annex Phase II**

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement and asked for ex parte contact, bias or conflicts of interest. Chair Simson disclosed that her ex parte contact was limited to a previous experience serving on the Planning Commission when the Target application was approved. She intended to participate. She asked if any member of the audience wished to challenge any Planning Commission member's ability to participate. None were received. Chair Simson asked for the staff report.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager noted he had received an email from Marilyn Sykes and information related to Chair Simson's questions since the staff report (see Planning record, Exhibit E, F). Mr. Kilby gave a presentation of the staff report regarding the Sentinel Storage Annex Phase II (see record, Exhibit 1). He said the first expansion known as Sentinel Storage Annex was in 2012 with 430 units. He said the subject property was about 21.82 acres along SW Langer Farms Parkway and there were two applications; a minor land partition, or division of land, and a site plan review for the expansion of the storage facility annex to add 436 additional units.

Mr. Kilby explained the proposal to partition the land into two parcels would result in Parcel 1 being 6.14 acres where the proposed additional storage units would be sited and Parcel 2 would be the remaining 15.6 acres. Chair Simson asked if the property owner had indicated what the second parcel would be developed as. Mr. Kilby responded that according to ORS 92.40 those properties involved as part of the 2012 subdivision were vested for 10 years after the approval of the subdivision. The uses approved as part of the PUD 95-1 would be allowed on any of the six lots created at the time. Mr. Kilby noted that fundamentally a PUD had to provide sewer, water and access to each lot. He said the property was zoned Light Industrial (LI) with a PUD overlay and the minimum lot size in the LI zone was 10,000 square feet. The proposed parcels were six acres and fifteen acres which exceeded the minimum lot size. He said the minimum lot width was 100 feet and Parcel 2 would have frontage along SW Century Blvd and Langer Farms Pkwy in excess of 100 feet; Parcel 1, has approximately 537 lineal feet along Langer Farms Parkway. He noted sewer and water were provided from existing services located in Langer Farms Parkway. Mr. Kilby reported the applicant proposed access from a private drive to the existing Sentinel Storage Annex off of Langer Farms Parkway, not from Langer Farms Parkway. He said the emergency access was proposed off of Langer Farms Parkway on the north side of the site which would be gated and closed to the public; accessible by the Fire Department using a Knox Box. He said the storage facility was a mix of enclosed, covered, and climate controlled units.

Mr. Kilby showed the proposed landscaping and explained a minimum canopy of 30% was required in industrial developments; the applicant proposed 31.5%. The visual corridor along Langer Farms Parkway was ten feet wide with street trees and a ten foot wide path. Behind the visual corridor would be additional landscaping as shown in the plans. He said the only required parking was at the office on Tualatin Sherwood Road as most of the people would pull in front of their unit, unload or load so there was no need for additional parking.

Vice Chair Griffin noted that only the south elevation facing the front drive and the west elevation facing Langer Farms Parkway were shown. Mr. Kilby replied that elevations facing north and east were not available. A discussion followed regarding the configuration of the site, determining the buildings along Langer Farms Parkway were connected by gates with intermittent glazing along the buildings.

Mr. Kilby explained the application was to meet four of the six criteria under the industrial design guidelines. He showed that the applicant met the following:

- *A minimum of two building materials used.* They have glass, stone, metal.
- *Maximum thirty-five foot setback for all parts of the building from the property line separating the site from all arterial or collector streets, the visual corridor can be included.* The buildings are twenty feet from the property line.
- *Loading areas are located to the side or rear of the building when viewed from the arterial or collector.* All loading will be interior to the site and would not be visible from the public street. The applicant has proposed landscaping along Langer Farms Parkway to screen the front. The only opportunity to see into the site would be at the emergency access location.

- *All roof-mounted equipment is screened with materials complimentary to the building design materials.*  
The Applicant stated they would not put roof mounted equipment other than climate control which would be behind the roof.

