



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

Planning Commission Meeting Packet

FOR

January 13, 2015

At 7 PM

**Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon**



City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140
January 13, 2015 – 7:00 PM

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/ Roll Call

2. Consent Agenda

- a. June 10, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes
- b. June 24, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes
- c. Sept 9, 2014 Work Session Minutes
- d. October 28, 2014 Work Session Minutes
- e. December 9, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes

3. Council Liaison Announcements (Mayor)

4. Staff Announcements (Brad Kilby)

5. Community Comments

6. New business

a. Election of new Chair and Vice Chair (per SZCDC 16.06.020)

Per Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code, a new Planning Commission chair and vice chair are to be elected in odd calendar years.

b. Public Hearing – SP 14-03 Lam Research Major Modification (Michelle Miller)

The applicant proposes adding 55 parking spaces with 886 square feet of additional parking area landscaping around the original building. This requires a major modification to the original site plan because the applicant proposes, “(a) change in the type and/or location of access-ways, drives or parking areas negatively affecting off-site traffic or increasing Average Daily Trips (ADT) by more than 100.”

c. Public Hearing – PUD 14-01/SUB 14-01, Cedar Brook PUD Final Development Plan (Michelle Miller)

The City Council approved the Cedar Brook Planned Unit Development (PUD) subdividing a 5.77-acre parcel into a sixty-five lot subdivision for residential use on August 5, 2014. The property is zoned High Density Residential with 16 dwelling units per acre and includes alley and front-loaded attached townhome clusters and 15 detached single family homes.

7. Planning Commissioner Announcements

8. Adjourn

Consent Agenda

Draft Minutes

The draft minutes for the following Planning Commission meetings were printed in the Planning Commission Packet for [December 9, 2014](#), but were not approved. Due to the size of the documents these draft minutes have not been reprinted in the January 13, 2015 Planning Commission meeting packet. They are available for viewing at City Hall, or at electronically on the website at www.sherwoodoregon.gov/pc.

- a. June 10, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes
- b. June 24, 2014 Planning Commission Minutes
- c. Sept 9, 2014 Work Session Minutes
- d. October 28, 2014 Work Session Minutes

**City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission
December 9, 2014**

Planning Commission Members Present: Staff Present:

Chair Jean Simson

Commissioner John Clifford

Commissioner Russell Griffin

Commissioner Lisa Walker

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director

Bob Galati, Civil Engineer

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager

Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

Planning Commission Members Absent:

Vice Chair James Copfer

Commissioner Beth Cooke

Commissioner Sally Robinson

Council Members Present:

None

Legal Counsel:

Chris Crean

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Jean Simson called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

2. Consent Agenda

Commissioner Lisa Walker asked about approving the minutes for commission members that were not present. With four commission members present there would not be a quorum to approve the Consent Agenda if any members abstained from voting. The following motion was received.

Motion: From Commissioner Russell Griffin to hold the Consent Agenda to the next meeting, Seconded by Commissioner John Clifford. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Vice Chair Copfer and Commissioners Cooke and Robinson were absent).

3. Council Liaison Announcements

There were none

4. Staff Announcements

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, spoke of the Boards and Commissions dinner held the previous week. He said the City was accepting applications for a Planning Commission vacancy coming in January with a deadline of December 19, 2014. Resolutions for appointment would go to the City council at the first of the year. (Note: the deadline for Planning Commission applications was extended to December 31, 2014.)

Brad commented that a resolution to form the Community Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee for the Sherwood West project would go before council on December 16, 2014 and said there was a call for people interested in being on the Community Advisory Committee. For public outreach a letter was sent to property owners in the Sherwood West area (available online) and an article

was placed in the December Gazette.

For more information see the city website at www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwoodwest.

Brad informed the Planning Commission of upcoming public hearings in January 2015 and said there would be no Planning Commission meeting on December 23, 2014.

Chair Simson asked if there was an update for traffic calming on Lynnly Way and the process for citizens to address traffic issues within the city. Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director, replied that the city receives complaints through the Community Development Department and the Police Department. She said the result might be increased enforcement, and in the case of Lynnly Way additional stop signs were placed. Julia advised that there was no funding for neighborhood traffic calming and she was hoping funding for a program could be allocated in the next budget cycle. She thanked citizens who continued to come to Planning Commission and City Council meetings to keep the issue “on the radar” until a long term solution is in place. Discussion followed.

5. Community Comments

Eugene Stewart, Sherwood business owner, commented about the traffic going through Sherwood which he said neither the transportation system plans for the city, county nor the state addressed. He said he traveled 99W a lot and he felt that a bypass needed to be on the front burner for the city. Mr. Stewart commented on development and traffic that slowed down the commute. He said that Sherwood West would add to traffic and pointed out the changes in traffic control devices over the years. Mr. Stewart added that TriMet busses did not have adequate space to stop out of traffic and commented on mass transit. He suggested that traffic increases should be monitored on a regular basis and said part of the traffic issues stem from people working outside of Sherwood. Mr. Stewart asked why the city could not assist businesses in coming to the city and used Two Kilts Brewery as an example.

Robert James Claus, Sherwood resident, commented on the upcoming changes in the City Council. He said he talked to the Secretary of State’s office and commented on the removal from the city charter regarding the ability for Council members to talk to a staff instead of going through the city manager. Mr. Claus commented on undue influence and alluded to a pattern of such. He commented on prosecutorial discretion, saying it was a felony.

Mr. Claus stated case law of Amber Realty vs. Euclid, spoke of zoning and takings which led into comments about overreaching police powers and Ferguson, Missouri. He commented on free speech in Sherwood and said it has been systematically shut down. Mr. Claus asserted that if zoning was given in one instance it should be granted in another. He suggested the Planning Commission had violated the 14th amendment and had a chance straighten it out.

Tim Voorhies, Sherwood property and business owner of Steeltek, said he wanted a two way conversation with staff and the Commission. He said he saw a public notice at the US Post Office for code changes for Industrial properties. He asked how long staff had been working on the code changes. Chair Simson responded that there was a work session on September 9, 2014. Mr. Voorhies commented that there were around one hundred industrial properties in the city, his research indicated that only one other industrial property was aware of the code change and that it was common courtesy to send a notice to each of those properties. He said it was wrong that there was no public notification to the people

being affected. Mr. Voorhies suggested that the room would be packed by the other industrial property owners if they knew what was going on. Chair Simson said Mr. Voorhies' comments belong on another agenda item and asked him to make his comments after the staff report.

Mr. Voorhies said he was talking about public notices and property owners deserve the courtesy of a notice by letter, not by posting it in different locations. He suggested that the change in City Council members would bring honor back to the city. Chair Simson directed staff to address Mr. Voorhies' comments regarding public notice in the staff report.

With no other community comments, Chair Simson turned to new business.

7. New Business

a. Public Hearing – PA 14-02 Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code Update

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement and reminded that the Planning Commission would be forwarding a recommendation to City Council which would give another opportunity to provide testimony. PA 14-02 was a City initiated legislative amendment.

Connie Randall, Associate Planner, gave a presentation (see record, Exhibit 1) and said the amendment to the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code seeks to correct errors, increase consistency between sections of the code, consolidate definitions, and clarify code language. She said there were two substantive changes to the code.

Connie reviewed that the first substantive change was to Chapter 16.31 which proposed to remove the requirement to obtain a Conditional Use Permit for incidental retail sales in the Light and General Industrial zones. The effect would be to treat Light Industrial (LI) and General Industrial (GI) zoned properties the same as properties zoned Employment Industrial.

Connie described the second substantive change as a change to Chapter 16.120 which proposed to increase the amount of monetary assurance of full and faithful performance, to those seeking to develop land, from 100% to 125% of the estimated cost of improvements.

Note: These items are described in more depth later in the staff report.

Connie reminded that the Planning Commission had held three work sessions regarding the code amendments:

- April 8, 2014 – Potential code amendments were part of a number of topics open for comment from the public.
- September 9, 2014 – Staff organized comments heard from the April 8th work session and comments gathered by staff from applicants, phone inquiries, and staff review.
- October 28, 2014 – Amendments were clarified and prioritized. Language was reviewed again and staff received direction from the Planning Commission and comments from the City Attorney.

Connie recounted that public notices were posted in five locations and online November 18, 2014, an article was placed in the November/December issue of the Sherwood Archer, and a public notice was published in The Times on November 27, 2014 and December 4, 2014 and in the December 2014

edition of the Sherwood Gazette. She said this was a Type V application and all noticing requirements were met. Connie informed the Commission that a notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) was sent on November 4, 2014 and Agency Notice to surrounding and affected agencies was sent on November 17, 2014.

Connie reported that staff had received comments from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the DLCD asking if the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) consistency would be addressed. No public comments were received.

Connie explained that two findings were required for text amendments:

16.80.030.A – Text Amendment Review

An amendment to the text of the Comprehensive Plan shall be based upon the need for such an amendment as identified by the Council or the Commission. Such an amendment shall be consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, and with all other provisions of the Plan and Code, and with any applicable State or City statutes and regulations.

16.80.030.C – Transportation Planning Rule Consistency

1. Review of plan and text amendment applications for effect on transportation facilities. Proposals shall be reviewed to determine whether it significantly affects a transportation facility, in accordance with OAR 660-12-0060 (the TPR). Review is required when a development application includes a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan or changes to land use regulations.

Connie explained that the proposal sought to amend chapters of Volume 3 of the Zoning and Community Development Code of the Comprehensive Plan and did not include changes to the goals or policies. She said there were no additional standards other than ensuring that the language is consistent with the existing Comprehensive Plan and applicable rules.

Connie summarized that there was a table in the packet containing the proposed text amendments, as Exhibit A, containing 52 items or changes. Each table item listed the item and an explanation of what had been proposed and why. She reiterated that there were two substantive changes with the remainder being administrative updates intended to correct scriveners, formatting, and citation errors. Connie said the changes would consolidate definitions and provide clarity to the code. For example in a few instances the code refers to sections that do not exist or have been renumbered through previous amendments. Connie disclosed that in a prior edit the publisher inadvertently inserted section 16.90.30 between section 16.90.20.B and 16.90.20.C which had caused a lot of confusion.

Connie added that where possible the word “shall” was eliminated and code language was written in a more direct and active voice as suggested by the city attorney during the October 28, 2014 work session; an action supported by the Commission.

Connie said some changes had been made to the proposed amendments since the October 28, 2014 work session and referred to a memo provided to the Commission (see record, Exhibit 2). She discussed the elimination of Item 3 from the proposed edits as it would put a duplicate definition for “Diameter at Breast Height” in the code and the consolidation of Items 33-34 and Items 39-41. Connie explained

that the verbiage remained the same, but the modifications resulted in a change in the item numbers from previous work session packets.

Connie pointed to Item 37 on page 63 in the packet and said the verbiage should read “yes; 500-1000 square feet” in the row titled Open Space Provided for Public Use. She pointed to Item 39 on page 56, and said there should be a period on the end of footnote 3.

Connie moved to Item 10 on page 49 of the packet. She explained that this was Section 16.31.20 or the use table for industrial zones and said “that incidental sales or display showrooms associated with a permitted use and limited to a maximum of 10% of the total floor of the business” were a conditional use item in the Light Industrial and General Industrial zones. She indicated that the proposal was to change incidental sales to a permitted use and to eliminate the requirement for a Conditional Use Permit; treating the properties that are zoned Light Industrial and General Industrial the same as the Employment Industrial zoned properties. Connie said there was a footnote that limited the size to 5000 square feet in a single outlet and no more than 20,000 square feet in multiple outlets in the same development project. This is consistent with metro’s Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Section 3.07.430 which allows for incidental retail as long as it is restricted in the current manner.

Commissioner Griffin repeated the requirements for clarification and commented that the use would now be permitted outright for Light and General Industrial. Connie confirmed and clarified that the limit was 10% or 5000 square feet, whichever is less. Chair Simson added that the current chart used to be a narrative, and before it was changed to a chart the retail sales had been allowed. Connie confirmed that prior to 2012 incidental retail sales with limitations were allowed in the LI and GI zones and this amendment restored the property rights prior to 2012. Connie added that regarding the Transportation Planning Rule the Engineering Department reviewed and determined that there would not be an increase in the amount of incidental retail sales because it would be currently permitted through a conditional use permit and would not significantly impact transportation facilities (see Planning Commission Packet, Exhibit B).

Connie described the second substantial change as, Item 44, Section 16.134.010.A in the Subdivisions section, dealing with the performance security. She stated the amount that the city would recover from a performance bond would change from 100% to 125%. Connie reported that it was very rare that the City has to pull a performance bond, but in the instance that it must there were administrative costs that are not recovered; when a developer does not complete a project and the City has to complete a project there is an additional burden to the city and the taxpayers that is not recovered. She explained that a previous amendment changed section 16.108.020.D.2 (also dealing with performance bonds) to the 125% performance bond so the change was also cleaning up inconsistencies in the code.

Chris Crean, City Attorney added that if the project is a public improvement, the City has to pay prevailing wage and go through a public contracting process, and the cost to the city for the same improvement would be higher; another justification to go to 125%.

Connie concluded by stating that based on findings of fact in the staff report and presentation in the Public Hearing, and the conclusion of law based on the applicable criteria, staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval of PA 14-02 to the City Council.

Chair Simson commented that in the open house work session held in April 2014, the code amendments were not as popular a topic as medical marijuana and Old Town standards. She said there were comments made about how the code needed improved and many of those where substantive changes where the public wanted the Planning Commission to change or improve a process.

Chair Simson indicated that staff recognized seventy nine code errors which were brought to the Planning Commission on September 9, 2014. She explained that the Commission decided that was too many changes for the citizens to look at so it was split into three chunks. The first chunk was to address scrivener's errors and inconsistencies within the code that were causing trouble with staff and the two substantive changes as discussed by staff. Chair Simson disclosed that there are more changes that will occur such as the process for a land use in Old Town so the right thing can be done more easily. She expressed an expectation that more people would attend the hearings for more substantive code changes and said Staff had gone above and beyond for noticing as the Planning Commission had asked staff to publicize the proposal as much as possible.

Brad commented on Mr. Voorhies' assertion that every industrial property should be sent a letter and declared that none of the uses allowed currently were changed or further restricted; in fact the restrictions were reduced. He said there was no requirement to provide a Ballot Measure 56 notice, which would have required a notice to each individual property owner, but because the changes were minor scrivener's errors and changes intended to make the code more consistent, they did not send letters to individual property owners. Brad informed that when we get into the next phase and there is more policy related content that affects property owner's ability to do things on their property, the City will be required to provide Ballot Measure 56 notice to individual property owners affected by the regulations. He reminded that it is a great cost to the City and the taxpayers, so when it is required, it will be done. Brad commented that notice was provided in accordance with state law and over above what is required by state law in Sherwood.

Chair Simson asked if there were additional questions on the process. None were received.

Chair Simson asked for questions from commission members.

Commissioner Griffin asked if the 125% bond insurance had been in place for a while, adding that 25% sounded expensive. Brad responded that it was common practice in other jurisdictions and was not specific to Sherwood. He reminded that a project may take place over a couple of years and the cost of materials, administration, and labor could go up and governments have to pay prevailing wages so the cost of the City doing development can be significantly more than a private developer and the 25% increase is intended to capture those additional costs.

Chris Crean added that it also matches Sherwood up with other jurisdictions across the metropolitan area so developers who build in multiple jurisdictions will face similar regulations in multiple places. To extend uniformity is a benefit as well.

Commissioner Griffin turned to page 47, 2b, Section 16.50.010.A. He asked what it meant to strike out the verbiage with red and replace it with "reserved".

Connie responded that it was a place holder and there will not be a section 16.50.010.A; rather than renumbering all of the code, it holds the spot open.

Commissioner Griffin turned to page 51, 16g, Section 16.10.020, and read the definition “Hedges: a line of closely spaced vegetation specifically planted and trained ...” and asked if the word “trained” was correct. Commissioner Clifford (a landscape architect) responded that training was an acceptable definition. Connie pointed out that it was not new language being proposed, but the current language in Section 16.58.20.B and staff was consolidating the definition into the definition section.

Commissioner Griffin turned to page 61, the Design Review Matrix. Chair Simson pointed out that the chart was created from the existing language. Commissioner Griffin commented that it was much easier to understand and under the Building Design it listed 21 points possible with a minimum of 12 points required. He gave examples of reducing the glazing as part of the design and increasing in another area of the matrix or deciding not to screen the roof and asked if that was what the City wanted. Connie responded that the matrix did not change the current system and only changed from in-line text to the matrix format. Brad added that this came up in the Sherwood Industrial Park II hearings where the applicant was not meeting all the standards and said there was an option that if the applicant did not meet all the standards they could come before the Planning Commission for an architectural review. Brad said if they choose to go through the standard approval process they have to meet a certain number of points. Discussion followed. Connie reminded the Commission that now that the code language was easier to read and the implications more understandable the standards may need to be reviewed regarding the kind of development the citizens wanted and to propose changes. She stated that staff had not proposed any changes, but tried to make easier to understand what the code required.

Chair Simson turned to page 66, Section F, Time Limits and asked about the verbiage for site plan approvals between 2007 and 2009 that received an extension to December 31, 2013 and asked if it should be removed or remain. Connie replied that the code is written in the active voice and there could be a case to leave the historical reference in the code. She suggested that it could be changed from “are extended” to “were extended”, but if so it would be only time in code where past tense is used; staff’s intent was to keep the code and not make the change. Chris Crean suggested the verbiage be “A site plan approval granted on or after January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2009 is extended until December 31, 2013.” Discussion followed and the Planning Commission accepted the suggestion by Mr. Crean.

Commissioner Griffin pointed out formatting issues on page 66 for percentages in Section 16.90.030.A.1.a., staff was directed to use the format of *ten (10)*.

Commissioner Griffin turned to page 67 and asked if the equivalent acknowledgement of a Clean Water Services provider letter could be an email. Brad responded that it could be an email or an official letter on letterhead.

With no other questions for the Commission, Chair Simson asked for public testimony.

Eugene Stewart commented that the Planning Manger’s explanation helped with the confusion about notices, but it was his understanding that with any changes made to the text of the code the affected property owners had to be notified. He said the notice said it affected the whole city. Mr. Stewart agreed that it would cost a lot of money to send notices out, but it seemed like there should have been a notice. He questioned how Goal 1 was met, said maybe he was reading it wrong, but it seemed like the Commission needed to sit down and have a session on this open to the public. Mr. Stewart said he and

the Planning Manager disagree on Goal 1, but the Planning Commission was not doing what the Planning Manager points to for Goal 1. Mr. Stewart asked why the citizens' involvement plan was continually ignored, said it should be written down someplace, and we should see if it is being done.

Mr. Stewart commented that the Planning Commission did not understand why the public did not get involved and answered that it was because of the way it is done. He said a person is given four minutes to speak, but might have a twenty page outline to discuss and the Commission might glance at it and push it aside. Mr. Stewart suggested that the Planning Commission needed to take public opinions into the process before a formal hearing and receive comments from the general public during a work session. He expressed confusion that the decision was made during the work session, because he thought the Commission was not supposed to make a decision until the public hearing. Mr. Stewart commented that the Commission is not supposed to talk to people before the meeting, and asserted that it did not work to have the public talk to the Planning Commission for four minutes. He said the time needed to be expanded, especially when there are good thoughts to present and added that the public needed feedback from the Planning Commission on what their thoughts were. Mr. Stewart commented about having a hearing in one of the busiest seasons of the year and suggested avoiding December. Mr. Stewart commented that Goal 1 says there is supposed to be a committee for citizens involvement and he would like to see the minutes of those meetings that are supposed to be held once a year. He did not think there had been a meeting held which has been required by state law for 40 years. Mr. Stewart maintained that if the City looked at its citizen involvement, there would be more participation.

Tim Voorhies, Sherwood property and business owner of Steeltek Industries, said it was interesting that Connie said that two public agencies commented and no citizens. He said he took that as fact that there was no public notification on it, because the people that I talked to were very concerned about what was going on with it, but they said the city was going to do what the city was going to do and our voice does not matter. Mr. Voorhies remembered a conversation with one of the city's staff, under a previous mayor's regime, who said "Tim, you don't understand the public process, all the decisions are made prior to any public meeting. If you don't like it, move your shop out of town". Mr. Voorhies commented that the bare minimums for the public notifications was met and said they fought hard to get the 1000 foot radius for zoning changes and annexation notifications and that was why he fought against Brookman. Mr. Voorhies explained that he was not notified, but was within the 1000 feet, but staff said they followed state rules because the property was not within the city limits yet so they did not notify out to 1000 feet.

