

---

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon**  
**Planning Commission Meeting**  
**July 12, 2016**

---

---

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

Chair Jean Simson  
Vice Chair Russell Griffin  
Commissioner Michael Meyer  
Commissioner Alan Pearson  
Commissioner Rob Rettig

**Staff Present:**

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director  
Josh Soper, City Attorney  
Bob Galati, City Engineer  
Brad Kilby, Planning Manager  
Michelle Miller, Senior Planner  
Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

**Planning Commission Members Absent:**

Commissioner Chris Flores  
Commissioner Lisa Walker

**Council Members Present:**

None

**Work Session**

**1. Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) Floodplain Updates**

Chair Simson began the meeting at 6:35 pm.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager described a letter of map amendment received by Mayor Clark on May 4, 2016 from the Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) regarding the floodplain in Sherwood. He explained that the City had until November 4, 2016 to amend the maps and the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code accordingly to be able to qualify for federal grants and to protect Sherwood homeowners. He noted that changes to the maps could not be negotiated and said an opinion from the National Marine Fishery Service stated the new maps may adversely affect certain species of wildlife. The public was afforded time to review the maps and a handout with a link to the opinion (see record, Exhibit 1).

The Planning Commission called recess at 6:48 pm to convene to the regular meeting.

**Regular Meeting**

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

Chair Jean Simson convened the meeting at 7:30 pm. With no Consent Agenda or Council Liaison Announcements, she asked for Staff Announcements.

**2. Consent Agenda**

None

**3. Council Liaison Announcements**

None.

#### 4. Staff Announcements

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, announced an open house on July 13, 2016 regarding the Tannery Site Assessment and said staff would be at Music on the Green with information about Marijuana Facilities in Sherwood and the Cedar Creek Trail project. He announced that staff was reviewing applications for the Senior Planner position to update the Comprehensive Plan and that David Bantz, Associate Planner hired until the end of the budget year would be leaving on Friday.

#### 5. Community Comments

None

#### 6. Old Business

##### a. Public Hearing – SP 16-04 Sherwood Plaza Apartments (continued from June 28, 2016)

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement and asked for any ex parte contact, bias or conflict of interest. None were received.

Michelle Miller, Senior Planner gave a presentation of the staff report (see record, Exhibit 2) and explained that it was a continued hearing from June 28, 2016. She noted some unresolved issues:

- Elevation of Building 2 facing SW Langer
- Pedestrian pathway connection on the eastern side of the development
- Proportionate share toward signal change on SW 12th
- Right of Way Dedication

Ms. Miller showed the Sherwood Plaza commercial site containing an undeveloped portion and said it was about 13 acres, zoned Retail Commercial (RC). She said the undeveloped portion east of the Plaza had an application to develop the land with apartments. In the Retail Commercial zone, apartments were a permitted use as long as they are secondary to the main use. She said the application was compliant with the purpose and intent of the Retail Commercial zone.

Ms. Miller noted that Langer Drive bordered the site on the north and west side and the site was surrounded by Sunfield Apartments and Arbor Terrace subdivision all zoned High Density Residential (HDR), fitting in with the existing neighborhood. Ms. Miller said the applicant proposed to gain access to the site on the existing driveway on the northeast side of the property and established that there would be eighty-two apartments in six buildings with 139 parking spaces (ten spaces over the required). The applicant proposed to add garages that are not counted towards parking.

Ms. Miller showed modified elevations submitted by the applicant of Building 1 and 2 (see planning record, Exhibit J). She reminded that the Planning Commission found Building 1 met the criteria, but wanted to see more elevations of Building 2 to ensure that it was pedestrian friendly and met the design criteria for multi-family development. She pointed out that the issues were inadequate fenestration and modulation of the side elevation of Building 2 and the revised side elevation had decks wrapping the front of the building, added windows and wall modulation. Ms. Miller showed the proposed pedestrian plaza on SW Langer Drive with trees, benches and a different sidewalk material to denote the area in front. She pointed out that the pedestrian plaza was in addition to the required eight foot sidewalk and street trees along the entire frontage and was placed in front of the buildings near the parking areas of Building 1 and 2.

Ms. Miller stated the criterion and the conditions of approval asked for a pedestrian connection through on the east side of the property between the garages of the Sunfield Lakes Apartments. She said there

were several locations in the development code where connections between neighborhoods were important: 16.92 says any required screening should have breaks where appropriate to connect the different neighborhoods, 16.96, included onsite circulation and the importance of having different connections between the developments. Ms. Miller showed locations of four bicycle and pedestrian connections required for the Sunfield Lakes development in 1996 and stated connectivity had been an important component of development in Sherwood for over twenty years. She said the connections were shown on the plat and one of the conditions in the Notice of the Decision was to “provide direct and continuous connection” and “appropriate links to the property line of vacant parcels or easements to allow for future connections, to ensure that pedestrian linkages provide the most direct route possible to minimize travel distances.”