Mr. Kilby noted the Fire Marshal's concerns with the emergency access shown on Langer Farms Parkway, such as the Knox Box, and said those items would be verified at final site plan review. He said the applicant maintained there would be a secure gated fence with controlled access and to his knowledge there had not been a large number of security complaints about the existing Sentinel Storage Annex. He repeated there was no required parking and said the proposal was expected to be a low traffic generator. A traffic study was provided estimating 109 average daily trips; the trigger to review traffic impacts was 400 average daily trips. Mr. Kilby disclosed that the overall development encompassing the construction of Langer Farms Parkway, Century Blvd., the signal at Tualatin Sherwood Road, and the extension of Langer Farms Parkway to 99W would have mitigated the impact from the 109 additional trips, because of the way it was zoned and that the PUD allowed more intense uses with higher traffic loads.

Mr. Kilby pointed out that Ms. Sykes' primary concern was any unit, other than a fully enclosed and secured unit, could easily become a target for vagrants and malicious mischief. She also expressed concerns about the impacts to schools. Mr. Kilby said all of the proposed units would be secure and provided with security, lighting, and controlled access. He had invited her to the hearing, but did not hear back.

Staff recommended approval of the proposal subject to the findings and conditions in the staff report and reminded the Commission that minor land partition approvals were good for a year and site plan approvals were good for two years.

Mr. Kilby explained that Chair Simson's concern was with the original PUD 95-1. Typically the City required an architectural guidebook for how the development would look, but it was lacking in 1995 and the decision was unclear. The decision required commercial retail and residential structures to follow the guidelines from a book with pictures and no standards called the White Porch Society. Mr. Kilby said the design guidelines provided by Chair Simson were in addition to the book (see Planning record, Exhibit F). He explained that in the 2012 application for the Sentinel Storage Annex (SP 12-03) the guidelines were not addressed, because the interpretation at the time was it was an industrial development, not a retail commercial development, and was not subject to the design standards. He said even if the Commission found the property must follow the PUD 95-1 standards they were subjective and he implored the Commission to ensure direct conditions and findings were provided so the applicant knew what the expectations were.

Mr. Kilby gave an example of a commercial design guideline from PUD 95-1 was that a pitched roof was encouraged, but not required. He said because it was as PUD the Commission could ask if the applicant was willing to add a pitched roof to the current application. He pointed out that in the staff report for the Langer Farms Phase 7, which was Gramor's Parkway Village development containing Walmart, the applicant had followed the design guidelines with pitched roofs, wood, glazing and building entrances off of Langer Farms Parkway. Mr. Kilby commented on the Target site where not as many were provided; they went away from the wood requirements and allowed the brick tilt up construction. Then, with the Sentinel Storage Annex (SP 12-03) the Commission decided it was an industrial development and the White Porch Society guidelines and PUD 95-1 design standards did not apply.

Chair Simson said when the original Target application came in she was on the Planning Commission, but was not on the Commission during the Walmart or the Sentinel Storage Annex and not involved in the decision making. She described when the Target application was submitted the original application

was a tilt up building with no architectural features and the Planning Commission worked with the applicant to get peaked roofs and additional architectural items. She remembered there had been architectural guidelines in place on the Langer PUD and found them before tonight's meeting. Chair Simson did not want to set a precedent for the rest of the parcel not to have the design guidelines apply, even if it was determined that they did not apply to the industrial use. She commented the purpose of the PUD was to give up something in exchange for getting something and ensure the development fits into the community; a PUD allowed the developer to build while gaining a better product for the community. Chair Simson explained she was not able to find the design guidelines for PUD 95-1 until an hour before the meeting so staff had not had time to look at it. She raised the concern because it was not addressed in the staff report and believed it was criteria the Planning Commission should look at even if it was determined they did not apply.

Chair Simson asked for applicant testimony.