Mr. Voorhies communicated that he did not trust the city one bit. He added that he did not know if this was the proper place to mention it, but the City was going to have a devil of a time passing any more housing to be annexed into this city from what he has heard around town. We don't want to get bigger. Mr. Voorhies asked if Sherwood West was being annexed to keep work ahead of staff and to keep the cash flow coming in. He enquired about spending the money ahead of getting the area annexed in and suggested annexation prior to planning as to not waste the money planning for something that probably will never get voted in to the city.

Mr. Voorhies commented that it was no surprise that more people were not present, because it is like hitting your head against the wall. He gave an example of when the Planning Commission did a great job on the cannery site, because the Commission listened to the public, but City Council threw the Commission under the bus. He said it took him back to the comment that all decisions were made prior to any public meetings. Mr. Voorhies asked the Commission if staff was leading them down the path that they wanted to travel, that he did not know, but he did not trust them.

Robert James Claus, Sherwood resident, commented regarding Chair Simson's remark about the most exciting topic being marijuana and said the Planning Commission did not understand why the public was unresponsive. He spoke about the annexation and mayoral elections. Mr. Claus commented that the process stinks and said the Planning Commission did not know what the words procedural due process meant. He alluded to the city attorney's experience and commented about putting in a pipeline, annexing 1000 acres, and putting in a junk apartment behind the scenes. He commented on councilman stating that it was not Walmart and without a response from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Claus said he was the only person in the room that has had the US Supreme Court talk about a code he wrote and said he could not work with staff because of their arrogance. He said Mr. Crean declined to accept his help before billboards were placed in the city and that was how the city got billboards.

Mr. Claus commented that it did not make a difference what was said to the Planning Commission that follows a fee driven staff because there is not enough money to pay them. He said the Planning Commission would go with a City Council that thinks they can keep stealing from the landowners every time they turn around and pay for something that we don't want.

Mr. Claus spoke of the Langer Farms development, questioned design standards, and commented that there were not any design standards. He repeated that people were not in attendance and suggested that it was because it did not make a difference. He said he did not care about medical marijuana and the Planning Commission was wrecking the city step by step. Mr. Claus spoke of police powers and asked the Commission to continue for two weeks for the new City Council. He said the Cannery Apartments were embarrassing with three quarters of a parking space and fifty units to the acre because someone wanted to turn this into downtown Portland.

Chair Simson called for a recess at 8:22 pm and reconvened at 8:26 pm.

Chair Simson asked for comments from staff regarding issues raised by public testimony.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, responded that the application was a legislative process and not a quasi-judicial process and the Planning Commission was not obliged to leave the record open. He noted that the matter would go before the newly seated City Council for those who expressed concerns. Brad reminded that there were not any substantive changes that caused him concern and said he did not hear any testimony applicable to the proposed amendments that he could respond to. Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director, added that the code update would be heard at the January 20th meeting and the recommendation should be forwarded to that City Council meeting.

Chair Simson indicated that the only comment she heard addressing the code amendments before the Commission were concerned with notification requirements which both the person testifying and staff showed that the minimums were met; it was posted in all the regular locations and there have been many work sessions and opportunities for people to see and read about.

Chair Simson asked for the Commission's desire regarding PA 14-02. Commissioner Walker commented that the matter did not need to be left open, the commission has been working on it for a long time, and there was nothing substantial enough in this phase. Commissioner Clifford agreed, said he had attended most of the meetings, and that the Commission had gone through the amendment line by line to clarify all of the terminology.

Chair Simson closed the public hearing and the following motion was received.

Motion: From Commissioner Lisa Walker to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for PA 14-02, Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code Update, based on the applicant's testimony, public testimony received and analysis, finding and conditions in the Staff Report with the proposed minor modifications discussed this evening. Seconded by Commissioner Russell Griffin. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Vice Chair Copfer and Commissioners Cooke and Robinson were absent).

8. Planning Commissioner Announcements

Commissioner Walker asked about the Planning Commission position held by Sally Robinson. Brad Kilby replied that applications for Commissioner Robinson's position were being accepted and Commissioner Clifford's position would be open in March 2015. Brad indicated that staff may keep applications received for this recruitment and ask for Planning Commission applications for a shorter timeframe for the open seat in March. He encouraged anyone wanting to be part of the process to get involved and committed to contacting an applicant from the previous round of recruiting to see if he was still interested.

9. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 8:33 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: _____

New Business Agenda

Item B

CITY OF SHERWOOD

January 6, 2015

Lam Research Site Plan Major Modification
Original File: Wildrose Industrial Park Site Plan, SP 00-04

SP 14-03

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

Pre-App. Meeting:

N/A

App. Submitted:

October 24, 2014

App. Complete:

December 22, 2014

120-Day Deadline:

April 3, 2015

Hearing Date:

January 13, 2015

From:



Michelle Miller, AICP
Senior Planner

Proposal: The applicant proposes adding 54 parking spaces and parking area landscaping to an industrial site that contains a 100,400 square foot building to accommodate the new tenant, Lam Research. The applicant proposes to add striping to the paved area around the building to gain the needed parking.

Lam Research plans on three shifts of 25 employees each, associated deliveries and shipments that will add 377 average daily trips to the site. The increase of over 100 Average Daily Trips (ADT)s requires a major modification of an existing site plan.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Applicant/Owner:

Brad Picking
P.O Box 632
Sandy, OR 97055

Applicant's Representative

Ray Moore/Lance Forney
All-County Surveyors and Planners, Inc.
P.O. Box 955
Sandy, OR 97055

B. Location: 2S128A001400

C. Address: 20551 SW Wildrose Place

D. Parcel Size: The site is approximately 4.98 acres in size.

E. Existing Development and Site Characteristics: The site is flat with perimeter landscaping to the west and east. The exterior of the site is developed with twenty-one existing paved parking spaces, three loading bays driveways, landscaping, and a storm water quality treatment facility.

F. Site History: This parcel is located within a three-lot partition developed in 1998, known as the Edy Road Industrial Park. Construction on the other parcels in the industrial park began

in 1998 and continued with the development of Wildrose Storage (SP 08-01) on the corner of SW Tualatin Sherwood Road and SW Wildrose Place. The subject property and the property to the south were used for Pacific Foods distribution facilities from 2008 until recently when it relocated. Lam Research signed a lease on the building and began interior tenant improvements last fall.

SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road is a heavily traveled three-lane road in front of the site, with sections of five lanes at a variety of locations from Sherwood to Tualatin. A left-turn lane on SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road provides access to SW Wildrose Place for vehicles driving from the west and turning into the development. The existing right of way is 49-foot standard distance from centerline as dedicated by the industrial subdivision. There is a lighted intersection to the west on the southwestern corner of SW Oregon Street and SW Tualatin Sherwood Road. Further east on SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road, the street intersects with SW Cipole and another traffic light. The existing right of way is 25 feet from centerline on SW Wildrose Place.

- G. **Zoning Classification and Comprehensive Plan Designation:** The zone is General Industrial. (GI) Per § 16.31, the GI zoning district provides for the manufacturing, processing, assembling, packaging and treatment of products from previously prepared or raw materials, providing such activities can meet and maintain minimum environmental quality standards and are situated so as not to create significant adverse effects to residential and commercial areas of the City. The minimum contiguous area of any GI zoning district shall be fifty (50) acres.
- H. **Adjacent Zoning and Land Use:** Surrounding uses include other industrial developments zoned GI.
- I. **Review Type:** Site Plan Modifications and Revocation requires the modification application be subject to the same review procedure as the original land use decision. In this case, the Planning Commission made the original decision after consideration of public comment and will make the decision in this modification. An appeal would be heard by the City Council. The scope of review is limited to the modification request and does not open the entire site up for additional review unless impacted by the proposed modification. For example, a request to modify a parking lot shall require site design review only for the proposed parking lot and any changes to associated access, circulation, pathways, lighting, trees, and landscaping.
- J. **Public Notice and Hearing:** Notice of the application was mailed to property owners within 1,000 feet, posted on the property and distributed in five locations throughout the City on December 23, 2014 in accordance with § 16.72.020 of the Sherwood Zoning and Development Code (SZDC). The notice was published in the Times on January 1 and 8, 2015 (a newspaper of general circulation) in accordance with § 16.72.020 of the SZDC.
- K. **Review Criteria:** SZDC §16.31 (Industrial Use District); § 16.90 Site Planning, § 16.92 Landscaping, § 16.94 Off-Street Parking and Loading, § 16.96 On-Site Circulation, Division VI. Public Infrastructure, § 16.110 Sanitary Sewer, § 16.112 (Water), § 16.114 (Storm Water) § 16.116 (Fire Protection), § 16.118 (Public and Private Utilities), § 16.142 Parks, Trees, and Open Space, § 16.154 Heat and Glare,

II. PUBLIC

COMMENTS

Public notice was mailed, posted on the property, and posted in five locations throughout the City on December 23, 2014. Staff has received no comments as of the date of this report; however, comments are welcome up to the close of the public hearing.

III. AGENCY COMMENTS

Staff sent e-notice to affected agencies on December 23, 2014. The following is a summary of the comments received. Copies of full comments are included in the record unless otherwise noted.

Sherwood Engineering Department: Craig Christensen, P.E. Engineering Department, submitted comments that will be discussed further within this report. His comments are attached as **Exhibit C**.

Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue: John Wolff, Deputy Fire Marshall submitted comments on December 23, 2014 and indicated a preliminary endorsement of the proposal. He was concerned about the clearance of the trees at the entrance of the development. His comments are attached as **Exhibit D**.

Clean Water Services provided confirmation that no other review will be necessary for this project.

Washington County, Kinder Morgan Energy, ODOT, METRO, NW Natural Gas and Portland General Electric did not respond or provided no comments to the request for agency comments by the date of this report.

IV. SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIRED FINDINGS

16.90.030 - Site Plan Modifications and Revocation

A. Modifications to Approved Site Plans

1. Major Modifications to Approved Site Plans

a. **Defined. The review authority shall determine that a major modification(s) review is required if one or more of the changes listed below are proposed:**

- (1) **A change in land use (i.e. residential to commercial, commercial to industrial, etc.);**
- (2) **An increase in density by more than ten (10) percent, provided the resulting density does not exceed that allowed by the land use district;**
- (3) **A change in setbacks or lot coverage by more than 10 percent, provided the resulting setback or lot coverage does not exceed that allowed by the land use district;**
- (4) **A change in the type and/or location of access-ways, drives or parking areas negatively affecting off-site traffic or increasing Average Daily Trips (ADT) by more than 100;**
- (5) **An increase in the floor area or height proposed for non-residential use by more than 10 percent;**
- (6) **A reduction of more than 10 percent of the area reserved for common open space; or**
- (7) **Change to a condition of approval that was specifically applied to this approval (i.e. not a "standard condition"), or a change similar to items (1)-(2) as determined by the Review Authority.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The traffic impact analysis (TIA) prepared by Mackenzie (Applicant's materials Exhibit A, Item J), indicate that the new tenant, Lam Research will increase the ADT by more than 100. The information shows that the change to the site falls under category (4), "a change in the type and/or location of accessways, drives or parking areas negatively affecting off-site traffic or increasing Average Daily Trips (ADT) by more than 100." The results of the TIA show that there will be 377 ADTs to the site.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion and the information provided by the applicant, the proposal is considered a major modification to a site plan.

D. Required Findings

No site plan approval shall be granted unless each of the following is found:

1. The proposed development meets applicable zoning district standards and design standards in Division II, and all provisions of Divisions V, VI, VIII and IX.

FINDING: As discussed earlier in this report, the scope of this review is limited to the changes to the site that are being proposed. In this case, the changes are to the parking lot area and not the building. Only the applicable standards that would apply to the proposed changes are addressed in detail throughout this report. The provisions of 16.31 Industrial Land Uses Districts, 16.58 Clear Vision, 16.90 Site Planning, 16.92 Landscaping, 16.94 Parking, 16.96 Onsite Circulation, Division VI. Public Infrastructure, 16.142 Parks, Trees and Open Space, and 16.154 Heat and Glare.

2. The proposed development can be adequately served by services conforming to the Community Development Plan, including but not limited to water, sanitary facilities, storm water, solid waste, parks and open space, public safety, electric power, and communications.

FINDING: Water, sanitary and streets are all available. These services were provided with the initial development in 2000. The nearest park is Murdock Park, off of SW Murdock Road in a residential neighborhood. Solid waste services, communication and public safety are all available to this development as it is located in Sherwood, with easy access to SW Tualatin Sherwood Road.

3. Covenants, agreements, and other specific documents are adequate, in the City's determination, to assure an acceptable method of ownership, management, and maintenance of structures, landscaping, and other on-site features.

STAFF ANALYSIS: This site plan is subject to the conditions of the approved Wildrose Industrial Park Site Plan (00-04). Any required covenants or restrictions imposed by the City will be required to be satisfied as an ongoing condition of the original land use decision. The City does not monitor or enforce private covenants and restrictions. The Engineering Department reviewed the plans and indicated that a Private Storm Water Facility Access and maintenance Covenant for each facility would be needed.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant does not meet this criterion. A recommended condition of approval is discussed further within this report under the applicable Storm Water Chapter 16.110.

4. The proposed development preserves significant natural features to the maximum extent feasible, including but not limited to natural drainage ways, wetlands, trees, vegetation (including but not limited to environmentally sensitive lands), scenic views, and topographical features, and conforms to

the applicable provisions of Division VIII of this Code and Chapter 5 of the Community Development Code.

FINDING: With this modification, the applicant proposes not to remove of any vegetation, but is required to maintain the existing landscaped site areas. The applicant meets this criterion.

5. For a proposed site plan in the Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Office Commercial (OC), Office Retail (OR), Retail Commercial (RC), General Commercial (GC), Light Industrial (LI), and General Industrial (GI) zones, except in the Old Town Overlay Zone, the proposed use shall satisfy the requirements of Section 16.108.070 Highway 99W Capacity Allocation Program, unless excluded herein.

FINDING: The Highway 99W Capacity Allocation Program has been removed from the SZDC during the Code changes implemented with Transportation System Plan Update of 2014. This criterion is no longer applicable.

6. Pursuant to § 16.106.080, or at the discretion of the City Engineer, the applicant shall provide adequate information, such as a traffic impact analysis (TIA) or traffic counts, to demonstrate the level of impact to the surrounding transportation system. The developer shall be required to mitigate for impacts attributable to the project, pursuant to TIA requirements in § 16.106.080 and rough proportionality requirements in § 16.106.090. The determination of impact or effect and the scope of the impact study shall be coordinated with the provider of the affected transportation facility.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant provided a TIA with this modification application. DKS Engineering, the City's transportation consultant reviewed the information and provided comments that are attached as Exhibit E. DKS commented that most study intersections would have a minimal impacts with the addition of the Lam Research traffic and would continue to meet intersection mobility targets in 2015 with the added traffic.

The one exception would be the intersection of Tualatin-Sherwood Road / Wildrose Place, which would have higher delay for southbound traffic on Wildrose Place waiting for gaps to enter traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. The intersection would have a volume/capacity ratio of 1.01 during the p.m. peak hour, which would exceed Washington County's mobility target of 0.99. The analysis indicates that the approach would operate at level of service (LOS) F and average delay for this movement would be approximately 165 seconds. The intersection operations would also exceed the City of Sherwood mobility targets that were revised in the recent TSP update.

The applicant proposed restriping the southbound Wildrose Place approach to include a separate right turn and left turn lane within the existing curb width, stated as 75 feet long and approximately 12 feet wide for each lane. This change would reduce vehicle delay for southbound vehicles on Wildrose Place (to approximately 70 seconds per vehicle), but would result in narrow lanes that would affect truck use and inhibit turning movements. This change would allow the intersection to meet Washington County mobility targets but the delay (70 seconds, LOS F) would still exceed City of Sherwood mobility targets of a two-way-stop-controlled (TWSC) intersection of LOS E. The intersection does not have sufficient volume to trigger a traffic signal warrant.

The delay for southbound vehicles on Wildrose Place would increase to approximately 165 seconds and the approach would exceed Washington County and City mobility targets during the p.m. peak hour without additional improvements. Restriping the current lane configuration to include a separate left turn and right turn

lane would impact trucks coming to and from the industrial area. The City may consider conditioning that the applicant widen the approach to include a second southbound lane to reduce delay since striping for a second lane does not fit in the existing curb width. However, while this improvement would reduce the delay for the approach, it would still not meet City mobility target of LOS E. Other movements and intersections would not be significantly impacted by the proposed use.

The City Engineer weighed these options and determined creation of a southbound lane would minimally improve the situation and have a negative impact on the turning movements of the trucks. This would not be proportional to the impact the Lam Research has on the transportation network. The City Engineer therefore would not recommend requiring the applicant to make this improvement.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

7. The proposed commercial, multi-family, institutional or mixed-use development is oriented to the pedestrian and bicycle, and to existing and planned transit facilities. Urban design standards shall include the following:

a. Primary, front entrances shall be located and oriented to the street, and have significant articulation and treatment, via facades, porticos, arcades, porches, portal, forecourt, or stoop to identify the entrance for pedestrians. Additional entrance/exit points for buildings, such as a postern, are allowed from secondary streets or parking areas.

b. Buildings shall be located adjacent to and flush to the street, subject to landscape corridor and setback standards of the underlying zone.

c. The architecture of buildings shall be oriented to the pedestrian and designed for the long term and be adaptable to other uses. Aluminum, vinyl, and T-111 siding shall be prohibited. Street facing elevations shall have windows, transparent fenestration, and divisions to break up the mass of any window. Roll up and sliding doors are acceptable. Awnings that provide a minimum 3 feet of shelter from rain shall be installed unless other architectural elements are provided for similar protection, such as an arcade.

d. As an alternative to the above standards 7a—7c, the following Commercial Design Review Matrix may be applied to any commercial, multi-family, institutional or mixed use development (this matrix may not be utilized for developments within the Old Town Overlay). A development must propose a minimum of 60 percent of the total possible points to be eligible for exemption from standards 7a—7c above. In addition, a development proposing between 15,001 and 40,000 square feet of floor area, parking or seating capacity and proposing a minimum of 80 percent of the total possible points from the matrix below may be reviewed as a Type II administrative review, per the standards of Section 16.72.010.A.2.

FINDING: The applicant is not proposing changes to the existing building and therefore this criterion is not applicable.

V. APPLICABLE CODE PROVISIONS

A. Division II– Land Use and Development

Chapter 16.31 INDUSTRIAL LAND USE DISTRICTS

16.31.020 Uses

A. The table below identifies the land uses that are permitted outright (P), permitted conditionally (C) and not permitted (N) in the industrial zoning districts. The specific land use categories are described and defined in Chapter 16.88

B. Uses listed in other sections of this code, but not within this specific table are prohibited.

C. Any use not otherwise listed that can be shown to be consistent or associated with the uses permitted outright or conditionally in the commercial zones or contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the commercial zones may be permitted outright or conditionally, utilizing the provisions of Chapter 16.88.

INDUSTRIAL	LI	GI	EI
• Limited manufacturing entirely within an enclosed building that is generally secondary to a permitted or conditional commercial use	P	P	P
• Medical or dental laboratories	P	P	P
• Laboratories (not medical or dental).	P	P	P
• mini-warehousing or self-storage	N	P	N
• Distribution, warehousing and storage associated with a permitted use	P	P	P
• Research and development and associated manufacturing	P	P	P

FINDING: The applicant indicates that the uses will be for general industrial-type operations for their computer wafer manufacturing business operations, storage of materials and warehousing. The applicant meets this criterion.

16.31.030 Dimensional Standards

No lot area, setback, yard, landscaped area, open space, off-street parking or loading area, or other site dimension or requirement, existing on, or after, the effective date of this Code shall be reduced below the minimum required by this Code. Nor shall the conveyance of any portion of a lot, for other than a public use or right-of-way, leave a lot or structure on the remainder of said lot with less than minimum Code dimensions, area, setbacks or other requirements, except as permitted by Chapter 16.84.

Development Standards by Zone	GI
Lot area- Industrial Uses:	20,000 SF
Lot width at front property line:	100 feet
Lot width at building line:	100 feet
Front Yard Setback	None
Side Yard Setback	None
Rear Yard Setback	None
Corner lot street side	None
Height	50 feet

STAFF ANALYSIS: The building has already been constructed, and the applicant does not plan to change the dimensions or height of the building.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, this criterion is not applicable.

16.58.010 Clear Vision Areas

A. A clear vision area shall be maintained on the corners of all property at the intersection of two (2) streets, intersection of a street with a railroad, or intersection of a street with an alley or private driveway.

B. A clear vision area shall consist of a triangular area, two (2) sides of which are lot lines measured from the corner intersection of the street lot lines for a distance specified in this regulation; or, where the lot lines have rounded corners, the lot lines extended in a straight line to a point of intersection, and so measured, and the third side of which is a line across the corner of the lot joining the non-intersecting ends of the other two (2) sides.

C. A clear vision area shall contain no planting, sight obscuring fence, wall, structure, or temporary or permanent obstruction exceeding two and one-half (2½) feet in height, measured from the top of the curb, or where no curb exists, from the established street center line grade, except that trees exceeding this height may be located in this area, provided all branches and foliage are removed to the height of seven (7) feet above the ground on the sidewalk side and ten (10) feet on the street side.

The following requirements shall govern clear vision areas:

- 1. In all zones, the minimum distance shall be twenty (20) feet.**
- 2. In all zones, the minimum distance from corner curb to any driveway shall be twenty-five (25) feet.**
- 3. Where no setbacks are required, buildings may be constructed within the clear vision area.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The site is located in the general industrial zone that requires a minimum clear vision distance of 20 feet. The site has access onto SW Wildrose Place with two driveway aprons. There are existing street trees that are an appropriate distance away to not impede the clear vision area. John Wolff, TVF&R reviewed the preliminary plans and noted that the proposed Cedar tree may impede clear vision area because the limbs may fall lower than 13' 6".

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has not met this criterion, but can do so with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, show that there are not any site obstructing objects within the clear vision area.

B. Division V. Community Design

16.92-LANDSCAPING

16.92.010-Landscaping Plan Required

All proposed developments for which a site plan is required pursuant to Section 16.90.020 shall submit a landscaping plan that meets the standards of this Chapter. All areas not occupied by structures, paved roadways, walkways, or patios shall be landscaped or maintained according to an approved site plan.

The applicant submitted a landscape plan that shows landscaping surrounding the site as well as adjacent to the buildings and parking areas. Compliance with the landscaping standards will be discussed below.

16.92.020 Landscaping Materials

A. Type of Landscaping

Required landscaped areas shall include an appropriate combination of native evergreen or deciduous trees and shrubs, evergreen ground cover, and perennial plantings. Trees to be planted in or adjacent to public rights-of-way shall meet the requirements of this Chapter. Plants may be selected from the City's "Suggested Plant Lists for Required Landscaping Manual" or suitable for the Pacific Northwest climate and verified by a landscape architect or certified landscape professional.

FINDING: The applicant provided a landscape plan that shows a combination of evergreen or deciduous trees and shrubs, evergreen ground cover, and perennial plants. The applicant did not identify the groundcover or the exact number of trees to be planted. The applicant has not met this criterion, but conditions to meet this standard have been identified later within this report.

16.92.030 Site Area Landscaping and Perimeter Screening Standards

A. Perimeter Screening and Buffering

1. Perimeter Screening Separating Residential Zones:

A minimum six-foot high sight-obscuring wooden fence, decorative masonry wall, or evergreen screen, shall be required along property lines separating single and two-family uses from multi-family uses, and along property lines separating residential zones from commercial, institutional/public or industrial zones subject to the provisions of Chapter 16.48.020 (Fences, Walls and Hedges).

FINDING: The site is not located adjacent to residential property and thus this criterion is not applicable.

2. Perimeter Landscaping Buffer

a. A minimum ten (10) foot wide landscaped strip comprised of trees, shrubs and ground cover shall be provided between off-street parking, loading, or vehicular use areas on separate, abutting, or adjacent properties.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The site plan shows a landscape strip around the perimeter of the site that is over ten feet wide on the west and northern boundary. There is no perimeter landscaping around the eastern or southern boundary. At the southern property line, there is a shared 60' access easement providing access to the building to the south as well as the subject property. This would make adding perimeter landscaping impractical, as it serves both properties and is necessary for the operations of both of the facilities. There is an existing driveway along the eastern boundary of the site as well. A storm water quality facility approximately 44,613 square feet is on the other side of this driveway, between the building and the eastern boundary. It is not practical to require perimeter landscaping along this boundary as there is sufficient mature landscaping screening the building. Additionally, the property to the east has perimeter landscaping along that property line. Since the applicant is developing an existing site, this situation would be considered a pre-existing nonconformity. The applicant is not making the site more non-conforming by adding parking, but using existing site constraints to make the adjustment in the parking area to serve the new tenant's needs.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion with respect to the landscaping along the perimeter of the western and northern boundary. With respect to the eastern

and southern boundary, the applicant does not meet this criterion, but it is considered a pre-existing nonconformity that is not exacerbated by this proposal.

B. Parking Area Landscaping

1. Purpose

The standard is a landscape treatment that uses a combination of trees, shrubs, and ground cover to provide shade, storm water management, aesthetic benefits, and screening to soften the impacts of large expanses of pavement and vehicle movement. It is applied to landscaped areas within and around the parking lot and loading areas.

2. Definitions

a. **Parking Area Landscaping:** Any landscaped area on the site that is not required as perimeter landscaping § 16.92.030 (Site Landscaping and Screening).

b. Canopy Factor

(1) Landscape trees are assigned a canopy factor to determine the specific number of required trees to be planted. The canopy factor is calculated based on the following formula:

Canopy Factor = Mature Height (in feet) × Canopy Spread (in feet) × Growth Rate Factor × .01

(2) **Growth Rate Factor:** The growth rate factor is three (3) for fast-growing trees, two (2) for medium growing trees, and one (1) for slow growing trees. The growth rate of a tree is identified in the "Suggested Plant Lists for Required Landscaping Manual."

3. Required Landscaping

There shall be at least forty-five (45) square feet parking area landscaping for each parking space located on the site. The amount of required plant materials are based on the number of spaces as identified below.

4. Amount and Type of Required Parking Area Landscaping

a. Number of Trees required based on Canopy Factor

Small trees have a canopy factor of less than forty (40), medium trees have a canopy factor from forty (40) to ninety (90), and large trees have a canopy factor greater than ninety (90);

(1) Any combination of the following is required:

(i) One (1) large tree is required per four (4) parking spaces;

(ii) One (1) medium tree is required per three (3) parking spaces; or

(iii) One (1) small tree is required per two (2) parking spaces.

(iv) At least five (5) percent of the required trees must be evergreen.

(2) Street trees may be included in the calculation for the number of required trees in the parking area.

b. Shrubs:

(1) Two (2) shrubs are required per each space.

(2) For spaces where the front two (2) feet of parking spaces have been landscaped instead of paved, the standard requires one (1) shrub per space. Shrubs may be evergreen or deciduous.

c. Ground cover plants:

(1) Any remainder in the parking area must be planted with ground cover plants.

(2) The plants selected must be spaced to cover the area within three (3) years. Mulch does not count as ground cover.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant provided a list of the plants, location of the plants and size of the containers of the plants to be planted. The applicant did not identify the specific number of each species of tree that will be planted but identified that they are all "large trees." One of the trees is a Blaze Maple, which may be considered a medium tree. The applicant proposes adding 14 trees using the formula of one large tree per four parking spaces to account for the 55 additional parking spaces proposed. The applicant proposes to add 117 shrubs, which is over the required 110 shrubs, two shrubs per space. The applicant did not identify any type of ground cover. Since the specific number of trees is not listed, staff cannot ascertain whether this condition is met or more trees would need to be placed on site.

The applicant indicates that there is 44,613 square feet of existing landscaping in the parking area. The applicant proposes to add 886 square feet of landscaping. The required amount of landscaping is 3,375 sq. ft. (45 sq. ft. x 75). The applicant clearly exceeds this standard. The applicant has not provided ground cover plants to cover the entire area within three years.

FINDING: The applicant has not provided enough detail about the quantity of specific trees in order to be compliant with this criterion, and thus this criterion is not met. It is possible to meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit a revised landscape plan that shows the total square footage of the amount of landscaping per each parking space, the quantity of trees based on canopy factor and the amount of shrubs and grass to be placed on the site.

5. Individual Landscape Islands Requirements

a. Individual landscaped areas (islands) shall be at least ninety (90) square feet in area and a minimum width of five (5) feet and shall be curbed to protect the landscaping.

b. Each landscape island shall be planted with at least one (1) tree.

c. Landscape islands shall be evenly spaced throughout the parking area.

d. Landscape islands shall be distributed according to the following:

(1) Residential uses in a residential zone: one (1) island for every eight (8) contiguous parking spaces.

(2) Multi or mixed-uses, institutional and commercial uses: one (1) island for every ten (10) contiguous parking spaces.

(3) Industrial uses: one (1) island for every twelve (12) contiguous parking spaces.

e. Storm water bio-swales may be used in lieu of the parking landscape areas and may be included in the calculation of the required landscaping amount.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant has provided landscape islands that are spaced to provide at least one island for every twelve contiguous parking spaces. Each landscape island contains one tree. The landscape islands are distributed evenly throughout the development. Some of the islands are irregularly shaped and staff is unable to determine the exact size. The applicant has not provided the dimensions for each landscape island to ensure that it is at least 90 square feet and 5 feet wide.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, this criterion is not met. It is feasible to meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide the dimensions for each new landscape island that shows they are at least 90 square feet and 5 feet wide.

C. Screening of Mechanical Equipment, Outdoor Storage, Service and Delivery Areas

All mechanical equipment, outdoor storage and manufacturing, and service and delivery areas, shall be screened from view from all public streets and any adjacent residential zones. If unfeasible to fully screen due to policies and standards, the applicant shall make efforts to minimize the visual impact of the mechanical equipment.

FINDING: The site is not adjacent to a residential zone. The building's eastern side faces SW Wildrose Place. The applicant does not propose any changes to the delivery area or mechanical equipment. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

D. Visual Corridors

Except as allowed by subsection 6. above, new developments shall be required to establish landscaped visual corridors along Highway 99W and other arterial and collector streets, consistent with the Natural Resources and Recreation Plan Map, Appendix C of the Community Development Plan, Part II, and the provisions of Chapter 16.142(Parks, Trees, and Open Space). Properties within the Old Town Overlay are exempt from this standard.

FINDING The site is not adjacent to any street where a visual corridor is required and therefore this criterion is not applicable.

16.92.040 Installation and Maintenance Standards

A. Installation

All required landscaping must be in-ground, except when in raised planters that are used to meet minimum Clean Water Services storm water management requirements. Plant materials must be installed to current nursery industry standards. Plant materials must be properly supported to ensure survival. Support devices such as guy wires or stakes must not interfere with vehicular or pedestrian movement.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant has not shown how the landscaping will be installed.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has not met this criterion. The applicant may be able to meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit landscape plans that offer details on how the landscaping will be planted including area calculations, and specific methods that will be employed to ensure that the landscaping achieves maturity in a timely manner (i.e. soil amendments, recommended soil volumes, etc.).

B. Maintenance and Mitigation of Landscaped Areas

- 1. Maintenance of existing non-invasive native vegetation is encouraged within a development and required for portions of the property not being developed.**
- 2. All landscaping shall be maintained in a manner consistent with the intent of the approved landscaping plan.**
- 3. Any required landscaping trees removed must be replanted consistent with the approved landscaping plan and comply with § 16.142, (Parks, Trees and Open Space).**

C. Irrigation

The intent of this standard is to ensure that plants will survive the critical establishment period when they are most vulnerable due to lack of watering. All landscaped areas must provide an irrigation system, as stated in Option 1, 2, or 3.

- 1. Option 1: A permanent built-in irrigation system with an automatic controller installed.**
- 2. Option 2: An irrigation system designed and certified by a licensed landscape architect or other qualified professional as part of the landscape plan, which provides sufficient water to ensure that the plants become established. The system does not have to be permanent if the plants chosen can survive independently once established.**
- 3. Option 3: Irrigation by hand. If the applicant chooses this option, an inspection will be required one (1) year after final inspection to ensure that the landscaping has become established.**

FINDING: The applicant has not indicated on the landscaping plans how the landscape areas will be irrigated or maintained. This criterion is not met, but can be met with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit landscape plans that show how the landscaping will be maintained over time.

16.94 Off Street Parking and Loading

16.94.010 - General Requirements

E. Location

3. Vehicle parking is allowed only on improved parking shoulders that meet City standards for public streets, within garages, carports and other structures, or on driveways or parking lots that have been developed in conformance with this code. Specific locations and types of spaces (car pool, compact, etc.) for parking shall be indicated on submitted plans and located to the side or rear of buildings where feasible.

The applicant proposes to add parking around the building on existing pavement by restriping these areas to gain parking. It is located on the side and rear of the building. The applicant identifies one Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking space. The Building Official indicates that the parking plans will be reviewed for compliance with ADA requirements at the time of building permit submittal.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion the applicant does not fully meet this criterion, but can do so with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to approval of the final site plan, submit site plans that illustrate that the proposed modifications are compliant with ADA parking standards.

a. All new development with forty (40) employees or more shall include preferential spaces for carpool/vanpool designation. Carpool and vanpool parking spaces shall be located closer to the main employee entrance than all other parking spaces with the exception of ADA parking spaces. Carpool/vanpool spaces shall be clearly marked as reserved for carpool/vanpool only.

The applicant indicates that they will employ 75 people over three different shifts, thus triggering the requirement for a marked carpool spot. The applicant has not shown where the carpool parking space will be located.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has not met this criterion. The applicant may meet the criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide site plans that show the location of the carpool parking space in close proximity to the entrance.

b. Existing development may redevelop portions of designated parking areas for multi-modal facilities (transit shelters, park and ride, and bicycle parking), subject to meeting all other applicable standards, including minimum space standards.

FINDING: The applicant does not propose redeveloping the site for multi-modal facilities. This criterion is not applicable.

F. Marking

All parking, loading or maneuvering areas shall be clearly marked and painted. All interior drives and access aisles shall be clearly marked and signed to show the direction of flow and maintain vehicular and pedestrian safety.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant provided a restriping plan for the additional parking spaces. The applicant showed a one-way drive aisle with angled parking along the western and northern sides of the building. The applicant did not show the location of any signage that would indicate to drivers that they were entering a one way drive where the one way drive begins. The applicant has not shown the loading areas on the plans.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant does not meet this criterion, but can satisfy the requirement with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit plans that show all interior drives and access aisles clearly marked and signed to show the direction of flow and maintain vehicular and pedestrian safety.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final occupancy, install striping and signage that show all internal access aisles clearly marked indicating direction of flow to maintain vehicular and pedestrian safety.

G. Surface and Drainage

1. All parking and loading areas shall be improved with a permanent hard surface such as asphalt, concrete or a durable pervious surface. Use of pervious paving material is encouraged and preferred where appropriate considering soils, location, anticipated vehicle usage and other pertinent factors.

FINDING: The applicant proposes to use existing pavement already constructed on site. This criterion is met.

2. Parking and loading areas shall include storm water drainage facilities approved by the City Engineer or Building Official.

STAFF ANALYSIS: There is an existing storm water quality facility on the property. No onsite storm facilities are proposed. No changes are proposed to the impervious areas with the added parking spaces. The existing storm sewer on the east, west and north sides of the building provide service to the site.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, this criterion is met.

H. Repairs

Parking and loading areas shall be kept clean and in good repair. Breaks in paved surfaces shall be repaired. Broken or splintered wheel stops shall be replaced. Painted parking space boundaries and directional symbols shall be maintained in a readable condition.

FINDING: The site has been operational for over fifteen years. The applicant proposes to repaint the parking area. The site will be inspected before the Certificate of Final Occupancy is granted and will need to be in good condition and repair. After that, any necessary repairs would become a Code Compliance issue. Based on the discussion, the applicant has not met this criterion, but can do so with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to Final Occupancy, ensure that the parking and loading areas are kept in good repair, wheel stops in good condition and the painted parking space boundaries and directional symbols are maintained in a readable condition.

I. Parking and Loading Plan

An off-street parking and loading plan, drawn to scale, shall accompany requests for building permits or site plan approvals, except for single and two-family dwellings, and manufactured homes on residential lots. The plan shall show but not be limited to:

- 1. Delineation of individual parking and loading spaces and dimensions.**
- 2. Circulation areas necessary to serve parking and loading spaces.**
- 3. Location of accesses to streets, alleys and properties to be served, and any curb cuts.**
- 4. Landscaping as required by Chapter 16.92.**
- 5. Grading and drainage facilities.**
- 6. Signing and bumper guard specifications.**

7. Bicycle parking facilities as specified in Section 16.94.020.C.

8. Parking lots more than one (1) acre in size shall provide street-like features including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or planting strips.

FINDING: The applicant prepared a parking plan that included the restriping plan and dimensions. Several of these items are missing from that plan that will be discussed within the applicable Code sections.

16.94.020 - Off-Street Parking Standards

A. Generally

Where square feet are specified, the area measured shall be the gross building floor area primary to the functioning of the proposed use. Where employees are specified, persons counted shall be those working on the premises, including proprietors, during the largest shift at peak season. Fractional space requirements shall be counted as a whole space. The Review Authority may determine alternate off - street parking and loading requirements for a use not specifically listed in this Section based upon the requirements of comparable uses.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The site originally contained twenty-one (21) parking spaces. The applicant proposes to add 54 parking spaces for 75 parking spaces to be distributed evenly along the perimeter of the building. The number of employees scheduled for Pacific Foods, the original tenant, largest shift was twenty (20) and twenty (20) parking spaces were required.

The applicant's TIA shows that there will be three (3) labor shifts equally distributed with twenty five (25) workers for each shift. Including some overlap of time, 75 parking spaces will be adequate to meet the needs of the employees under this standard.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this standard.

B. Dimensional and General Configuration Standards

1. Dimensions For the purpose of this Chapter, a "parking space" means a stall nine (9) feet in width and twenty (20) feet in length. Up to twenty five (25) percent of required parking spaces may have a minimum dimension of eight (8) feet in width and eighteen (18) feet in length so long as they are signed as compact car stalls.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant showed a combination of angled, parallel and standard parking spaces. The applicant shows that there will be nineteen (19) compact parking spaces and 56 standard, meeting the 25% maximum allowed.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

2. Layout

Parking space configuration, stall and access aisle size shall be of sufficient width for all vehicle turning and maneuvering. Groups of more than four (4) parking spaces shall be served by a driveway so as to minimize backing movements or other maneuvering within a street, other than an alley. All parking areas shall meet the minimum standards shown in the following table and diagram.

**Table 2: Minimum Parking Dimension Requirements
One-Way Driving Aisle (Dimensions in Feet)**

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	J
45	8.0	16.5	13.0	11.3	46.0	3.0	2.5	51.0
9.0	18.5	12.0	12.7	49.0	3.0	2.5	54.0	
60°	8.0	17.0	18.0	9.2	52.0	3.0	2.5	57.0
9.0	19.5	16.0	10.4	55.0	3.0	2.5	60.0	

FINDING: The applicant provided site plans showing the individual parking spaces dimensions that meet the standards identified above for the 45 and 60 degree compact and standard angled parking spaces listed in the table above.

3. Wheel Stops

a. Parking spaces along the boundaries of a parking lot or adjacent to interior landscaped areas or sidewalks shall be provided with a wheel stop at least four (4) inches high, located three (3) feet back from the front of the parking stall as shown in the above diagram.

b. Wheel stops adjacent to landscaping, bio-swales or water quality facilities shall be designed to allow storm water runoff.

FINDING: The applicant has not shown wheel stops where they abut a sidewalk. Therefore, the applicant does not meet this criterion. It is possible to meet this criterion with the following conditions.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide plans that show wheel stops of at least four inches high located three feet back from the front of the parking stall where they abut interior landscaping or sidewalks.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to receiving the Certificate of Final Occupancy, install wheel stops where they abut sidewalks or interior landscaping.