Matt Buchanan, Planner with AKS Engineering and Forestry in Tualatin, came forward and said he was representing the applicant, Langer Family LLC. He thanked the planning staff for work done in reviewing the application and appreciated time spent by the Planning Commission on reviewing the materials. He said the staff report was read and agreed with the findings and recommendations. Mr. Buchanan reported that he did not prepare a formal presentation, because the recommendations of approval in the staff report were reasonable. He offered to answer questions from the Commission and introduced John Christensen, Project Engineer with AKS.

Mr. Buchanan stated it was the first time he was seeing the commercial design guidelines provided by Chair Simson and asserted the application met a lot of the criteria, but he was not sure they applied, because the exhibit indicated they were specifically for retail building construction. The applicant did not consider a self-storage facility a retail use.

Chair Simson said within the industrial zone uses it was identified as a commercial use and commented it was a boggle because the underlying zone was Light Industrial. She acknowledged it was hard to determine the intent from 1995 with a two page set of guidelines and described that with Target there was an expectation that it would be built to meet the guidelines and fit in with the community.

Mr. Buchanan stated the development agreement for the project bound the applicant by the land uses and that the development was required to meet the development standards in place today. He did not see how the PUD criteria presented by Chair Simson applied, because at the top it stated it was for retail building construction. He agreed it was a commercial use in an industrial land use district, but it was not a retail building.

Commissioner Pearson commented on his father who was a sculpture and worked out of a rented self-storage unit in Florida along with other businesses in a storage facility. He asked if this kind of activity would be permitted at the facility in Sherwood.

Mr. Kilby responded that the facility was intended for storage and services were limited. He said it was common practice in some storage facilities for small businesses to store tools or park vehicles overnight. He said it was prominent in other places for storage units to become incubators for small businesses, and asked the Commission to keep in mind units would not be open to the general public; it would be secured by a gate with key code access. Mr. Kilby said his experience had been mostly with tradesmen; where they keep their tools and equipment in a storage unit. He remarked he had even heard of people living in storage units. Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director, clarified that was not being proposed

and the building codes would not allow the units to be lived in. She said if that was the proposal it would go through another process to get the proper permits, due to traffic impacts and building codes.

Vice Chair Griffin asked if there would be a fence. Mr. Buchanan replied the whole interior of the building would be closed off. There was a gate which would only be accessible with the key code. He said there was emergency access, but it could only be accessed by fire department. There was no perimeter fence, just the structures.

Vice Chair Griffin received confirmation there would not be a garbage located on site. The staff report noted people who had garbage could take it to the main office on Tualatin Sherwood Road or to the Sentinel Storage Annex that did have garbage. He asked if the key code would allow access to both sites. Vice Chair Griffin asked why a garbage facility was not proposed. Mr. Buchanan responded the site was not a location that would generate much garbage. He said it was a storage facility and not a place where people would hang out except to unload materials, drop off the boat or RV and leave. Vice Chair Griffin asked how often the facility would be checked in case people were messy and expressed concerns for the mess and rodents as raised by Ms. Sykes. Mr. Buchanan said the Langer family had other facilities to the east and north, they maintained their facilities very well, and there were garbage facilities at both of the other two locations.

John Christenson with AKS Engineering and Forestry came forward and said there would be a shared use agreement between the adjacent facilities for waste. Key card access would be provided to both users for access to the available dumpster. He said the dumpster next door would be serviced by Pride Disposal and the owner was interested in maintaining a top notch facility so they routinely swept and maintained it to keep garbage out.

Commissioner Pearson understood the concerns expressed by other Planning Commission members. He said people were messy and there needed to be something for people to throw their garbage into.

Chair Simson asked how the Commission could recommend a trash enclosure. She asked the applicant if they would be willing to work with Pride Disposal to site a trash enclosure. The applicant confirmed.

Ms. Hajduk added that if a dumpster was added to the site, the size and location had to be located in such a way Pride Disposal could provide service to it. The question was if it had to be a dumpster, or if trash cans and management to maintain them could be required. Staff would check to see if there was specific code criteria that could require trash service at the site.