C. Bicycle Parking Facilities

1. General Provisions

a. **Applicability.** Bicycle parking spaces shall be provided for new development, changes of use, and major renovations, defined as construction valued at twenty-five (25) percent or more of the assessed value of the existing structure.

b. **Types of Spaces.** Bicycle parking facilities shall be provided in terms of short-term bicycle parking and long-term bicycle parking. Short-term bicycle parking is intended to encourage customers and other visitors to use bicycles by providing a convenient and readily accessible place to park bicycles. Long-term bicycle parking provides employees, students, residents, commuters, and others who generally stay at a site for at least several hours a weather-protected place to park bicycles.

c. **Minimum Number of Spaces.** The required total minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use category is shown in Table 4, Minimum Required Bicycle Parking Spaces.

d. **Minimum Number of Long-term Spaces.** If a development is required to provide eight (8) or more required bicycle parking spaces in Table 4, at least twenty-five (25) percent shall be provided as long-term bicycle with a minimum of one (1) long-term bicycle parking space.

e. **Multiple Uses.** When there are two or more primary uses on a site, the required bicycle parking for the site is the sum of the required bicycle parking for the individual primary uses.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant has not indicated the location of the bicycle parking on the plan set for this modification. Due to the number of required parking spaces, the applicant would be required to have

at least two bicycle parking spaces. Since there are less than eight bike spaces required, long-term bike parking is not required.

FINDING: Based on this discussion, this criterion is not met. It is possible to meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit plans that show at least two bicycle parking spaces located in close proximity to the primary entrance.

2. Location and Design.

a. General Provisions

(1) Each space must be at least two (2) feet by six (6) feet in area, be accessible without moving another bicycle, and provide enough space between the rack and any obstructions to use the space properly.

(2) There must be an aisle at least five (5) feet wide behind all required bicycle parking to allow room for bicycle maneuvering. Where the bicycle parking is adjacent to a sidewalk, the maneuvering area may extend into the right-of-way.

(3) Lighting. Bicycle parking shall be at least as well lit as vehicle parking for security.

(4) Reserved Areas. Areas set aside for bicycle parking shall be clearly marked and reserved for bicycle parking only.

(5) Bicycle parking in the Old Town Overlay District can be located on the sidewalk within the right-of-way. A standard inverted "U shaped" or staple design is appropriate. Alternative, creative designs are strongly encouraged.

(6) Hazards. Bicycle parking shall not impede or create a hazard to pedestrians. Parking areas shall be located so as to not conflict with vision clearance standards.

b. Short-term Bicycle Parking

(1) Provide lockers or racks that meet the standards of this section.

(2) Locate inside or outside the building within thirty (30) feet of the main entrance to the building or at least as close as the nearest vehicle parking space, whichever is closer.

c. Long-term Bicycle Parking

(1) Provide racks, storage rooms, or lockers in areas that are secure or monitored (e.g., visible to employees or customers or monitored by security guards).

(2) Locate the outside bicycle parking spaces within one hundred (100) feet of the entrance that will be accessed by the intended users.

(3) All of the spaces shall be covered.

d. Covered Parking (Weather Protection)

(1) When required, covered bicycle parking shall be provided in one (1) of the following ways: inside buildings, under roof overhangs or awnings, in bicycle lockers, or within or under other structures.

(2) Where required covered bicycle parking is not within a building or locker, the cover must be permanent and designed to protect the bicycle from rainfall and provide seven-foot minimum overhead clearance.

(3) Where required bicycle parking is provided in lockers, the lockers shall be securely anchored.

Table 4: Minimum Required Bicycle Parking Spaces

Industrial Categories

- Industrial 2 or 1 per 40 spaces, whichever is greater

FINDING: As discussed above, the applicant has not shown any bicycle parking on the plans. The applicant has been conditioned earlier in this report to provide adequate bicycle parking onsite.

16.94.030 - Off-Street Loading Standards

A. Minimum Standards

2. The minimum loading area for non-residential uses shall not be less than ten (10) feet in width by twenty-five (25) feet in length and shall have an unobstructed height of fourteen (14) feet.
3. Multiple uses on the same parcel or adjacent parcels may utilize the same loading area if it is shown in the development application that the uses will not have substantially overlapping delivery times.
4. The following additional minimum loading space is required for buildings in excess of twenty thousand (20,000) square feet of gross floor area:
 - a. Twenty thousand (20,000) to fifty (50,000) sq. ft. - five hundred (500) sq. ft.
 - b. Fifty (50,000) sq. ft. or more - seven hundred fifty (750) sq. ft.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The site contains three loading bays along the southern side of the building. The applicant has not proposed to change the location and thus this criterion is not applicable.

B. Separation of Areas

Any area to be used for the maneuvering of delivery vehicles and the unloading or loading of materials shall be separated from designated off-street parking areas and designed to prevent the encroachment of delivery vehicles onto off-street parking areas or public streets. Off-street parking areas used to fulfill the requirements of this Chapter shall not be used for loading and unloading operations.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The site contains three loading bays along the southern side of the building. There is parking between the bays but separated with additional pavement or landscaping. The bays are for large semi trucks and are differentiated by concrete, rather than asphalt. The applicant plans on adding striping as well to delineate these spaces.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

16.96 Onsite Circulation

16.96.030 - Minimum Non-Residential Standards

Minimum standards for private, on-site circulation improvements in non-residential developments:

Industrial: Improved hard surfaced driveways are required as follows:

Required Parking Spaces	# Driveways	Minimum Width	
		One-Way Pair	Two-Way
1 - 249	1	15 feet	24 feet
250 & above	2	15 feet	24 feet

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant proposes a total of seventy-five parking spaces that will surround three sides of the building. The proposed one way drive around the building is 20 feet.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

3. Surface materials are encouraged to be pervious when appropriate considering soils, anticipated vehicle usage and other pertinent factors.

B. Sidewalks and Curbs

1. A private pathway/sidewalk system extending throughout the development site shall be required to connect to existing development, to public rights-of-way with or without improvements, to parking and storage areas, and to connect all building entrances to one another. The system shall also connect to transit facilities within five hundred (500) feet of the site, future phases of development, and whenever possible to parks and open spaces.

STAFF ANALYSIS: There is a sidewalk surrounding the southern and western sides of the building with access to the front entrance of the building.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

C. Division VI - Public Improvements

Chapter 16.106 TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

16.106.020 Required Improvements

A. Generally

Except as otherwise provided, all developments containing or abutting an existing or proposed street, that is either unimproved or substandard in right-of-way width or improvement, shall dedicate the necessary right-of-way prior to the issuance of building permits and/or complete acceptable improvements prior to issuance of occupancy permits. The following figure provides the depiction of the functional classification of the street network as found in the Transportation System Plan, Figure 8-1.

STAFF ANALYSIS: As discussed earlier in this report, the City Engineer has not required any additional improvements or right-of-way dedication. At the time of this report, Washington County did not have any comment or required improvements.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, this criterion is met.

16.110 - Sanitary Sewers

Sanitary sewers shall be installed to serve all new developments and shall connect to existing sanitary sewer mains. Sanitary Sewers shall be constructed, located, sized and installed at standards consistent 16.110.

STAFF ANALYSIS: According to the Engineering Department, a public sanitary sewer main is located on the west (10" dia.) and north (8" dia.) sides of the subject property within public easements. The existing building is connected to public sanitary sewer. No new fixtures are proposed as part of this development. No new improvements are required.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

16.112- Water Supply

16.112.010 Required Improvements

Water lines and fire hydrants conforming to City and Fire District standards shall be installed to serve all building sites in a proposed development. All waterlines shall be connected to existing water mains or shall construct new mains appropriately sized and located in accordance with the Water System Master Plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS: According to the Engineering comments, a 10" diameter public water main exists on the east side of the subject property within a public easement. The existing building is

connected to public water via a 2" domestic meter and 8" fire water meter. No new water fixtures are proposed to be installed as part of this development. The existing main on the east side provides service to the property and therefore no improvements will be required.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has met this criterion.

16.114 - Storm Water

Storm water facilities, including appropriate source control and conveyance facilities, shall be installed in new developments and shall connect to the existing downstream drainage systems consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the requirements of the Clean Water Services water quality regulations contained in their Design and Construction Standards R&O 04-9, or its replacement.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The Engineering Department has reviewed the proposal and provided the following comments concerning the storm water detention and treatment. An 18" diameter public sewer main is located on the north and western sides of the property within public easements. There is 30" storm sewer main, just east of the subject property for future development along SW Wildrose Place and SW Tualatin Sherwood Road. There is onsite water quality treatment that is connected to the public sewer. No new facilities are proposed and the existing facilities are adequate. No public storm sewer improvements are required.

However, in order for the City to inspect the existing facilities and ensure that they continue to function properly, a Private Storm Water Facility Access and Maintenance Covenant for each storm treatment facility should be recorded Washington County with a copy provided to the City.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion the applicant does not fully meet the criterion, but can do so with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final occupancy, record a Private Storm Water Facility Access and Maintenance Covenant for each storm water treatment facility with Washington County and provide copies to the City.

16.116 FIRE PROTECTION

16.116.010 Required Improvements

When land is developed so that any commercial or industrial structure is further than two hundred and fifty (250) feet or any residential structure is further than five hundred (500) feet from an adequate water supply for fire protection, as determined by the Fire District, the developer shall provide fire protection facilities necessary to provide adequate water supply and fire safety.

John Wolff, Deputy Fire Marshall from Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R) reviewed the plans after receiving notice and indicated that they preliminarily approved the project. He noted that the curbs will need to be painted red and marked "No Parking Fire Lane" at approved intervals. If the fire hydrants are subject to impact by a motor vehicle, guard posts, bollards or other approved means of protection need to be provided. A three-foot clear space must be provided around the circumference of the fire hydrants. His comments are attached as Exhibit C.

FINDING: All Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R) requirements apply to this development. Compliance with the standard TVF&R requirements is required throughout the development of this project. This standard has not been met, but the applicant may meet this standard from with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITON: Prior to final occupancy, ensure that the site meets all TVF&R requirements.

16.118 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UTILITIES*

16.118.010 Purpose

Public telecommunication conduits as well as conduits for franchise utilities including, but not limited to, electric power, telephone, natural gas, lighting, and cable television shall be installed to serve all newly created lots and developments in Sherwood.

16.118.020 Standard

A. Installation of utilities shall be provided in public utility easements and shall be sized, constructed, located and installed consistent with this Code, Chapter 7 of the Community Development Code, and applicable utility company and City standards.

B. Public utility easements shall be a minimum of eight (8) feet in width unless a reduced width is specifically exempted by the City Engineer. An eight-foot wide public utility easement (PUE) shall be provided on private property along all public street frontages. This standard does not apply to developments within the Old Town Overlay.

FINDING: No new utilities are necessary to be added to the site and there is an existing public utility easement throughout the site. This criterion is met.

D. Division VIII. Environmental Resources

16.142.070 Trees on Property Subject to Certain Land Use Applications

B. Applicability

All applications including a Type II - IV land use review, shall be required to preserve trees or woodlands, as defined by this Section to the maximum extent feasible within the context of the proposed land use plan and relative to other codes, policies, and standards of the City Comprehensive Plan.

C. Inventory

1. To assist the City in making its determinations on the retention of trees and woodlands, land use applications including Type II - IV development shall include a tree and woodland inventory and report. The report shall be prepared by a qualified professional and must contain the following information:

FINDING: The applicant has not proposed to remove any trees on site and thus this criterion is not applicable.

3. Required Tree Canopy - Non-Residential and Multi-family Developments

Each net development site shall provide a variety of trees to achieve a minimum total tree canopy of 30 percent. The canopy percentage is based on the expected mature canopy of each tree by using the equation πr^2 to calculate the expected square footage of each tree. The expected mature canopy is counted for each tree even if there is an overlap of multiple tree canopies.

The canopy requirement can be achieved by retaining existing trees or planting new trees. Required landscaping trees can be used toward the total on site canopy required to meet this standard. The expected mature canopy spread of the new trees will be counted toward the required canopy cover. A certified arborist or other qualified professional shall provide an

estimated tree canopy for all proposed trees to the planning department for review as a part of the land use review process.

	Commercial, Industrial, Institutional Public and Multi-family
Canopy Requirement	30%
Counted Toward the Canopy Requirement	
Street trees included in canopy requirement	No
Landscaping requirements included in canopy requirement	Yes
Existing trees onsite	Yes x2
Planting new trees onsite	Yes

FINDING: The applicant has not discussed compliance with this criterion, but the landscape plans indicate that there are many trees on site. The applicant could meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide the tree canopy calculation that shows the minimum 30% tree canopy cover for the site.

Chapter 16.154 HEAT AND GLARE

16.154.010 Generally

Except for exterior lighting, all otherwise permitted commercial, industrial, and institutional uses shall conduct any operations producing excessive heat or glare entirely within enclosed buildings. Exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjoining properties, and the use shall not cause such glare or lights to shine off site in excess of one-half (0.5) foot candle when adjoining properties are zoned for residential uses.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

Based upon review of the applicant’s submittal information, review of the code, agency comments and consideration of the applicant’s revised submittal, staff finds that the proposed site plan does not fully comply with the standards but can be conditioned to comply. Therefore, staff recommends Approval of **Lam Research Site Plan Modification (SP 14-03)** with the following conditions of approval:

VI. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

A. General Conditions

1. Compliance with the Conditions of Approval is the responsibility of the developer or its successor in interest.
2. This land use approval shall substantially comply with the submitted preliminary site plans and narrative dated October 24, 2014 and prepared by All County Surveyors and Planners, except as indicated in the conditions of the Notice of Decision. Additional

development or change of use may require a new development application and approval.

3. The developer/owner/applicant is responsible for all costs associated with private/public facility improvements.
4. This approval is valid for a period of two (2) years from the date of the decision notice. Extensions may be granted by the City as afforded by the SZCDC § 16.90.030.F.
5. The continual operation of the property shall comply with the applicable requirements of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code and Municipal Code.
6. This approval does not negate the need to obtain permits, as appropriate from other local, state or federal agencies even if not specifically required by this decision.
7. Retaining walls are not allowed within public easements or the public right of way.

B. Prior to Final Site Plan Approval:

1. Submit plans that show that there are no site obstructing objects within the clear vision area.
2. Submit a revised landscape plan that shows the total square footage of the amount of landscaping per each parking space, the quantity of trees based on canopy factor and the number of shrubs and grass to be placed on the site.
3. Submit plans that identify the dimensions for each new landscape island. The islands are required to be at least 90 square feet and five feet wide.
4. Submit plans that show wheel stops of at least four inches high located three feet back from the front of the parking stall where they abut interior landscaping or sidewalks.
5. Submit landscape plans that offer details on how the landscaping will be planted including area calculations, and specific methods that will be employed to ensure that the landscaping achieves maturity in a timely manner (i.e. soil amendments, recommended soil volumes, etc.).
6. Submit landscape plans that show how the landscaping will be maintained over time.
7. Submit site plans that show the location of the carpool parking space in close proximity to the entrance.
8. Submit site plans that illustrate that the proposed modifications are compliant with ADA parking standards.
9. Submit plans that show all interior drives and access aisles clearly marked and signed to show the direction of flow and maintain vehicular and pedestrian safety.
10. Submit plans that show at least two bicycle parking spaces located in close proximity to the primary entrance.

11. Provide the tree canopy calculation that shows the minimum 30% tree canopy cover for the site.

C. Prior to Issuance of the Certificate of Final Occupancy:

1. Install striping and signage that show all internal access aisles clearly marked indicating direction of flow to maintain vehicular and pedestrian safety.
2. Designate preferential spaces for carpool or vanpool parking with signage.
3. Install wheel stops where they abut sidewalks or interior landscaping.
4. Record a Private Storm Water Facility Access and Maintenance Covenant for each storm water treatment facility with Washington County and provide copies to the City.
5. Ensure that the parking and loading areas are kept in good repair, wheel stops in good condition and the painted parking space boundaries and directional symbols are maintained in a readable condition.
6. Ensure that the site meets all TVF&R requirements.

VII. Exhibits

- A. Applicant's submittal with narrative and supporting documents dated October 24, 2014 and amended December 1, 2014
- B. Amended Traffic Study response prepared by Mackenzie and dated December 18, 2014
- C. Engineering comments submitted by Craig Christensen P.E., Civil Engineer on December 2, 2014
- D. Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue Department comments submitted by John Wolff on December 29, 2014
- E. Transportation Response prepared by Garth Appanaitis, DKS Engineering on January 5, 2015
- F. Wildrose Industrial Park Site Plan, SP 00-04

END OF REPORT

EXHIBIT A

SP 14-03 Lam Research

1. Application materials from applicant
2. Proposed plans

All items are available for viewing at City Hall or may be reviewed electronically at the following web address:

<http://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/planning/project/lam-research-major-modification>

December 18, 2014

City of Sherwood
Attention: Bob Galati
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140

Re: **LAM Wildrose Industrial Park**
TIA Incompleteness Response#2
Project Number 2140370.00

Dear Mr. Galati:

This letter has been prepared to address comments provided in a memorandum dated December 12, 2014, from DKS regarding the completeness of the TIA prepared for the LAM Wildrose Industrial Park (SP 14-03 20551). Queuing analysis has been conducted using SimTraffic and the analysis procedures consistent with ODOT APM analysis methods for 95th-percentile queuing analysis.

As described in the TIA Completeness Response letter dated November 20, 2014, the PM Peak Hour Scenarios were rerun with consistent signal timing at the intersection of Tualatin Sherwood Road/Oregon Street. All queues reported have consistent and expected lengths. Queuing calculations using SimTraffic are enclosed with this letter.

The following table presents 95th percentile queues for all intersection approaches which experience an increase in volume due to project traffic. It should be noted the queuing analysis results are unreliable, as intersections analyzed are near capacity and simulations had to be run multiple times to achieve expected results, i.e., longer queues when volumes increase.

95TH PERCENTILE QUEUE LENGTHS (FEET)									
Intersection	Approach	Movement	Available Storage	2014 Existing		2015 Pre-Development		2015 Post-Development	
				AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
SW Oregon Street/SW Tualatin Sherwood Road	EB	Th	760*	500	1650	700	1900	800	2000
	WB	Lt	325	125	275	125	300	125	300
		Th, Rt	640	200	275	250	300	250	350
	NB	Rt	235*	250	150	300	150	300	150



City of Sherwood
 LAM Wildrose Industrial Park
 Project Number 2140370.00
 December 18, 2014
 Page 2

SW Wildrose Place /SW Tualatin Sherwood Road	EB	Lt	100	25	25	25	25	25	50
	WB	Th, Rt	>1,000	0	25	0	25	0	50
	SB	Lt, Rt	200	50	275	75	300	75	750
SW Cipole Road/SW Tualatin Sherwood Road	EB	Lt	370	75	75	100	75	100	75
		Th	>1,000	125	175	150	200	150	200
	WB	Th	800	175	275	175	325	200	375
	SB	Rt	250	50	150	50	175	50	225

Result reports in **BOLD** font exceed available storage.
 *Distance to nearest driveway, available storage extends past driveway

As shown in the table, the following movements exceed the available storage.

- The eastbound through queues at the Oregon Street/Tualatin Sherwood Road intersection extend past the nearest driveway; however, they do not extend past the adjacent intersection of Gerda Lane/Tualatin Sherwood Road.
- The northbound right turn queues at the same intersection extend past the adjacent driveway and are not made worse by the proposed development in the AM peak hour.
- Mitigation for the proposed development is suggested for the southbound queues at the Wildrose Place/Tualatin Sherwood Road intersection in the following section. It should be noted the distance from Wildrose Place/Tualatin Sherwood Road to the end of the cul-de-sac is 700 feet. The queues for the post-development scenario include the southbound queue at the site access at the end of the cul-de-sac.

The following table presents 95th percentile queues for the southbound movement at the Wildrose Place/Tualatin Sherwood Road intersection with the suggested mitigation of separate left and right turn lanes of 200 ft.

95TH PERCENTILE QUEUE LENGTHS WITH MITIGATION(FEET)					
Intersection	Approach	Movement	Available Storage	2015 Post-Development	
				AM	PM
SW Wildrose Place /SW Tualatin Sherwood Road	SB	Lt	200	25	625
		Rt	200	50	550

Result reports in **BOLD** font exceed available storage.

As shown in the previous two tables, the PM peak hour post-development single southbound queue is estimated to be 750 feet, and the sum of the two southbound queues with mitigation is 1,175 feet. These results would indicate longer queues with mitigation, which is contrary to expected results of adding a right turn lane. Further, the queuing results with mitigation assume almost half the hourly volume would be queued at one time.

These queuing analysis results using SimTraffic have been provided at the City’s request, and we trust they will address the completeness requirements for the application.

City of Sherwood
LAM Wildrose Industrial Park
Project Number 2140370.00
December 18, 2014
Page 3

Please contact me or Katie Atkins if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Brent Ahrend, P.E.
Senior Associate | Traffic Engineer

Enclosure(s): Queuing Calculations

c: Will Naito, Bob Naito, Steve Naito – Naito Development
 Lance Forney, Ryan Moore – All County Surveyors and Planners, Inc.
 Katie Atkins – Mackenzie

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	61	25
Average Queue (ft)	9	1
95th Queue (ft)	38	12
Link Distance (ft)	160	243
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)		
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	53	616	150	158	289	152	302	48
Average Queue (ft)	3	248	80	59	104	76	147	11
95th Queue (ft)	30	509	175	118	212	134	256	36
Link Distance (ft)		864			606	864	864	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		1						
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		23	0		0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		41	0		0			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	SB
Directions Served	L	LR
Maximum Queue (ft)	31	68
Average Queue (ft)	5	16
95th Queue (ft)	24	50
Link Distance (ft)		626
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110	
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	99	145	233	97	117	69
Average Queue (ft)	44	53	72	12	41	23
95th Queue (ft)	83	128	168	56	93	51
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			2			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			1			

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 43

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	63	31
Average Queue (ft)	13	1
95th Queue (ft)	46	12
Link Distance (ft)	160	243
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)		
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	81	686	150	209	314	174	361	44
Average Queue (ft)	5	339	90	67	127	79	173	12
95th Queue (ft)	42	697	183	137	249	142	307	37
Link Distance (ft)		864			606	864	864	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		4						
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		29	0		1			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		52	2		1			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	SB
Directions Served	L	LR
Maximum Queue (ft)	34	81
Average Queue (ft)	6	22
95th Queue (ft)	26	63
Link Distance (ft)		626
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110	
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	108	169	214	143	105	71
Average Queue (ft)	46	68	85	16	31	22
95th Queue (ft)	88	143	166	66	77	51
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			2			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			1			

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 56

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	66	14
Average Queue (ft)	14	1
95th Queue (ft)	47	11
Link Distance (ft)	160	243
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)		
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	46	814	150	216	299	184	366	48
Average Queue (ft)	3	400	89	65	121	82	164	13
95th Queue (ft)	25	816	186	133	240	151	291	40
Link Distance (ft)		864			606	864	864	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		6						
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		32	0		0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		56	1		1			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	SB
Directions Served	L	LR
Maximum Queue (ft)	44	88
Average Queue (ft)	9	23
95th Queue (ft)	33	65
Link Distance (ft)		626
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110	
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	128	148	266	91	103	80
Average Queue (ft)	50	61	92	15	31	23
95th Queue (ft)	96	136	194	59	77	56
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			2			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			2			

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 59

**Queuing and Blocking Report
AM Peak Hour**

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	58	15
Average Queue (ft)	13	1
95th Queue (ft)	43	7
Link Distance (ft)	146	243
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)		
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	19	739	150	144	300	174	346	34
Average Queue (ft)	1	325	90	59	109	77	173	10
95th Queue (ft)	9	655	184	111	220	139	297	32
Link Distance (ft)		864			594	864	864	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		2						
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		30	0		0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		52	0		0			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	37	35	92
Average Queue (ft)	11	10	17
95th Queue (ft)	34	32	62
Link Distance (ft)		626	626
Upstream Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110		
Storage Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			

Queuing and Blocking Report
 AM Peak Hour

12/17/2014

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	113	160	256	91	100	74
Average Queue (ft)	47	61	82	15	26	22
95th Queue (ft)	90	135	173	55	71	51
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			2			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			1			

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 54

**Queuing and Blocking Report
Baseline**

12/18/2014

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	38	33
Average Queue (ft)	16	5
95th Queue (ft)	42	23
Link Distance (ft)	160	243
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)		
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	22	1388	150	294	377	205	186	63
Average Queue (ft)	1	717	109	183	132	106	85	20
95th Queue (ft)	11	1651	198	286	284	173	155	53
Link Distance (ft)		2273			606	863	863	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		1			0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0			0			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		42	0	3	0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		81	2	20	1			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	WB	SB
Directions Served	L	TR	LR
Maximum Queue (ft)	38	31	245
Average Queue (ft)	5	1	119
95th Queue (ft)	24	31	276
Link Distance (ft)		1107	626
Upstream Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110		
Storage Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			

Queuing and Blocking Report
 Baseline

12/18/2014

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	79	225	341	72	145	192
Average Queue (ft)	30	79	125	6	60	82
95th Queue (ft)	64	184	276	37	120	159
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			5			1
Queuing Penalty (veh)			1			1

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 106

**Queuing and Blocking Report
Baseline**

12/18/2014

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	64	31
Average Queue (ft)	18	4
95th Queue (ft)	49	21
Link Distance (ft)	160	243
Upstream Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		
Storage Bay Dist (ft)		
Storage Blk Time (%)		
Queuing Penalty (veh)		

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	38	1476	150	306	416	251	202	71
Average Queue (ft)	2	911	112	196	147	120	86	19
95th Queue (ft)	23	1903	199	292	301	209	157	53
Link Distance (ft)		2273			606	863	863	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		3			0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0			0			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		47	1	3	0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		91	4	27	2			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	WB	SB
Directions Served	L	TR	LR
Maximum Queue (ft)	33	26	287
Average Queue (ft)	5	1	135
95th Queue (ft)	23	22	309
Link Distance (ft)		1107	626
Upstream Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110		
Storage Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			

Queuing and Blocking Report
 Baseline

12/18/2014

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	91	259	423	87	180	223
Average Queue (ft)	36	84	154	6	70	82
95th Queue (ft)	74	199	325	50	140	164
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)		0	7		0	1
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0	1		1	1

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 128

**Queuing and Blocking Report
Baseline**

12/18/2014

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB	NB	SB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	115	30	13	29
Average Queue (ft)	49	5	0	6
95th Queue (ft)	125	24	6	38
Link Distance (ft)	160	243	626	226
Upstream Blk Time (%)	9			
Queuing Penalty (veh)	0			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)				
Storage Blk Time (%)				
Queuing Penalty (veh)				

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	71	1570	150	309	514	245	202	67
Average Queue (ft)	4	1022	113	210	163	119	85	19
95th Queue (ft)	41	1990	202	310	358	200	155	52
Link Distance (ft)		2273			606	863	863	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		8			0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0			1			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		49	0	5	0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		96	3	39	2			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	WB	SB
Directions Served	L	TR	LR
Maximum Queue (ft)	43	98	598
Average Queue (ft)	11	4	481
95th Queue (ft)	36	58	712
Link Distance (ft)		1107	626
Upstream Blk Time (%)			23
Queuing Penalty (veh)			13
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110		
Storage Blk Time (%)			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			

Queuing and Blocking Report
 Baseline

12/18/2014

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	96	279	521	92	174	257
Average Queue (ft)	36	91	163	7	69	98
95th Queue (ft)	77	212	373	50	141	217
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)						
Queuing Penalty (veh)						
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			7	0	0	3
Queuing Penalty (veh)			2	0	0	3

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 159

Queuing and Blocking Report
Baseline

12/18/2014

Intersection: 1: SW Wildrose Place & Site Access

Movement	EB	WB	NB	SB
Directions Served	LTR	LTR	LTR	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	72	33	15	3
Average Queue (ft)	27	5	1	0
95th Queue (ft)	57	24	8	3
Link Distance (ft)	146	243	626	226
Upstream Blk Time (%)				
Queuing Penalty (veh)				
Storage Bay Dist (ft)				
Storage Blk Time (%)				
Queuing Penalty (veh)				

Intersection: 3: SW Oregon Street & SW Tualatin Sherwood Road

Movement	EB	EB	EB	WB	WB	NB	NB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	R	L	TR	LT	R	LTR
Maximum Queue (ft)	50	2000	150	308	461	236	184	73
Average Queue (ft)	2	1304	107	211	169	117	92	19
95th Queue (ft)	22	2324	201	307	374	198	164	53
Link Distance (ft)		2273			594	863	863	138
Upstream Blk Time (%)		8			0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		0			2			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	150		100	260				
Storage Blk Time (%)		50	0	5	0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)		98	3	44	2			

Intersection: 4: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Wildrose Place

Movement	EB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	TR	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	47	140	533	462
Average Queue (ft)	14	11	399	193
95th Queue (ft)	40	99	618	541
Link Distance (ft)		1107	626	626
Upstream Blk Time (%)			2	1
Queuing Penalty (veh)			0	0
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	110			
Storage Blk Time (%)				
Queuing Penalty (veh)				

Queuing and Blocking Report
 Baseline

12/18/2014

Intersection: 5: SW Tualatin Sherwood Road & SW Cipole Road

Movement	EB	EB	WB	WB	SB	SB
Directions Served	L	T	T	R	L	R
Maximum Queue (ft)	102	264	662	122	166	198
Average Queue (ft)	40	89	185	8	70	89
95th Queue (ft)	85	204	466	57	139	166
Link Distance (ft)		1107	1136			1126
Upstream Blk Time (%)			0			
Queuing Penalty (veh)			0			
Storage Bay Dist (ft)	365			125	175	
Storage Blk Time (%)			8		0	1
Queuing Penalty (veh)			2		0	1

Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 153



Engineering Land Use Application Comments

To: Michelle Miller, Senior Planning

From: Craig Christensen, P.E., Engineering Associate II

Project: LAM Wildrose Industrial Park (SP 14-03)

Date: December 23, 2014

Engineering staff has reviewed the information provided for the above cited project. Final construction plans will need to meet the standards established by the City of Sherwood and Clean Water Services (CWS), in addition to requirements established by other jurisdictional agencies providing land use comments. City of Sherwood Engineering Department comments are as follows:

Sanitary Sewer

A public sanitary sewer main exists on the west (10" dia.) and north (8" dia.) sides of the subject property within public easements. The existing building is connected to public sanitary sewer. No new sanitary fixtures are proposed to be installed as part of this development. The existing sanitary sewer on the west and north sides of the subject property provides sewer service to and through the property, therefore no public sanitary sewer improvements are required.

Water

A 10-inch diameter public water main exists on the east side of the subject property within a public easement. The existing building is connected to public water via a 2" domestic meter and 8" fire water meter. No new water fixtures are proposed to be installed as part of this development. The existing water main on the east side of the subject property provides water service to and through the property, therefore no public water improvements are required.

Storm Sewer

An 18-inch diameter public storm sewer main exists on the west and north sides of the subject property within public easements. Also there exists a 30" storm sewer main just east of the subject property for the future development along SW Wildrose Place and property south of SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road. The subject property has on-site water quality treatment and is connected to public storm sewer. No new storm facilities are proposed to be installed as part of this development. The existing storm sewer on the

Project: LAM Wildrose Industrial Park (SP 14-03)
Date: December 23, 2014
Page: 2 of 2

west and north sides of the subject property along with the storm sewer east of the subject property provides storm sewer service to and through the property, therefore no public storm sewer improvements are required.

A Private Storm Water Facility Access and Maintenance Covenant for each storm water treatment facility shall be recorded with Washington County with a copy being submitted to the city project manager prior to Land Use Approval.

Transportation

The subject property has access to SW Wildrose Place. SW Wildrose Place is a dead end cul-de-sac with the only access coming from SW Tualatin Sherwood Road. A traffic impact analysis has shown that the change in function for the subject property will result in additional traffic and significant additional queueing length for SW Wildrose Place traffic turning onto SW Tualatin Sherwood Road. Since SW Tualatin Sherwood Road is a Washington County road, Washington County review and approval of the traffic impact analysis is required. Any conditions for public street improvements will be determined by Washington County and become part of the project requirements.

Grading and Erosion Control:

City policy requires that prior to any grading, a permit shall be obtained from the Building Department for all grading and erosion control on the private portion of the site. In addition, an approved grading and erosion control plan is also required prior to any grading.

Other Engineering Issues:

Any work within city public right-of-way will require a public right-of-way permit.

A plumbing permit is required prior to constructing any plumbing facilities on private property.

Site development will need to meet the approval of Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue.

Additional System Development Charges may be assessed and will need to be paid prior to Land Use Approval.

End of Engineering Land Use Review Comments.



December 23, 2014

City of Sherwood
22560 SW Pine
Sherwood OR, 97140

Re: 20551 SW Wildrose Plc / Edy Rd Industrial Park Parking Striping

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed site plan surrounding the above named development project. Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue endorses this proposal predicated on the following criteria and conditions of approval:

- 1) **FIRE APPARATUS ACCESS ROAD WIDTH AND VERTICAL CLEARANCE:** Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches. ***Fire access is approved as discussed with modifications shown at NE corner. However, SW corner landscaping will need to be such that 20 feet of width is not compromised for a height of 13'6". "The Western Red Cedar" proposed at each side of the access appears to have a potential canopy that would compromise the 20 foot width lower than 13'6". Adjust this to assure access is not compromised.***
- 2) **PAINTED CURBS:** Where required, fire apparatus access roadway curbs shall be painted red and marked "NO PARKING FIRE LANE" at approved intervals. Lettering shall have a stroke of not less than one inch wide by six inches high. Lettering shall be white on red background. (OFC 503.3) ***Curbs to be painted to assure No Parking where applicable.***
- 3) **PHYSICAL PROTECTION:** Where fire hydrants are subject to impact by a motor vehicle, guard posts, bollards or other approved means of protection shall be provided. (OFC 507.5.6)
- 4) **CLEAR SPACE AROUND FIRE HYDRANTS:** A 3 foot clear space shall be provided around the circumference of fire hydrants. (OFC 507.5.5)

If you have questions or need further clarification, please feel free to contact me at 503-259-1504.

Sincerely,

John Wolff
Deputy Fire Marshal

Copy: TVF&R File



720 SW Washington St.

Suite 500

Portland, OR 97205

503.243.3500

www.dksassociates.com

MEMORANDUM (DRAFT)

DATE: January 5, 2015

TO: Craig Christensen, City of Sherwood
Bob Galati, City of Sherwood
Michelle Miller, City of Sherwood

FROM: Garth Appanaitis, P.E.
Chris Maciejewski, P.E.

SUBJECT: **Sherwood Transportation on-Call Task 18**
LAM Wildrose Industrial Park (SP 14-03 20551) – TIA Technical Review

P#11117-018

This memorandum summarizes our technical review of the transportation impact analysis (TIA) materials¹ submitted for the LAM Wildrose Industrial Park (SP 14-03 20551). The project site is located at 20551 SW Wildrose Place, on the west side of SW Wildrose Place. The proposed use will be a repurpose the existing 100,400 square feet warehouse facility to accommodate an increase in site usage and parking.

Based on our review of the material, the additional traffic generated by the site will not create significant impacts to the transportation system. The following sections summarize our review findings.

Scope of the Transportation Analysis

Since the proposed use would not significantly alter the configuration of the existing site, an analysis of site circulation, loading and conflicts was not requested. The traffic analysis focused on impacts to intersections along SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road due to additional traffic generated by the site.

Proposed Use

The following items summarize our understanding of the proposed use:

- The site is currently occupied by Pacific Foods Distribution facility, and is located on a five acre lot that is zoned as General Industrial (GI).
- The proposed use would repurpose the approximately 100 ksf building and add parking (55 spaces added for a total of 75 spaces). The building will be used for warehousing and light assembly to support the existing LAM facility on Leveton Drive in Tualatin.
- The site is anticipated to open in 2015 and was analyzed for 2015 conditions in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour.

¹ Transportation Impact Analysis LAM Wildrose Industrial Park, prepared by Mackenzie, Inc., October 2014; Exhibit J-a Additional Information to Trip Analysis (By Others), prepared by Mackenzie, November 20, 2014; and TIA Incompleteness Response #2, prepared by Mackenzie, December 18, 2014.



Site Traffic

The following items summarize the type and magnitude of the proposed site traffic:

Traffic Access

- Site traffic would access the transportation system via two existing driveways on SW Wildrose Place and the shared driveway with the property south of the site. The proposed use would not modify the site access configuration.
- Wildrose Place is a cul-de-sac that connects the site and three others to the transportation system via SW Tualatin Sherwood Road.

Trip Generation

- Site trip generation was based on anticipated activity for employees and deliveries, and was provided by LAM research. The trip generation included vehicle type and accounted for employee shift patterns. The site was assumed to have three employee shifts² during the workday. One of the shifts would arrive during the a.m. peak, while two shifts would leave during p.m. peak and another shift would arrive.
- Each shift of 25 employees is assumed to account for 88 daily trips. If all employees were to drive single occupancy vehicles (SOV) and not carpool (or use transit or another mode), that would account for approximately 50 trip ends (in and out of the site). The additional 38 trip ends could account for 19 (or approximately 75 percent) of employees leaving and returning to the site during lunch or another break period.
- The estimated trip generation provided by LAM research is generally consistent with the total daily trips of other industrial uses (based on average rates provided by ITE Trip Generation). The site would generate approximately 420 daily trips, while other industrial uses (including manufacturing and warehousing) would generate between approximately 270 and 490 daily trips. The site is anticipated to generate less a.m. peak hour trips and more p.m. peak hour trips than these related industrial uses due to the proposed shift pattern of the site.
- Trip generation for the existing use was based on a prior traffic study and subtracted from the proposed use trips to determine the additional trips added to the transportation system.
- The text (page 5) and Table 3 state that the existing use has a total of 4 trips in the a.m. peak hour and 5 trips in the p.m. peak hour. The appendix also includes an email that reiterates this number of trips. However, the existing entering and exiting trips listed in Table 3 and not consistent with these totals. Table 3 includes more total trips entering and exiting the site for each time period (8 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 10 trips during the p.m. peak hour). The subsequent traffic analysis is based on this higher number of existing trips and therefore a smaller increment of added trips for the proposed use. Due to the small magnitude of this inconsistency, the overall findings and traffic impacts are not likely to be significantly impacted by this error.

² The assumed employee shifts include: 5 a.m. to 5 p.m. (12 hour), 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. (9 hour), and 5 p.m. to 5 a.m. (12 hour)



- The proposed use would generate 35 additional trips in the a.m. peak, 84 additional trips in the p.m. peak, and 377 additional daily trips above the existing use.³
- **FINDING:** The estimated trip generation is reasonable based on the proposed number of employees, shift patterns, and delivery activity.

Trip Distribution

- Trip distribution was estimated based on existing traffic patterns at the study intersections and engineering judgment.
- Trip distribution assumed the following:
 - 15 percent to/from south on Tualatin Sherwood Road
 - 5 percent to/from north on Cipole Road
 - 60 percent to/from east on Tualatin-Sherwood Road
 - 20 percent to/from west on Tualatin-Sherwood Road
- **FINDING:** The assumed trip distribution is reasonable based on existing traffic patterns, proposed uses, and observations from other traffic studies.

Transportation System Impacts

The following items describe the transportation system impacts:

Analysis Scope and Added Traffic

- Background traffic growth along Tualatin-Sherwood Road was assumed to be three percent from 2014 to 2015 levels. This increment of growth is consistent with growth forecasts and modeling for Sherwood's Transportation System Plan (TSP).
- Three intersections along Tualatin-Sherwood Road (Oregon Street, Cipole Road, and Wildrose Place) were analyzed along with the two site driveways for traffic operations and impacts.
- Most study intersection turn movements would have five or less added trips in the a.m. peak hour and ten or less added trips during the p.m. peak hour. The primary exceptions (with additional trips) would be movements to/from Tualatin (southbound left turn and westbound right turn at Wildrose Place, and eastbound through and westbound through at Cipole Road).

Mobility Impacts

- Most study intersections would have nominal operational impacts with the additional site traffic and would continue to meet intersection mobility targets in 2015 with the added traffic.
 - The one exception would be the intersection of Tualatin-Sherwood Road / Wildrose Place, which would have higher delay for southbound traffic on Wildrose Place waiting for gaps to enter traffic on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. The intersection would have a volume/capacity ratio of 1.01 during the

³ These figures are based the total trips listed in Table 3, but do not match the sum of total trips entering and exiting the site during each time period as reported in Table 3.



p.m. peak hour, which would exceed Washington County’s mobility target of 0.99. The analysis indicates that the approach would operate at level of service (LOS) F and average delay for this movement would be approximately 165 seconds. The intersection operations would also exceed the City of Sherwood mobility targets that were revised in the recent TSP update.