Vice Chair Griffin inquired how many units were in each facility. He was informed there were 430 units in the existing facility and 436 proposed units in phase II. Mr. Kilby commented if people began leaving junk and trash everywhere it would be subject to the City's nuisance ordinance in the Municipal code and subject to code enforcement. He said most businesses proposed trash services where the City sends the application to Pride Disposal to review the enclosure and accessibility to it. He stated Pride Disposal did not tell business owners a dumpster was required; the owner pays for the service to have it dumped based on the service need and time.

Vice Chair Griffin commented the trash receptacle at phase I with 430 units would have been an appropriately sized design and now they were proposing to share it with a 436 unit facility. He suggested the trash receptacle would be undersized. Mr. Kilby responded that the owner could contract with Pride Disposal to dump it more often. It was up to the business to understand how much trash was being generated and how often it needed to be emptied.

Chair Simson said the reasonable expectation to comply with the nuisance ordinance would be to have trash receptacles on a smaller scale and employees taking the trash to the dumpster.

Commissioner Meyer added that the reality was that emptied storage units were full of trash and not everyone was responsible enough to take the trash with them. He did not doubt there would be trash left at the site. He asked if it was incumbent upon the owner to upkeep the site or if the Commission should require receptacles.

Vice Chair Griffin liked the idea of allowing access to the dumpster at the adjacent site, but maintained there should be something on site. Commissioner Meyer did not think it had to be a dumpster if there were signs for the location of a larger dumpster posted. He thought cans placed intermittently would work. Commissioner Pearson was in favor of trash receptacles.

Chair Simson asked if the Commission could advise the applicant that the nuisance ordinance would be implemented if the trash became unmanageable. Mr. Kilby explained the applicant was not present, just his representative. He pointed out there was no legal basis to require trash cans nor could staff enforce it. He said the applicant understood the business and the need for garbage cans. He was not sure if it was the City's place to regulate. He said the city regulated the use and appearance of the property, but there were no clear and objective standards related to the requirement for trash enclosures. Clear and objective standards within the code should be applied to the extent possible.

Vice Chair Griffin expressed that the Commission should be able to endorse having the receptacles. He said as a user, he would not drive to the other location and punch in a code to throw away his trash. He was confident the owner would want to do the right thing.

Chair Simson asked about odor regulation. Mr. Kilby said to look in section 16.152. Chair Simson found that on page 23 of the packet it noted that "all uses shall provide solid waste storage receptacles which are adequately sized to accommodate all solid waste generated on the site. All solid waste storage areas and receptacles shall be located out of public view. Solid waste receptacles for multi-family, commercial and industrial uses shall be screened by a six foot high sight obscuring fence or masonry wall and shall be easily accessible to collection vehicles." She said staff analysis was correct in that it does not show any trash enclosures and suggested modifying the finding to say because there was no public access to the site and it was mainly screened by the building. She said the finding should state the applicant must provide adequate storage and make sure it was screened from the public view by not putting them in front of the emergency gates. Staff would craft language during public testimony.

Chair Simson noted the applicant had used 3:42 minutes of testimony time. She asked for public testimony. None were received. She called for a recess at 8:07 pm and reconvened at 8:14 pm.

Mr. Kilby read the revised finding. "The Commission has expressed concern about the lack of a trash enclosure and the high likelihood that trash is generated by the tenants of this use. The applicant is not proposing to provide solid waste and recycling facilities as required by section 16.98.020, therefore the standard is not satisfied and the following condition is warranted. The condition is "Prior to site plan approval the applicant shall provide onsite solid waste and recycling storage that satisfies the requirements of 16.98.020."

Mr. Kilby said if the applicant chose to put in another dumpster they would have to obtain approval from Pride Disposal. The other option was to provide small individual trash cans and staff would review how the receptacles were managed at final site plan submittal. For the benefit of the applicant Mr. Kilby explained that the concern was the proposal included building Sentinel Storage Annex phase II as large

as phase I and there would need to be some sort of onsite collection on this parcel, because they were separate.