- The applicant proposed restriping the southbound Wildrose Place approach to include a separate right turn and left turn lane within the existing curb width, stated as 75 feet long and approximately 12 feet wide for each lane. This change would reduce vehicle delay for southbound vehicles on Wildrose Place (to approximately 70 seconds per vehicle), but would result in narrow lanes that would impact truck use and inhibit turning movements. This change would allow the intersection to meet Washington County mobility targets but the delay (70 seconds, LOS F) would still exceed City of Sherwood mobility targets of a two-way-stop-controlled (TWSC) intersection of LOS E. The intersection does not have sufficient volume to trigger a traffic signal warrant.
- **FINDING:** The delay for southbound vehicles on Wildrose Place would increase to approximately 165 seconds and the approach would exceed Washington County and City of Sherwood mobility targets during the p.m. peak hour without additional improvements. Restriping the current lane configuration to include a separate left turn and right turn lane would impact trucks coming to and from the industrial area. The City of Sherwood may consider conditioning that the applicant widen the approach to include a second southbound lane to reduce delay since striping for a second lane does not fit in the existing curb width. However, while this improvement would reduce the delay for the approach, it would still not meet City of Sherwood mobility target of LOS E. Other movements and intersections would not be significantly impacted by the proposed use.

Vehicle Queuing Impacts

- Intersection queuing analysis was performed to determine 95th-percentile queue lengths using SimTraffic software.
- Due to the nominal traffic added to most turning movements (generally 10 vehicles or less during the peak hour), overall queuing impacts were minimal and turn lane channelization would not be exceeded by 95th-percentile queue lengths.
- The southbound 95th-percentile vehicle queue on Wildrose Place at Tualatin-Sherwood Road would grow from 300 feet without the development to 750 feet with the development. As noted in the analysis, this distance would cover the entirety of Wildrose Place.
- The westbound 95th-percentile vehicle queue on Tualatin-Sherwood Road at Oregon Street would extend 350 feet during the p.m. peak hour with the project and would not block access to Wildrose Place.
- **FINDING:** The 95th-percentile vehicle queues along Tualatin-Sherwood Road would not exceed available turn storage with the proposed use and would not block access to Wildrose Place.

Summary of Review Findings

The following items summarize the findings of our technical review:

- **FINDING:** The estimated trip generation is reasonable based on the proposed number of employees, shift patterns, and delivery activity.



- **FINDING:** The assumed trip distribution is reasonable based on existing traffic patterns, proposed uses, and observations from other traffic studies.
- **FINDING:** The delay for southbound vehicles on Wildrose Place would increase to approximately 165 seconds and the approach would exceed Washington County and City of Sherwood mobility targets during the p.m. peak hour without additional improvements. Restriping the current lane configuration to include a separate left turn and right turn lane would impact trucks coming to and from the industrial area. The City of Sherwood may consider conditioning that the applicant widen the approach to include a second southbound lane to reduce delay since striping for a second lane does not fit in the existing curb width. However, while this improvement would reduce the delay for the approach, it would still not meet City of Sherwood mobility target of LOS E. Other movements and intersections would not be significantly impacted by the proposed use.
- **FINDING:** The 95th-percentile vehicle queues along Tualatin-Sherwood Road would not exceed available turn storage with the proposed use and would not block access to Wildrose Place.

CITY OF SHERWOOD
Staff Report

Date: 04-11-2000
File No: SP 00-04 Wildrose Industrial Park Site Plan

TO: SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION App. Submitted: 1-28-2000
App. Complete: 2-25-2000
FROM: PLANNING DEPARTMENT 120 Day Deadline: 6-24-2000
K. Teramura
Consulting City Planner

I. BACKGROUND

- A. Applicant/Owner: Pacific Northwest Properties, LP
9665 SW Allen Boulevard, #115
Beaverton, Oregon 97005
Attn: Paul Gram
- Applicant's Representative: Mildren Design Group, Inc.
11830 SW Kerr Parkway, Suite 325
Lake Oswego, Oregon 97035
Attn: Gene Mildren
- B. Location: The property is located on the westerly side of SW Wildrose Place, approximately 250 feet north of its intersection with SW Tualatin-Sherwood Road. The property is further identified as Lots 2 and 3 of the Edy Road Industrial Park (Township 2 South; Range 1 West; Section 28A; Tax Lots 1300 and 1400).
- C. Parcel Size: Lot 2 is approximately 4.98 acres in size and Lot 3 is approximately 4.99 acres in size for a total of 9.97 acres.
- D. Existing Development and Site Characteristics: The vacant parcels front SW Wildrose Place, a public street, and can be served by public facilities. Vegetation on the relatively flat site consists of weeds and other plants that are not considered significant, nor are there any identified wetlands, significant habitat or natural areas on the site.
- E. Zoning Classification and Comprehensive Plan Designation: General Industrial (GI).
- F. Adjacent Zoning and Land Use: All adjacent lands are zoned GI and consist of primarily industrial parcels to the north and west, agriculture and industrial parcels to the east, and undeveloped wooded lots and residential sites to the south. A Southern Pacific Railroad line passes near the northwest corner of the subject site.
- G. Request: The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Plan review to establish two warehousing and storage facilities for food products. The buildings will be of single-story, tilt-up construction and will measure 100,400 square feet and 100,350 square feet respectively.
- H. Criteria: Required findings for site plan approval are found in Section 5.102.04 of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code.

II. APPLICATION SUMMARY

- A. The applicant intends to construct on the subject property two single-story tilt-up buildings of 100,400 square feet and 100,350 square feet respectively. The buildings will be used for warehousing and storage of food products manufactured by Pacific Foods. There will be three access points to the property. The first and southernmost access point is located near where the south property line of Parcel 2 intersects with the western edge of SW Wildrose Place. 270 feet north of the first access point, the second access point is located where SW Wildrose Place terminates in a cul-de-sac. The third access point is approximately 330 feet north of the second point along the western edge of the fire lane access that connects to SW Wildrose Place. Parking will be located in the central portion of the site between the two proposed buildings.
- B. The subject property is located in the General Industrial (GI) zone. Pursuant to Section 2.112.02.D.3, of the Community Development Code, “warehousing and storage” of “food products” is a permitted use in the zone. Development of the site therefore requires a site plan review.

III. AGENCY COMMENTS

- A. The City requested comments from affected agencies. The following information briefly summarizes those comments. All original documents are contained in the planning file and are a part of the official record on this case.
- B. The City Engineer noted all construction must comply with City and USA design and construction standards. Driveways entering Wildrose Place must comply with the City’s standards for commercial driveways. Additional right-of-way must be dedicated in accordance with City standards along Wildrose Place to provide a 35-foot half width ROW along the straight section of Wildrose and a 50-foot minimum radius ROW in the cul-de-sac. Street lights and street trees are to be provided along the Wildrose Place site frontage. A joint access agreement is required for the shared driveway into the site.

If it does not already exist; a minimum 15-foot easement must be provided to the City of Sherwood centered over the existing water main that runs to the north from the end of Wildrose Place. Water lines on-site must be private. Double detector valves are required for lines 4-inches and greater in size. Backflow devices are required for domestic service and irrigation lines. These valves and devices are to be located at the point where water lines leave the public easements or ROW. All public water lines must be ductile iron. Any wells on site are to be properly abandoned in accordance with state rules, prior to grading.

The stormwater pond along the east property line must not infringe on the adjacent access easement. Provisions must be incorporated into the utility plan to provide drainage through the site from the upstream property immediately to the south of the site. These provisions are to include appropriate piping, channels, and easements. In addition, design of the on-site stormwater treatment and detention facilities must address the impact of upstream drainage entering the facility. A downstream analysis is required to be

submitted with the final site engineering plans. Any storm sewer or channel carrying runoff from the public ROW must be covered by an easement dedicated to the City of Sherwood. The stormwater pond along the east property line must be privately maintained, since the majority of runoff it handles is from the site. However, since the pond receives some runoff from the public ROW, an easement covering the facility must be dedicated to the City to allow for emergency maintenance.

Public easements are required over all public utilities outside the public right-of-way. Easements dedicated to the City are to be exclusive easements unless otherwise authorized by the City Engineer. Due to the complex nature of the drainage in this area, no grading can occur on the site until the City and USA approve final engineering plans. The City Engineer may require a geotech report if questions arise regarding the constructability of the proposed public improvements or stormwater facilities. Before building occupancy, documentation that all needed easements have been recorded must be provided to the City Engineer. In addition, the vacation process must be completed for any easements to be vacated.

- C. The Unified Sewerage Agency reviewed the proposal and noted that the applicant will be required to extend public storm sewer to the uphill adjacent property. A drainage analysis and water quality facility will be required in accordance with USA and City standards. Industrial waste permits may be required. The applicant will need to fill out the industrial waste questionnaire available from USA at the time building permit application is made.
- D. The Sherwood Building Official reviewed the proposal and noted that all private storm and sanitary lines are required to comply with the Uniform Plumbing Code which permits a one percent slope with a letter of request. The preliminary plans indicate less than a one percent slope. An accessible route is required from required exits or an area of rescue assistance. This could have an adverse effect on the rear exit doors. Accessible parking must be located as close to the main entrance of the buildings as possible. One of these accessible parking spaces is required to be van accessible.
- E. Washington County indicated the calculated trip generation of this development and current usage levels of SW Tualatin Sherwood Road exceed the limits of R&O 86-95 and therefore require that the applicant submit an Access Report for review by the County Traffic Analyst. If road improvements are required following the County Engineering Division's review of the applicant's complete access report, facility improvements must comply with the County Traffic Analyst's Cumulative Review. The applicant must submit engineering plans consistent with the improvement requirements established by the Review, and, install these improvements prior to occupancy of the structure.
- F. Pride Disposal has approved the refuse container location. The Public Works Foreman had questions regarding pipe sizing and cross connection, but did not oppose the development. The City Finance Officer and the City Police Department reviewed the proposal and did not comment. No other contacted agency responded.

IV. SITE PLAN REVIEW

- A. Required findings for a Site plan Review are found in Section 5.102.04 of the Community Development Code. Section 5.102.04.A. requires the proposed development to meet the applicable zoning district standards and all provisions of Chapters 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9.**

Findings: The proposed development meets, or can conditionally comply, with all of the applicable zoning district standards of Chapters 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9. The relevant criteria in Chapters 2, 5 and 8 are discussed below. The relevant criteria in Chapter 6 relates to public improvements as discussed below. Chapter 9 is not applicable to this site plan application, as there are no Historic Resources on the site.

1. Chapter 2 - Land Use and Development

2.112 General Industrial (GI) Zoning District

2.112.05 Dimensional Standards

1. Lot Area: 20,000 sf.
2. Lot width at front property line: 100 feet.
3. Lot width at building line: 100 feet.
4. There are no minimum building setbacks.
5. Maximum height shall be 50 feet.

Findings: The two parcels exceed the minimum area and dimension requirements. There are no setbacks required along the property boundaries and the buildings are less than 50 feet in height. Based on the submitted site plan and building elevation drawings, the proposal complies with these limitations.

2. Chapter 5 - Community Design

5.203.02 Landscaping - Parking and Loading Areas

- A. Total Landscaped Area - A minimum of ten percent (10%) of the lot area used for the display or parking of vehicles shall be landscaped in accordance with Section 5.200.
- B. Adjacent to Public Rights-of-Way - A landscaped strip at least ten (10) feet in width shall be provided between rights-of-way and any abutting off street parking, loading, or vehicle use areas. Landscaping shall include any combination of evergreen hedges, dense vegetation, earth berm, grade, change in grade, wall or fence, forming a permanent year-round screen, excepting clear vision areas as per Section 2.303.
- C. Perimeter Landscaping - A ten (10) foot wide landscaped strip shall be provided between off-street parking, loading, or vehicular use areas on

separate abutting properties or developments. A minimum six (6) foot high sight-obscuring fence or plantings shall also be provided, except where equivalent screening is provided by intervening buildings or structures.

- D. Interior Landscaping - A minimum of fifty percent (50%) of required parking area landscaping shall be placed in the interior of the parking area. Landscaped areas shall be distributed so as to divide large expanses of pavement, improve site appearance, improve safety, and delineate pedestrian walkways and traffic lanes. Individual landscaped areas shall be no less than sixty-four (64) square feet in area and shall be provided after every fifteen (15) parking stalls in a row.
- E. Landscaping at Points of Access - When a private accessway intersects a public right-of-way or when a property abuts the intersection of two (2) or more public rights-of-way, landscaping shall be planted and maintained so that minimum sight distances shall be preserved pursuant to Section 2.301.

Finding: Approximately 19% of the total site and 10% of the site's interior and parking area will be landscaped with a combination of deciduous and evergreen vegetation and a variety of ground covers. As all adjacent land is zoned for industrial use, additional screening or buffering is not required. A vehicle use area will abut the right-of-way of SW Wildrose Place. However, this area, along with any parking/circulation areas, will be buffered from adjacent right-of-way and properties by a minimum 10-foot wide perimeter landscape strip. The landscape plan demonstrates that this strip will be landscaped in such a manner that visual impacts onto adjacent sites will be reduced.

Parking is located toward the interior of the lot and will be buffered from adjacent properties by the proposed buildings and by the perimeter landscape strip, which includes the strategic planting of 6-foot high Western Hemlock. Additional screening of the parking area will not be necessary. Approximately 60 percent of the required parking area landscaping will be placed in the interior of the parking area and will be distributed so as to divide large expanses of pavement, improve site appearance and safety, and delineate pedestrian walkways and traffic lanes. Plantings at the intersection of the driveway with SW Wildrose Place must be trimmed to maintain sight distances. This can be placed as a condition.

5.300 Off-Street Parking and Loading

5.302.02 Minimum Standards

Findings: Industrial uses require one space per employee on the largest shift. The applicant anticipates the facility employing up to approximately 20 employees and the site plan provides 36 parking stalls (34 standard spaces and 2 accessible spaces, of which one is van accessible). This proposal does comply with City off-street parking standards.

5.302.03 Miscellaneous Standards

- A. Dimensions - For the purpose of Section 5.300, a “parking space” generally means a minimum stall nine (9) feet in width and twenty (20) feet in length. Up to twenty-five percent (25%) of required parking spaces may have a minimum dimension of eight (8) feet in width and eighteen (18) feet in length so long as they are signed as compact car stalls.
- B. Layout – Parking space configuration, stall and access aisle size shall be of sufficient width for all vehicle turning and maneuvering. Groups of more than four (4) parking spaces shall be served by a driveway so that no backing movements or other maneuvering within a street, other than an alley, will be required. All parking areas shall meet the minimum standards shown in Appendix G.
- C. Wheel Stops – Parking spaces along the boundaries of a parking lot or adjacent to interior landscaped areas or sidewalks shall be provided with a wheel stop at least four (4) inches high, located three (3) feet back from the front of the parking stall as shown in Appendix G.
- E. Bicycle Parking Facilities - Bicycle parking must be located within fifty (50) feet of an entrance to the building. With the permission of the City, bicycle parking may be located in public right-of-way. The recommended minimum number of bicycle parking spaces for each use is found in subsection “E.”

Findings: Based on the submitted plan, the parking stalls comply with the dimension, layout, and wheel stop requirements. Subsection “E.” requires 2 bicycle-parking spaces or one bicycle-parking space per 40 auto parking spaces, whichever is greater. In this case, 2 bicycle-parking spaces are required of the proposal and the site plan demonstrates the provision of 4 bicycle-parking spaces divided evenly between two areas that are within 50 feet of a primary building entrance.

5.303 **Off-Street Loading Standards**

5.303.01 Minimum Standards

- B. The minimum loading area for non-residential uses shall not be less than ten (10) feet in width by twenty-five (25) feet in length and shall have an unobstructed height of fourteen (14) feet. The following additional minimum loading space is required for buildings in excess of twenty thousand (20,000) square feet of gross floor area: 50,000 sq. ft. or more – 750 sq. ft.

Findings: Based on the submitted plan, loading areas are provided on the north side of Building 1 and on the south side of Building 2 and have a total area measurement that exceeds the minimum loading area requirement.

5.303.02 Separation of Areas

Any area to be used for the maneuvering of delivery vehicles and the unloading or loading of materials shall be separated from designated off-street parking areas and designed to prevent the encroachment of delivery vehicles onto off-street parking areas or public streets. Off-street parking areas used to fulfill the requirements of Section 5.302 shall not be used for loading and unloading operations.

Findings: Although off-street parking is located along the same building faces where off-street loading areas are located, it appears the two uses will be clearly designated and mutually exclusive. There is sufficient drive aisle width between the two buildings to handle the traffic volumes for both uses.

5.400 **On-Site Circulation**

5.401 Generally

5.401.02 Joint Access

Two (2) or more uses, structures, or parcels of land may utilize jointly the same ingress and egress when the combined ingress and egress of all uses, structures, or parcels of land satisfied the other requirements of this Code, provided that satisfactory legal evidence is presented to the City in the form of deeds, easements, leases, or contracts to clearly establish the joint use.

Finding: The combined ingress and egress of the two parcels of land are able to satisfy the other requirements of this Code if a joint access agreement is established. This is a condition of the site plan approval.

5.401.03 Connection to Streets

- A. Except for joint access as per Section 5.401.02, all ingress and egress to a use or parcel shall connect directly to a public street, excepting alleyways.
- B. Required private sidewalks shall extend from the ground floor entrances or the ground floor landing of stairs, ramps or elevators to the public sidewalk or curb of the public street, which provides required ingress and egress.

Finding: The proposed development has direct access to a public street and pedestrian walkways connect the easternmost ground floor entrances of both buildings to SW Wildrose Place.

5.403.01 Minimum Non-residential Standards for Driveways

B. Industrial: Improved hard surfaced driveways are required as follows:

<u>Required Parking Spaces</u>	<u># Driveways</u>	<u>Minimum Width</u>	
		<u>One-Way</u>	<u>Two-Way</u>
1-249	1	15 feet	24 feet

Finding: The site plan demonstrates three hard surface driveways off of SW Wildrose Place that meet these requirements.

5.403.02 Sidewalks and Curbs

B. Industrial: Sidewalks and curbs may be required at the discretion of the Commission.

Finding: The Western edge of SW Wildrose Place is currently improved with a curb and 5 foot sidewalk.

5.500 On-Site Storage

5.502 Solid Waste Storage

All uses shall provide solid waste storage receptacles, which are adequately sized to accommodate all solid waste generated on site. All solid waste storage areas and receptacles shall be located out of public view. Waste receptacles for multi-family, commercial and industrial uses shall be screened by six-foot high sight-obscuring fence or masonry wall and shall be accessible to collection vehicles.

Finding: The applicant originally proposed that the waste storage receptacles(s) be located inside the proposed buildings as a means of preventing the general public from dumping toxic materials into the private facility’s waste receptacles. After the City had received feedback from Pride Disposal that this arrangement would not be acceptable because of liability issues surrounding collection within buildings, the applicant worked with Pride Disposal to develop an acceptable location for waste collection. The adequately sized, screened waste storage receptacle will be located within an enclosure along the western boundary of the site, midway between the two proposed building (See Exhibit “A”). The construction of the enclosure will be required to meet City of Sherwood standards. This solid waste receptacle site has been confirmed as acceptable by Pride Disposal.

5.700 Signs

5.703.03 Industrial Zones

No sign requiring a permit shall be allowed in industrial zones except for the following:

- A. Signs permitted in commercial zones, provided that only one (1) multi-faced free-standing sign designating the principal uses of the premise shall be permitted in any setback area, if the area of any one face of such free-standing sign does not exceed sixty (60) square feet and the total area of all faces of such free-standing sign does not exceed one hundred and twenty (120) square feet.
- B. Directional Signs: The requirements of Section 5.703.01C shall apply.

Finding: No signs are currently proposed for this development. The Applicant states that sign permit applications will be submitted in the future in accordance with the requirements of the industrial zone.

3. **Chapter 6 - Public Improvements**

6.300 Streets

6.303 Required Improvements

6.303.01 Generally

Except as otherwise provided, all developments containing or abutting an existing or proposed street, that is either unimproved or substandard in right-of-way width or improvement, shall dedicate the necessary right-of-way prior to the issuance of building permits and/or complete acceptable improvements prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

Finding: The parcel fronts SW Wildrose Place, which currently has half-street improvements of an 18-foot paved width, 6-inch curb, and 5-foot sidewalk. The City Engineer notes that the half-street right-of-way width for Wildrose Place is substandard and recommends that the Applicant be required, as a condition of approval, to dedicate additional right-of-way along the Wildrose Place frontage to provide a 35-foot half width right-of-way along the straight section of Wildrose and a 50-foot minimum radius right-of-way in the cul-de-sac.

6.306 Sidewalks

6.306.02 Sidewalk Design Standards

- B. Local streets shall have minimum five (5) foot wide sidewalks, located as required by this Code.

Finding: SW Wildrose Place, a local street, is currently improved with a 5-foot wide sidewalk.

6.400 Sanitary Sewers

6.401 Required Improvements

Sanitary sewers shall be installed to serve all new developments and shall connect to existing sanitary sewer mains.

Finding: There is an existing 8-inch sanitary sewer line along the western and northern edges of the site. The City Engineer submitted comments regarding connections to a public sanitary sewer. A connection will be required to maintain public health. Agency recommendations, and compliance with agency requirements, may be placed as conditions of approval. Otherwise, no capacity issues were identified by either agency.

6.500 Water Supply

6.501 Required Improvements

Water lines and fire hydrants conforming to City and Fire District standards shall be installed to serve all building sites in a proposed development. All waterlines shall be connected to existing water mains.

Finding: The City Engineer submitted comments regarding connections to the public water line. A connection will be required to maintain public health. The recommendations, and compliance with City requirements, may be placed as conditions of approval. Otherwise, the City did not identify any capacity issues.

6.600 Storm Water

6.601 Required Improvements

Storm water facilities, including appropriate source control and conveyance facilities, shall be installed in new developments and shall connect to the existing downstream drainage system consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Finding: The City Engineer and the Unified Sewerage Agency submitted comments regarding storm water. Their recommendations can be placed as conditions of approval. Otherwise, no capacity or design issues were identified by either agency.

6.700 Fire Protection

When land is developed so that any commercial or industrial structure is further than 250 feet or any residential structure is further than 500 feet from an adequate water supply for fire protection, as determined by the Fire District, the developer shall provide fire protection facilities necessary to provide adequate water supply and fire safety.

Finding: The Tualatin Valley Fire District did not provide comments prior to the staff report.

4. **Chapter 8 - Environmental Resources**

8.300 Standards

8.301 Procedures

8.301.02 Conformance

Conformance with the standards of Section 8.300 shall, at a minimum, be certified in writing by a professional engineer and submitted with the application for site plan review required by Section 5.100, except as per Section 8.301.05. The written certification shall include:

- A. Statement certifying that the proposed commercial, industrial or institutional use, if properly managed and operated, will comply with City environmental performance standards, and citing evidence supporting the certification.

Finding: This statement was submitted in accordance to the requirements of this section.

8.304 Parks and Open Space

8.304.06 Trees Along Public Streets

- A. Trees Along Public Streets: Trees are required to be planted by the land use applicant to the following specifications along public streets abutting or within any new development. Planting of such trees shall be a condition of development approval.

1. Tree location: On private property within the front yard setback area or within public street right-of-way between front property lines and street curb lines. The land use applicant may, at their option, provide for a minimum four (4) foot deep continuous planter strip between curb and sidewalk for the purposes of street tree planting. The City may grant a corresponding reduction in right-of-way or street width, or equivalent on-street parking requirements.
2. Tree size: A minimum trunk diameter of two (2) inches DBH and minimum height of six (6) feet.
3. Tree spacing: A minimum of one (1) tree for every twenty-five (25) feet of public street frontage, or two (2) trees for every buildable lot, whichever yields the greater number of trees.

5. Tree types: As per Appendix J of this Code.

Finding: There is approximately 260 feet of public street frontage on Parcel 2 and approximately 40 feet of public street frontage on Parcel 3 that will not be used for paved access to the site. Applying the tree spacing requirement of 1 tree for every 25 feet of public street frontage, or 2 trees for every buildable lot, whichever is greater, requires the planting of 10 street trees on Parcel 2 and 2 street trees on Parcel 3. The landscape plan indicates that 11 street trees will be planted on Parcel 2 and that no street trees will be planted on Parcel 3. The applicant may be required to plant 2 street trees along the public right-of-way frontage of Parcel 3 to comply with City of Sherwood standards. The street tree types that are proposed are found within the list of approved tree types per Appendix J of the Code.

8.304.07 Trees on Property Subject to Certain Land Use Applications

A. Generally - The purpose of Section 8.304.07 is to establish processes and standards, which will minimize cutting or destruction of certain trees and woodlands within the City. This Section is intended to help protect the scenic beauty of the City; to retain a livable environment through the beneficial effect of trees on air pollution, heat and glare, sound, water quality, and surface water and erosion control; to encourage the retention and planting of tree species native to the Willamette Valley and Western Oregon; to provide an attractive visual contrast to the urban environment, and to sustain a wide variety and distribution of viable trees and woodlands in the community over time.

Finding: The applicant has provided a tree inventory as required by the Code. Any trees removed for purposes other than installation of public utilities shall be mitigated at an inch to inch caliper ratio. The submitted landscaping plan identifies the replacement trees and is consistent with Development Code requirements.

8.306 Noise

8.306.01 Generally

All otherwise permitted commercial, industrial, and institutional uses in the City shall comply with the noise standards contained in OAR 340-35-035. The City may require proof of compliance with OAR 340-35-035 in the form of copies of all applicable State permits or certification by a professional acoustical engineer that the proposed uses will not cause noise in excess of State standards.

Finding: The proposed food storage and distribution facilities will operate within the confined spaces of the building. Loading and unloading activities will occur within the interior of the site between the two storage buildings; along the eastern wall of Building 1; and along the western walls of both buildings. No noise, above what is typically associated with industrial warehouse activities or what is allowed

for delivery trucks, will occur. Noise levels associated with the proposed use are reasonable, therefore, proof of compliance with State noise standards is not necessary.

8.308 Air Quality

8.308.01 Generally

All otherwise permitted commercial, industrial, and institutional uses shall comply with applicable State air quality rules and statutes.

Finding: The proposed industrial food storage and distribution facilities will not utilize any devices or apparatus that will degrade existing air quality.

8.309 Odors

8.309.01 Generally

All otherwise permitted commercial, industrial, and institutional uses shall incorporate the best practicable design and operating measures so that odors produced by the use are not discernable at any point beyond the boundaries of the development site.

Finding: No odorous emissions are anticipated to be created by the proposed food storage and distribution facilities.

8.310 Heat and Glare

Except for exterior lighting, all otherwise permitted commercial, industrial, and institutional uses shall conduct any operations producing excessive heat or glare entirely within enclosed buildings. Exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjoining properties, and the use shall not cause such glare or lights to shine off site in excess of one-half (0.5) foot candle when adjoining properties are zoned for residential use.

Finding: The exterior lighting for the proposed food storage and distribution facility is not anticipated to produce excessive heat or glare. No lights will shine onto adjacent properties as the lighting will be directed inward towards the interior parking and circulation area.

8.311 Energy Conservation

8.311.02 Standards

A. **Building Orientation:** The maximum number of buildings feasible shall receive sunlight sufficient for using solar energy systems for space, water or industrial process heating or cooling. Buildings and vegetation shall be sited

with respect to each other and the topography of the site so that unobstructed sunlight reaches the south wall of the greatest possible number of buildings between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM, Pacific Standard Time on December 21st.

- B. Wind: The cooling effects of prevailing summer breezes and shading vegetation shall be accounted for in site design. The extent solar access to adjacent sites is not impaired, vegetation shall be used to moderate prevailing winter wind on the site.

Finding: Based on the submitted plan, the proposed orientation of the buildings and vegetation will utilize solar energy and wind for heating and cooling effects and will comply with the energy conservation standards of the City.

5. Chapter 9 - Historic Resources

Finding: The proposed project is not within any established historical or special resource zones as defined by Chapter 9.

- B. The proposed development can be adequately served by services conforming to the Community Development Plan, including but not limited to water, sanitary facilities, storm water, solid waste, parks and open space, public safety, electric power and communications.**

Findings: Information submitted by the affected agencies indicates adequate services can be extended to the site. No system-wide or service limitations were identified. Specific facility information was previously addressed under the “Chapter 6” material.

- C. Covenants, agreements, and other specific documents are adequate, in the City’s determination, to assure an acceptable method of ownership, management and maintenance of structures, landscaping and other on-site features.**

Findings: Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&R) documents will be recorded with the property to assure that landscaping and building and site maintenance will be provided by the owners/tenants of the parcels. There is no evidence that indicates this arrangement will not be suitable in the maintenance and operation of the facility.

- D. The proposed development preserves significant natural features to the maximum feasible extent, including but not limited to natural drainageways, wetlands, trees, vegetation, scenic views and topographical features, and conforms to the applicable provisions of Chapters 5 and 8 of this Code.**

Findings: The Unified Sewerage Agency did not identify any sensitive areas on site. Recommended agency improvements can be placed as conditions of approval. Otherwise, based on the above findings, the proposed development met the applicable standards of Chapters 5 and 8.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Based on a review of the applicable code provisions, agency comments, and staff review, staff recommends approval of SP 00-04 Wildrose Industrial Park Site Plan with the following conditions:

- A. Prior to any development on the subject site, the developer shall complete the following:
 - 1. Submit an engineering plan for the entire development to the Sherwood City Engineer for review and approval. The plan shall include information concerning water, sanitary sewer, fire hydrants, street lights, on-site improvements, right-of-way dedication, easements and other information as necessary to indicate conformance with the Sherwood Public Works Standards and consistency with the development proposal.
 - 2. Submit engineering plans for storm water to the Unified Sewerage Agency for review and approval. The plans shall include information regarding drainage patterns, channels, piping, water quality facilities, and other information as necessary to indicate conformance with USA Standards and consistency with the development proposal.
 - 3. Submit engineering plans for any required traffic facility improvements on Tualatin-Sherwood Road to Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation for their review and approval.
- B. Prior to obtaining a building permit the developer shall complete the following:
 - 1. The developer shall obtain any necessary approval and permits from the Washington County Land Use and Transportation Department regarding traffic facility improvements.
 - 2. The developer shall obtain any necessary approvals and permits from the Unified Sewerage Agency to complete sanitary sewer and storm sewer improvements.
- C. Upon receiving approval for engineering plans, storm and sanitary sewer improvements and traffic facility improvements from the respective agencies, the developer may apply for a building permit to construct the proposed facility. The building permit plans shall conform to the submitted site plan and approved engineer plans. At the same time building permit application is made, the applicant shall complete the Industrial Waste Questionnaire available from USA.
- D. Prior to obtaining an occupancy permit the developer shall complete the following:
 - 1. The developer shall extend or install sanitary sewer, water and storm drainage facilities to serve the development. The improvements shall comply with the approved engineering plans from the respective agencies and the applicable requirements identified in item "G." of this Section.

2. The developer shall provide documentation to the City Engineer that all needed easements and access agreements identified in the City Engineer's report of comments dated March 31, 2000 have been recorded. In addition, the vacation process must be completed for any easements to be vacated.
 3. Traffic facility improvements required by Washington County shall be installed consistent with approved engineering plans.
 4. Landscaping and screening improvements shall be installed consistent with the submitted landscaping plan except that 2 street trees shall be planted along the public street frontage of Parcel 3 in accordance with City of Sherwood standards.
 5. All vehicle and bicycle parking improvements, including paving, stripping, driveways and other requirements, shall be installed consistent with the submitted parking plan except where it has been noted by the Sherwood Building Official that the van accessible parking space must be relocated as close as possible to the main entrance of Building 2.
- E. Continual operation of the property shall comply with the applicable requirements of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code.
- F. This Site Plan review approval shall be limited to the submitted layout and proposed food storage and distribution facilities. Any additional development or change of use shall require a new development application and approval.
- G. Public facility and street improvements shall be subject to the following:
1. Unless specifically exempted in writing by the final decision all street, utility and related site improvements shall comply with the requirements of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Ordinance and Public Works Design Standards. This shall also include information outlined in the submitted City Engineer's report of comments dated March 31, 2000 and made a part of this record.
 2. Building permits for the work on the buildings and on-site private utilities shall not be issued until after the developer has received final approval of construction drawings for all required public utility improvements, including on-site parking lots, water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, landscaping and irrigation plans. Further, this approval shall require a Developer-City agreement to be executed, and a performance security satisfactory to the City to be submitted guaranteeing that all improvements will be completed in accordance with the approved drawings, City Standards and specifications within the specified time period.
 3. Prior to final plan approval, written approval of construction drawings must be received from Washington County for any work within the County right-of-way or affecting County roads or utility systems.

4. Permanent connection to public services will not be allowed until all public improvements are completed, and all on-site improvements are completed and approved by the City or a performance security satisfactory to the City Engineer is submitted to guarantee all improvements will be completed in accordance with the approved drawings, City standards and specifications.
 5. The water line serving the fire hydrant on-site shall be private with a double check valve at the right-of-way line. The water meter for the domestic service shall be located in the right-of-way. Any wells on site shall be properly abandoned in accordance with state rules, prior to grading.
 6. Approval from Washington County is required prior to connecting the on-site storm system to the county system.
 7. No grading can occur on the site until the City and USA approve final engineering plans.
- H. The developer shall be responsible for all costs associated with public facility improvements, including applicable system development charges.
- I. The approval shall be valid for a period of one year. Compliance with the Conditions of Approval shall be the responsibility of the developer.

New Business Agenda

Item C

CITY OF SHERWOOD
Staff Report
Cedar Brook Planned Unit Development
Final Development Plan

Date: January 6, 2015

To: SHERWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION

From: PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Pre App. Meeting: December 16, 2013
Application Submitted: October 24, 2014
Application Complete: December 2, 2014
120-Day Deadline: April 1, 2015
Public Hearing: January 13, 2015



Michelle Miller, AICP
Senior Planner

Proposal: The applicant received approval for a 65-lot residential subdivision through the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process in the High Density Residential (HDR) zone on August 5, 2014. The applicant is planning to develop single-family attached and detached homes on individual lots that would be less than 5,000 square feet. Nineteen percent of the site is covered with five different areas of open space in order to comply with the planned unit development requirements. The applicant will construct full street improvements, extending SW Cedar Brook Way, an additional street (Street A) through the development north/south and a private alley. Along with the onsite parking spaces, the applicant provides for 77 on street parking spaces for 261 parking spaces within the development or four (4) parking spaces per unit. In order to develop the site in this manner, the applicant received approval to deviate from multiple Sherwood Zoning and Development Code provisions including setbacks, minimum lot size, lot dimensions, and street design and configurations.

The Planning Commission reviews the applicant's Final Development Plan for the PUD for compliance with the preliminary approval. Ultimately, the PUD Final Development Plan process allows the Planning Commission to have design oversight of the open space areas and housing design of the project that would be unavailable using the standard Code provisions for a subdivision.

The applicant's materials for Final Development Approval include a narrative, a final plat, a revised plan set, a parking plan, proposed Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs), detailed landscaping plans and an Architectural Pattern Book. During this phase of the project, the Planning Commission reviews the specific conditions of approval ordered at the preliminary phase of the project to ensure that it meets with the intention of the original order.

I. APPLICATION INFORMATION

- A. Applicant:** DR Horton Inc.-Portland Division
4380 SW Macadam Avenue, Suite 100
Portland OR 97239
Contact: Steven Miller
- Applicant's Engineer:** Emerio Design
6900 SW 105th Avenue

Beaverton OR 97008

- B. Location:** Washington County Tax Map 2S130CD13400. The property is at the northeastern intersection of SW Cedar Brook Way and Meinecke Parkway.
- C. Parcel Sizes:** The site is comprised of 5.77 acres total including area for the Cedar Brook Way extension.
- D. Existing Development and Site Characteristics:** The site is vacant with a vegetated corridor along the western and northern edges of the property line. The vegetated corridor is approximately fifty feet in most places and slopes to the western edge of the site into the vegetated corridor. Nine trees are to remain within this corridor. The rest of the site is vacant and level. SW Meinecke Parkway, a fully developed roadway extends to the roundabout at the intersection of SW Meinecke Parkway and SW Cedar Brook Way with sidewalks to the roundabout.
- E. Site History:** Historically, the site was farmed until approximately 2000. It sat vacant for a number of years when the site was part of a three-lot minor land partition, Cedar Brook Way MLP (05-05), which was approved in 2005. When the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), in cooperation with the City constructed the western extension of SW Meinecke Parkway terminating in a traffic roundabout at SW Cedar Brook Way, tax lots 100 and 101 were physically created with the road separating them. Those three lots were zoned General Commercial (GC). Two of those lots contain office buildings. In 2013, the site was approved for a zone change from GC to HDR (PA 13-04 Brownstone Text Amendment).

Most recently, the applicant received PUD approval to develop the site for a sixty-five lot subdivision with townhomes and single family housing types (Ordinance 2014-13) (PUD 14-01).

- F. Zoning Classification and Comprehensive Plan Designation:** The site is zoned HDR, and considered suitable for residential development.
- G. Adjacent Zoning and Land Use:** Land to the east is zoned HDR and developed with multi-family housing. Land to the south and across SW Meinecke is zoned GC and developed with two separate office buildings. To the west, across the vegetated corridor buffer, is a residential subdivision with single-family homes zoned low-density residential, planned unit development (LDR-PUD). The subdivision is Wydham Ridge.
- H. Land Use Review:** According to § 16.40.030, upon approval of the PUD overlay zoning district and preliminary development plan by the Council, the applicant prepares a detailed Final Development Plan as per this Chapter, for review and approval of the Commission. The Final Development Plan shall comply with all conditions of approval as per Section 16.40.020. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and submit a detailed site plan for any non-single-family structure or use not addressed under Section 16.40.020(B)(6), for review and approval, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 16.90. The site plan shall be processed concurrently with the Final Development Plan.
- I. Neighborhood Meeting:** A neighborhood meeting is not required for Final Development Plan Applications.
- J. Public Notice:** Notice of this land use application was posted at the site on December 22, 2014 and in five public locations throughout the City on December 23, 2014. Notice was also

mailed to property owners within 1,000 feet of the site and any other party who expressed an interest in receiving mailed notice on December 23, 2014 in accordance with Section 16.72.020 of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code (SZCDC). Notice was also published in the Sherwood Gazette newspaper on January 1, 2015 and scheduled for publication in The Times on January 1 and 8, 2015.

K. Review Criteria: SZCDC§16.40 Planned Unit Development.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Notice was sent to property owners within 1,000 feet of the proposal on December 23, 2014. As of the date of this staff report, no comments have been received.

III. AGENCY/DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

The City requested comments from affected agencies on December 2, 2014. All original documents are contained in the planning file and are a part of the official record on this case. The following information briefly summarizes those comments:

Sherwood Engineering Department: Staff has reviewed the proposal and found that no new conditions were recommended on behalf of the Engineering Department.

Sherwood Broadband: Brad Crawford, City of Sherwood IT Director, indicated that the applicant will install conduit and vaults from the vault on Cedar Brook Way through the extension of Cedar Brook Way during the previous review process.

Clean Water Services (CWS): CWS provided comments and a recommendation that the previous conditions remain in effect (**Exhibit B**).

Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (TVF&R) provided comments indicating approval of the project (**Exhibit C**).

IV. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

16.40.020 - Preliminary Development Plan

A. Generally

A PUD Preliminary Development Plan shall be submitted for the review and approval in accordance with Chapter 16.72. PUDs shall be considered: a.) on sites that are unusually constrained or limited in development potential, as compared to other land with the same underlying zoning designation, because of: natural features such as floodplains, wetlands, and extreme topography, or man-made features, such as parcel configuration and surrounding development; b.) on parcels of land within the Urban Renewal District where flexibility and creativity in design may result in greater public benefit than strict adherence to the code; or c.) in other areas deemed appropriated by Council during the adoption of a concept plan required by a Metro UGB expansion.

The applicant received approval of the PUD on August 6, 2014 (ORD. 14-13).

B. Content

6. Architectural Pattern Book: A compendium of architectural elevations, details, and colors of each building type shall be submitted with any PUD application. The designs shall conform to the site plan urban design criteria in Section 16.90.020(G) or any other applicable standards in this Code. A pattern book shall act as the architectural control for the homeowner's association or the commercial owner. An Architectural Pattern Book shall address the following:

- a. Illustrative areas within the development application covered by the pattern book.
- b. An explanation of how the pattern book is organized, and how it is to be used.
- c. Define specific standards for architecture, color, texture, materials, and other design elements.
- d. Include a measurement or checklist system to facilitate review of the development for conformity with the pattern book.
- e. Include the following information for each building type permitted outright or conditionally proposed in the PUD:
 - (1) Massing, facades, elevations, roof forms, proportions, materials, and color palette.
 - (2) Architectural relevance or vernacular to the Pacific Northwest.
 - (3) Doors, windows, siding, and entrances, including sash and trim details.
 - (4) Porches, chimneys, light fixtures, and any other unique details, ornamentation, or accents.
 - (5) A fencing plan with details that addresses the relationship between public space and maintaining individual privacy subject to Section 16.58.020.