Chair Simson asked the Commission about the design criteria from the PUD 95-1. She felt the criteria should be addressed in the staff report. If the Commission believed it did not apply, because the use was industrial, the report should at least reference the PUD 95-01 Notice of Decision so when next piece comes before the Commission it was on record that PUD 95-01 would be reviewed as part of the approval process.

Commissioner Meyer commented the application met most of the standards. He agreed with referencing the standards going forward for future development so the same standard was met.

Vice Chair Griffin expressed concern for the façade facing Langer Farms Parkway. He noted the development application down Century Blvd was required to add more glazing to improve the look of the building facing the road. He did not have any major design concerns. Vice Chair Griffin turned to page 19 of the packet regarding landscaping and suggested using grass in the landscaping. Vice Chair Griffin commented the PUD guidelines were twenty years old, but they did not allow bark dust to be substituted for grass in front yards and he would like to like grass in front of the building. The applicant has proposed bark dusk.

Chair Simson asked if the Commission believed the PUD 95-1 design criteria for retail commercial design guidelines applied to the application. She expressed a desire to have the PUD 95-01 addressed in the staff report and asked if any of the retail commercial design guidelines applied to the parcel.

Mr. Kilby responded that the applicable criteria applied to all of the applications in the PUD, particularly the Walmart application. He said the Walmart site was a retail commercial facility and not an industrial facility and he did not believe this application was a commercial use; it was more relevant as an industrial use.

Chair Simson commented that the PUD 95-1 decision contained two design guidelines; residential or retail commercial. Retail buildings were to have a particular look and feel with arched opening, storefronts, and trimmed openings. She maintained that even though the application was not a retail building the landscaping, signage, and lighting within the commercial design guidelines from PUD 95-1 should apply.

Commissioner Pearson suggested phase II was like a small warehouse and asked how warehousing fell under the criterion. Mr. Kilby said he considered it an industrial use so the standards would not apply. He argued that even in the Target case there were no arched openings, limited wood on the exterior, and a flat roof with a façade of pitched roofs at the opening and at the corner. He said the Walmart site had more of the design criteria, because the developer of the site wanted to respond more to the criteria and make it look nice.

Vice Chair Griffin commented that he did not have any concerns with the look and even though it was light industrial, it was on a main road into Sherwood. Mr. Kilby said the Commission agreed that SP 12-03 Sentinel Storage Phase I was an industrial use and if the present Commission should decide the 2012 decision was in error, then findings would have to be made and the community would need to decide which standards from PUD 95-01 should apply and met. He asked for the lighting standards to be read.

*In addition to the City of Sherwood approved intersection street light all residential area, 12<sup>th</sup> Street, and common area will use a 6200MC-100HPs/12-DB-BK, RTANT-9'-6"-4" w/ lamp Trimble House pedestrian light fixture in pre-painted forest green, spaced at approximately 150 lineal feet apart, placing them on alternating side of the street.*

Mr. Kilby pointed out that guideline was no longer followed and there had been a different lighting standard applied, because the street lamps were now black along Langer Farms Parkway. He contended that some of the standards were outdated and were written in 1995 with the envisioned PUD developing more quickly. The City Council has over time extended the PUD and staff and the Commission were left with the pieces.

Chair Simson said the reason she brought it forth was that she remembered there were design guidelines. She reiterated that the PUD 95-01 Sherwood Village retail commercial design guidelines should be noted in the staff report and said if they were no longer applicable, because the industrial design standards provided a better development, then the staff report should say so. She expressed concern for what would happen to the other twenty acres north of the subject site.

Chair Simson noted the PUD could not be changed because it had gone through the public hearing process, but a finding could be made to state the PUD 95-1 design criteria was geared toward retail commercial and as an industrial use, with an existing use of similar nature from 2012, the design guidelines did not apply. All Commissioners were in agreement.