The applicant submitted a revised comprehensive architectural pattern book (Pattern Book) describing the building types in detail (Exhibit A, Exhibit 2). The Pattern Book provides information on the building type describing the facades, elevations, setbacks and deviations of the standards. The book includes a description of the different building materials available, color palettes, ornamentation and accents, and a fencing plan that addresses the relationship between public space and maintaining individual privacy subject to Section 16.58.020.

The Pattern Book addresses the design criteria based on the townhome standards and indicated that the design will reflect a traditional Northwest architectural vernacular described as "Northwest Craftsman" or "English Cottage style." The roofs will be moderate to steeply pitched, with natural wood like Hardi-plank siding with cultured stone or brick for accents.

Along the facades facing public streets, the building offsets will be a minimum of three (3) feet and occur at least every 20 feet along building frontage. The building materials will have at least three different finish materials consistent on all facades of the structure. The porches will be covered and will serve as the focal point of the street façade. The buildings will be accented with lights and ornamentation that reflects a craftsman style.

The Pattern Book addresses the particular conditions of approval and the variety of materials proposed for this development. The color palette for the PUD includes a variety of earth tone colors, slate grays and tans with a deeper accent color. The applicant proposes up to three base colors and two accent colors on each house that will not be replicated next to each other.

The applicant has provided a checklist to be used during the building permit approval process. The checklist identifies each lot number and corresponding approved setbacks for the specific lot. It identifies the applicable townhome standards and other specific requirements identified in the architectural pattern book.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this criterion.

16.40.030 - Final Development Plan

A. Generally

Upon approval of the PUD overlay zoning district and preliminary development plan by the Council, the applicant shall prepare a detailed Final Development Plan as per this Chapter, for review and approval of the Commission. The Final Development Plan shall comply with all conditions of approval as per Section 16.40.020. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and submit a detailed site plan for any non-single-family structure or use not addressed under Section 16.40.020(B)(6), for review and approval, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 16.90. The site plan shall be processed concurrently with the Final Development Plan.

Based on the Notice of Decision, the applicant must demonstrate compliance with the following general and specific PUD Detailed Final Development Plan requirements:

1. **A detailed final development plan shall be submitted for review and approval within 1 year of the preliminary PUD approval.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant submitted a final development plan for the Planning Commission approval on October 23, 2014. The applicant received preliminary approval on August 5, 2014 and therefore the final development plan has been submitted within a year.

FINDING: Based on the discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

2. **Submit an architectural pattern book that provides an illustrative guide for the development including a measurement or checklist system to facilitate review, include information for each building type that describes massing, facades, elevations, roof forms, proportions, materials and color palette, doors, windows, siding, entrances, porches, light fixtures and other ornamentation, or accents, and a fencing plan that addresses the relationship between public space and maintaining individual privacy subject to § 16.58.020.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: As discussed above, the applicant submitted an architectural pattern book (Pattern Book) with the final development plan. The Pattern Book contains the various paint swatches and color palettes, the architectural elements proposed, and a checklist that can be used during building permit submittals. The applicant has also submitted a fencing plan that is detailed in the submitted plans (Exhibit A, Exhibit 1, Sheet L2.0).

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

3. **Provide the CC & Rs that document how the areas of open space, common areas and onsite parking will be monitored and maintained by the Home Owner's Association.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant submitted draft CC&Rs that explain how common areas and open space will be maintained (Exhibit A, Exhibit 4). The CC&Rs address how the residential garages are to be used exclusively for parking the owner's vehicles, per a condition of approval. This requirement is outlined on page 9, Section 4.8 of the CC&Rs.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

4. **Submit plans that show that the porches do not encroach on any of the clear vision area.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant submitted plans that show the clear vision areas for the site at the intersection of Street A and SW Cedar Brook Way (Exhibit A, Exhibit 1, Sheet L1.0). The townhomes that face Street A include porches that are outside of the clear vision area.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

- 5. Submit plans and elevations of the townhomes that provide for doors, porches, balconies, windows or architectural features to provide variety in the façade and comply with the townhome design standards.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: Exhibit 3 of the applicant's materials depict the elevations proposed for the housing types. The applicant shows examples of the elevation for five, four and three unit townhomes. The plans show porches with awnings, windows and different siding and architectural materials used in the design of the homes. The City will use the applicant's checklist to identify compliance with the specific conditions or approved deviations from the standards found in the notice of decision when the building permits are submitted.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

- 6. Submit plans that show the design of the pedestrian pathway within Tract B to include landscaped buffers between the properties of at least three feet on each side.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant included landscape plans with the submittal (Exhibit A, Exhibit 1, Sheets L1.0-L7.0). On Sheet L1.0, Tract B is shown with the three-foot buffers between the property lines and the five-foot wide sidewalk.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

- 7. Submit plans that show the perimeter screening separating the single-family residential zones from the multi-family residential zones.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: Creekview Crossing, a multi-family development, is located along the eastern boundary of the site. The rear yards of lots 1-28 border the multi-family development. The applicant proposes to install a six-foot cedar "good neighbor" fence along the eastern boundary of the site, separating the site from the Creekview Crossing development.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

- 8. Submit a parking plan that details and describes the dimensions of the parking spaces and any deviation from the parking space standards.**

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant submitted a detailed parking plan that identifies the parking space dimensions of nine (9) feet wide by 22 feet long for the on-street parking. There are 77 on-street parking spaces along Street A and SW Cedar Brook (Exhibit A, Exhibit 1, Sheet L6.0). The Notice of Decision indicated that the applicant had satisfied the base parking standards with this development.

The applicant has not provided the dimensions of the one and two car garages. It is difficult to ascertain whether there is sufficient space within the garages for typical garage items, sport or bicycle equipment or even garbage receptacles. Since the CC&Rs indicate that garbage receptacles cannot be in public view, and yard space is limited, the applicant has not addressed how the individual units will store these bins, and whether the garages are large enough to accommodate them.

Single-family homes are required to have at least one parking space onsite. Townhomes in the HDR zone are required to have at least two parking spaces. Council allowed a deviation from this standard so long as the CC&Rs include a provision that the garages must be used for parking a primary passenger vehicle and not for any storage. The applicant provided CC&Rs that require that garages must be used for parking primary passenger vehicles (Exhibit A, Exhibit 4, Section 4.8). The table below shows the available onsite parking for each housing type.

{Cedar Brook Planned Unit Development}

Lot Numbers	Housing Type Description	Number of Units	Dwelling Unit Size (square feet)	Lot size range (square feet)	Number of Onsite Parking spaces including Garages per unit
1-38	Two-story townhome with one car garage in front	38	1,500	1,610 – 2,552	38 garage and 38 driveway spaces
39-53	Two-story single family detached with rear loaded garage	15	1,304-1,392	2,374 - 3,245	30 garage and 30 driveway spaces
54-65	Two-story townhome with two car alley-loaded garage	12	1,400	1,600-1,974	24 garage and 24 driveway spaces

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant does not meet this condition, but may be able to do so with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of the building permits, provide details that show the dimensions of the one and two car garages, and show that there is adequate space for the garbage and recycling receptacles. In the alternative, provide the location for the garbage and recycling containers for each individual property.

9. Submit landscape plans that include the visual corridor located on SW Meinecke.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The applicant submitted landscape plans that include the visual corridor (Exhibit A, Exhibit 1, Sheet L1.0). The 10-foot visual corridor will extend along SW Meinecke, a collector with segments that are within the right-of-way and several of the properties' rear yards. A visual corridor may be placed in the street right-of-way between the property line and the sidewalk in the residential zone. The applicant proposes Greenspire Linden trees, Rose Creek Abelia, and groundcover along SW Meinecke within the visual corridor.

Because the rear yards of lots 29-38 will abut SW Meinecke and the visual corridor, the applicant has proposed a six-foot high, mostly wood, fence along this portion of the development. A fence is allowed within the visual corridor in the residential zone. SW Meinecke is classified as a collector street that connects with an elaborately landscaped roundabout. Visual interest from the right-of-way is a priority and the development needs to be appealing from the street view. The applicant submitted a revised fence plan for the properties that abut SW Meinecke showing a cross section that includes either masonry or brick details on the pillars/posts of the fence. This will improve the visual interest of the development from the visual corridor.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

10. Submit a landscape plan that identifies a tree canopy of at least 40% on the site.

The applicant proposes a combination of trees shown on the landscape plans (Exhibit A, Exhibit 1, Sheet L1.0). The applicant proposes two types of street trees, that are identified as recommended street trees found within the SCDZC. Several other types of trees are located within the open space areas and on private lots. It appears feasible from the overall calculation that the applicant can meet this criterion. The applicant suggests that they exceed the criterion by one percent (1%). However, the applicant has not provided a sufficient breakdown of tree type and estimated tree canopy spread for each tree to provide enough certainty that the applicant satisfies this condition.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has not met this condition, but can do so with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of the building permit, submit a detailed landscape plan that specifies the type of trees to be planted, the tree canopy spread for each tree and the total calculation used to meet the canopy requirement.

11. Submit plans that show that the front façade of the townhomes do not include more than forty percent (40%) of garage door area.

The applicant submitted elevations of the different townhome units that demonstrate the front façade does not include more than 40% of the garage door area. Lots 1-38 will have a single car garage fronting on a street. The front façade of each home will be at least 20 feet wide and 18.2 feet tall which totals 364 square feet. The garage is 56 square feet, approximately 15% of the entire façade.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant meets this condition.

B. Final Subdivision Plat

If the PUD involves the subdivision of land, a final plat shall be prepared and submitted for final approval, pursuant to Chapter 16.124.

The applicant submitted a subdivision plat with the final development plan that is under review by the Engineering and Planning Departments. Once the Engineering plans are approved, the applicant will finalize the plat for review and submission to the Planning Department with formal submission to Washington County. The applicant submitted a revised plat on December 31, 2014 that could not be reviewed before the hearing.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has not met this criterion.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of the building permits, receive approval of the final plat.

16.40.050 Residential PUD

A. Permitted Uses

The following uses are permitted outright in Residential PUD when approved as part of a Final Development Plan:

- 1. Varied housing types, including but not limited to single-family attached dwellings, zero-lot line housing, row houses, duplexes, cluster units, and multi-family dwellings.**

2. **Related NC uses which are designed and located so as to serve the PUD district and neighborhood.**
3. **All other uses permitted within the underlying zoning district in which the PUD is located.**

FINDING: The applicant proposes residential uses and all lots will be for single-family attached and detached homes, a permitted housing type within this zone. The applicant meets this criterion.

B. Conditional Uses

A conditional use permitted in the underlying zone in which the PUD is located may be allowed as a part of the PUD upon payment of the required application fee and approval by the Commission as per Chapter 16.82. (Ord. 86-851 § 3)

FINDING: The applicant does not propose a conditional use, and thus this criterion is not applicable.

16.40.030 - Final Development Plan

A. Generally

Upon approval of the PUD overlay zoning district and preliminary development plan by the Council, the applicant shall prepare a detailed Final Development Plan as per this Chapter, for review and approval of the Commission. The Final Development Plan shall comply with all conditions of approval as per Section 16.40.020. In addition, the applicant shall prepare and submit a detailed site plan for any non-single-family structure or use not addressed under Section 16.40.020(B)(6), for review and approval, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 16.90. The site plan shall be processed concurrently with the Final Development Plan.

As discussed earlier in this report, the applicant submitted the final development plans for residential units. No non-residential structures are proposed. The conditions of approval pertaining to the final development plan were addressed. The submittal for the final plat has been submitted and under review. All of the conditions of approval from ORD. 14-013 remain in effect, during the development and construction of the planned unit development subdivision.

The applicant has submitted detailed site plans for the areas of open space (Applicant's materials, Exhibit A. Sheets L3.0, 4.0 and 5.0). The applicant shows that Tract E and F are located near the center of the development. The plans show various fitness equipment or "stations" to be scattered along the pathways of these two tracts. The applicant has included a small play structure within the center of the development.

Tract E and F are landscaped with trees, grass and shrubs. The CC&Rs indicate the area will be the responsibility of the Home Owner's Association (HOA) to maintain the areas. There is no indication of how the tracts will be watered so that the landscaping can be maintained.

The applicant proposes that Tract K to be used for a private fenced dog park with amenities. There will be a bench, waste bags, a water station and trash receptacles. The site will have eleven trees. The applicant proposes a small grassy area with the most of the site to be covered in bark dust/chips, called Cedar Hogs Fuel and other wood chips. Staff is concerned that this type of ground cover may create maintenance and odor issues over time and not be hospitable for dogs. It is important for the material to degrade safely over time due to its location near the vegetated corridor.

Staff contacted Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation, park management to inquire about the materials proposed for the dog park by the applicant. THPRD uses bark chips as an all season alternative in dog

park areas, but avoid splintery types of mulch because it gets between dogs' paws. During the summer months, most of their dog areas contain grass as it does not get as muddy.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has not completed the project; therefore, this criterion cannot fully be met without the following conditions.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of the building permits, identify how the areas of open space will be maintained.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Comply with all conditions of approval found in the Notice of Decision for Cedar Brook PUD (ORD. 14-13).

B. Final Subdivision Plat

If the PUD involves the subdivision of land, a final plat shall be prepared and submitted for final approval, pursuant to Chapter 16.124.

The applicant submitted a revised final plat on December 31, 2014. Copies of the amended plat are found under applicant's materials, (Exhibit A, Item 8). There is not enough time for staff to review the final plat prior to the final development hearing. Staff will review the final plat and determine compliance with the Code before releasing it for review by Washington County.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion the applicant has not met this criterion, and been conditioned earlier in this report.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Based on a review of the applicable code provisions, agency comments, and staff review, staff finds that the Final Development plan does not fully meet the applicable review criteria. However, the applicable criteria can be satisfied if specific conditions are met. Therefore, staff **recommends that the Planning Commission APPROVE with conditions the Cedar Brook PUD FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (PUD 14-01 and SUB 14-01)**. Recommended conditions are as follows:

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Prior to issuance of building permits, provide details that show the dimensions of the one and two car garages, and show that there is adequate space for the garbage and recycling receptacles. In the alternative, provide the location for the garbage and recycling containers for each individual property.
2. Prior to issuance of building permits, submit a detailed landscape plan that specifies the type of tree to be planted, the tree canopy spread for that tree and calculation used to meet the canopy requirement.
3. Prior to issuance of building permits, identify how the areas of open space will be maintained.
4. Prior to issuance of building permits, receive approval of the final plat.
5. Comply with all conditions of approval found in the Notice of Decision for Cedar Brook PUD (ORD. 14-13).

VI. EXHIBITS

- A. Applicant's materials submitted on October 23, 2014, and revised on November 2, November 25, and December 31, 2014
- B. Clean Water Services letter submitted on December 17, 2014
- C. Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue letter submitted December 22, 2014

End of Report

EXHIBIT A

PUD 14-01/ SUB 14-01 Cedar Brook PUD Final Development Plan

1. Application Materials from Applicant – Binder

Final Development Plan Narrative

1 – Parking and Landscape Plans

2 – Architectural Pattern Book

3 – Building Elevations, Floor Plans, and Renderings

4 – Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions

5 – Zoning Map, Title of Insurance

6 – Neighborhood Meeting Notes and Notice to Neighbors

7 – Ordinance 2014-013 Approval of Cedar Brook PUD

8 – Plat

9 – Streetscape Renderings

2. Full Size Landscaping Plan Set

All items are available for viewing at City Hall or may be reviewed electronically at the following web address:

<http://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/planning/project/cedar-brook-pud-final-developement-plan>



MEMORANDUM

Date: December 17, 2014
To: Michelle Miller, Senior Planner, City of Sherwood
From: Jackie Sue Humphreys, Clean Water Services (the District)
Subject: Cedar Brook Way PUD Final Development, SP 14-04, 2S130CD13400

Please include the following comments when writing your conditions of approval:

PRIOR TO ANY WORK ON THE SITE AND PLAT RECORDING

A Clean Water Services (the District) Storm Water Connection Permit Authorization must be obtained prior to plat approval and recordation. Application for the District's Permit Authorization must be in accordance with the requirements of the Design and Construction Standards, Resolution and Order No. 07-20, (or current R&O in effect at time of Engineering plan submittal), and is to include:

- a. Detailed plans prepared in accordance with Chapter 2, Section 2.04.2.b-1.
- b. Detailed grading and erosion control plan. An Erosion Control Permit will be required. Area of Disturbance must be clearly identified on submitted construction plans. If site area and any offsite improvements required for this development exceed one-acre of disturbance, project will require a 1200-CN Erosion Control Permit. If site area and any offsite improvements required for this development exceed five-acres of disturbance, project will require a 1200-C Erosion Control Permit.
- c. Detailed plans showing each lot within the development having direct access by gravity to public storm and sanitary sewer.
- d. Provisions for water quality in accordance with the requirements of the above named design standards. Water Quality is required for all new development and redevelopment areas per R&O 07-20, Section 4.05.5, Table 4-1. Access shall be provided for maintenance of facility per R&O 07-20, Section 4.02.4.

- e. If use of an existing offsite or regional Water Quality Facility is proposed, it must be clearly identified on plans, showing its location, condition, capacity to treat this site and, any additional improvements and/or upgrades that may be needed to utilize that facility.
- f. If private lot LIDA systems proposed, must comply with the current CWS Design and Construction Standards. A private maintenance agreement, for the proposed private lot LIDA systems, needs to be provided to the City for review and acceptance.
- g. Show all existing and proposed easements on plans. Any required storm sewer, sanitary sewer, and water quality related easements must be granted to the City.
- h. A “Sensitive Area” is in the vicinity of the site. Applicant shall comply with the conditions as set forth in the Service Provider Letter No. 13-002074, dated March 26, 2014.
- i. Any proposed offsite construction activities will require an update or amendment to the current Service Provider Letter for this project.

CONCLUSION

This Land Use Review does not constitute the District’s approval of storm or sanitary sewer compliance to the NPDES permit held by the District. The District, prior to issuance of any connection permits, must approve final construction plans and drainage calculations.



NOTICE OF APPLICATION AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Notice Date: December 4, 2014
Please submit comments by: December 24, 2014

Notice is hereby given that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on **January 13, 2015** for Cedar Brook Way Planned Unit Development, Final Development Plan (SP-14-04) located near SW Meinecke/SW Cedar Brook Way in northwest Sherwood. The applicant received approval as a planned unit development to subdivide the property into sixty-five lots, with varied lot sizes and areas of open space. The Planning Commission will hold a hearing for final development review of the proposal considering the design of the homes and compliance with the conditions of approval of the initial planned unit development.

Case File No.: SP 14-04 Tax Map/Lot: 2S130CD13400
Address: No address Property Location: Adjacent to SW Meinecke and SW Cedar Brook Way
Applicant: DR Horton Homes Property Owner: Dutch Ventures LLC
Attn: Andy Tiemann
4380 SW Macadam Avenue
Portland OR

Staff Contact: **Michelle Miller, AICP Senior Planner** 503-625-4242
millerm@sherwoodoregon.gov

Proposal: The applicant received PUD approval for a sixty-five lot subdivision for residential use, zoned High Density Residential. The planned unit development will have varying lot sizes from 1800-3000 sq. ft. In order to satisfy the PUD requirements, the applicant plans several areas of private open space and walking trails for the benefit of the public. The applicant has applied for final development plan approval, which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The materials can be viewed at <http://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/planning/project/cedar-brook-pud>

COMMENTS – Cedar Brook Planned Unit Development, Final Development Plan Approval, SP 14-04

- No comment
- We encourage approval of this request.
- Please address the following concerns should this application be approved:

- We encourage denial of this request for the following reasons:

Please feel free to attach additional sheets as needed to complete your comments.

C
A



John Wolff IAAI-CFI
Deputy Fire Marshal II
(503) 259-1504 - direct
(503) 642-4814 - fax
(503) 649-8577 - main
John.Wolff@tvfr.com
11945 S.W. 70th Avenue
Tigard, OR 97223-9196
www.tvfr.com

Date: _____
Tel.: _____ (optional)
Email: _____ (optional)

TUALATIN VALLEY FIRE & RESCUE
APPROVED _____
CONDITIONALLY APPROVED _____
APPROVAL OF PLANS IS NOT AN APPROVAL OF OMISSIONS OR OVERSIGHTS.
SEE ATTACHED LETTER _____
John Wolff
PLANS EXAMINER 12-22-14
DATE