Chair Simson asked for applicant rebuttal and said they had 26 minutes to rebut the Planning Commission's discussion and the public testimony.

After hearing the revised condition regarding section 16.98.020 Solid Waste Storage, Mr. Buchanan commented that 16.98.020 stated all uses "shall provide solid waste and recycling storage receptacles which are adequately sized to accommodate all solid waste generated on site." He said the response in the narrative was that solid waste would not be generated by the storage facility. Mr. Buchanan acknowledged that people generate waste and said to the extent a trash receptacle was necessary access to the existing Sentinel Storage Annex was available to customers. He said the way the code was written, it did not require a trash receptacle to be provided on site and they met the standard. Mr. Kilby noted that the chapter heading was 16.98 On-Site Storage.

Mr. Christensen said the verbiage the applicant hoped to see was to adhere to the nuisance ordinance. Mr. Kilby stated that was outside of the process and through code enforcement. Chair Simson said the Commission was advising the applicant to provide solid waste storage receptacles on site; the applicant could chose to utilize six hefty trash cans, out of sight of the public. The cans and how they would be maintained would need to be noted for final site plan review. Mr. Kilby pointed out that maintenance needed to be documented so it was enforceable when there was a nuisance and code enforcement stepped in. The applicant agreed to provide onsite receptacles as defined by the condition.

She asked staff to draft a finding showing the PUD 95-1 design guidelines did not apply to the application. She said if the next phase was a retail outlet the Commission would be looking at them.

Mr. Kilby read the finding. *The Sherwood village retail commercial design guidelines as provided in PUD 95-1 are not applicable to this use because it is industrial as opposed to commercial retail use. Future developments that proposed commercial retail uses within the PUD are subject to the guidelines as stipulated in PUD 95-1.*

The Commission provided scrivener's errors in the staff report. The following motion was received.

**Motion: Vice Chair to approve the application for SP 16-06/ MLP 16-02 Sentinel Storage Annex Phase II based on the applicant testimony, public testimony received, and the analysis findings and conditions in the staff report with the aforementioned modifications. Seconded by Commissioner Mike Meyer. All present Planning Commission members voted in favor.**

### 8. Planning Commissioner Announcements

Councilor Pearson on behalf of himself and Commissioner Meyer invited audience members to attend the candidate forum sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce and the Sherwood High School at the high school from 6:00-8:30 pm October 5, 2016.

Vice Chair Griffin asked if there was an update on the curb in front of the pallet and lumber business on SW Langer Farms Parkway. He said he witnessed a semi-truck dragging over the top of the curb and into the landscaping more than once. Mr. Kilby responded the fire marshal and building official did a site visit and will respond to the concerns via formal letter. He said the public works department had contacted the tenants about broken water meters and curbs. Ms. Hajduk added the City was aware the site issues and would work with the tenant with the means available to the City such as code compliance, the fire department, and public works. Vice Chair Griffin thought the site was a fire hazard and was glad the city was addressing concerns.

Mr. Kilby noted the next meeting was scheduled for the October 25, 2016. Chair Simson asked for a work session to review the process for traffic calming concerns and citizen's traffic complaints at that meeting.

Commissioner Pearson added that after the election there may be vacant seats on the Planning Commission. He said the Commission was critically important and in the time he had served on the Commission he knew the work done was critical to the growth, development, and future of this town. He pleaded with anyone who could hear the sound of his voice to consider filling the vacant seats. The process was a simple application and a meeting with the mayor, staff and Planning Commission Chair. He said this was the most important public Commission in the city and spoke to the needed involvement and input. Commissioner Pearson said the Commission did a lot of work to make the city great and the City Council listened to what the Planning Commission said and often approved its recommendations. He said if he was successful in running for City Council it had been a pleasure serving on the Planning Commission.

### 9. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 8:41 pm.

Submitted by:



Kirsten Allen, Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: October 25, 2016