Ms. Miller said other public improvements recommended by staff included widening the sidewalks to eight feet, to demonstrate or dedicate a right of way width to thirty six feet half street width along the frontage of SW Langer Drive, and to reconstruct the sidewalk ramp to the east side of the existing driveway to ADA standards where the pedestrian crossing will be improved. Staff requested the removal of Condition D.5 to contribute \$7423 for the intersection signal change and said it would be assessed as part of the System Development Charges (SDC) because SDC charges take the impact of development into consideration.

Bob Galati, City Engineer discussed the pedestrian crossing improvements. He said the requirement was for enhanced high visibility signage. He noted that the Commission was indicating preference for a signalized crossing such as a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) like the one on Pine Street in front of City Hall or a lighted stop sign similar to the one on Sunset Blvd. He explained that the signal in front of City Hall was a standardized crossing for railroads. Mr. Galati said staff reviewed what was required and spent a lot of time with DKS Associates, the City’s traffic consultant, and Kittleson, the applicant’s traffic consultant, going through the analysis. He recounted that the Planning Commission had questioned why a pedestrian crossing was not provided closer to the development and the location was most appropriate for the pedestrian crossing. He explained the location was determined by where pedestrian traffic was coming from and going to; a bus stop located at the corner, the crossing from one shopping center to the other shopping center and control of where pedestrians cross. Mr. Galati said the enhanced signage was expected to increase the area identified as a pedestrian crossing and instead of the normal two parallel lines there would be a striping pattern. More signage would be placed prior to the crossing to notify drivers of the crossing ahead. He pointed out that a signalized crossing was not technically required, nor warranted, because it did not meet the limits, but the Planning Commission could choose to require the signalized crossing. If so, the applicant could accept it and become eligible for transportation SDC credits, because they were providing a public infrastructure above what was required, or if challenged by the developer, would go to City Council who may find that it was not warranted, but decide to require it for safety reasons. He said it would be a policy decision by Council. He wanted the Commission to understand that the cost of the signal would be offset by transportation SDCs.

Mr. Galati communicated that the removal of the \$7423 fee in Condition D.5 was because the Transportation Master Plan identified that signal change as a project so it was part of the baseline calculation for SDC fees. When a development comes through the SDC fees the impact of the development would be taken into account and paid into the fund. He noted that it would not have been the same if it had been an impact to Highway 99W, because SDC calculations do not take into account the impacts to the highway. That was part of the Capacity Allocation Program (CAP) program and generally if there is an impact to the highway they either pay a fee in lieu to the county or state or do the improvements.

Staff recommended approval with the conditions as discussed in the staff report and as amended.

Commissioner Rob Retting commented that outside of Commission he was a land surveyor and he did a lot of All American Land Title Association surveys that were apartment complexes or shopping malls. One of the big concerns were access points where people could access the site. He felt strongly against putting in a pedestrian opening, because it created a cloud on the property and even though the City had the connectivity requirement an opening could create title issues. He added that being a surveyor, he was aware that many do not like strangers on their property and sometimes fences were a good thing. He agreed with the applicants' request not to have the opening.

Commissioner Pearson commented that there would be a vegetative barrier and asked for the purpose of the fence with a hole in it. Ms. Miller responded that the fence was not necessary as the applicant was putting in landscaping for the required perimeter screening. She said there was an existing fence, because of the required buffering between commercial and residential zones and added that the Sunfield Lakes Apartment complex provided a sidewalk that connected to the development where she had indicated.

Chair Simson called for applicant testimony.

**Annemarie Skinner**, Jim Toporek and Brian Shahum came forward. Ms. Skinner, the applicants' representative, said the applicant agreed with the staff report and the conditions presented as modified, including the right of way dedication that was changed from 39 feet to 36 feet. The applicant supported the assessment and requirements for the crosswalk as written and if the Commission chose to require the upgrade for the crosswalk they would take the SDC credits in exchange. The applicant appreciated staff's research on the easements and connections to adjacent properties and would meet the condition for the pedestrian connection. She said the applicant would also be in support of deleting the condition requiring the break in the fence. If the commission chose to require the opening they asked to change the word "central" to "northerly" as spot marked by staff was located where the proposed garages would go and moving it north was a better location and in line with the thirty foot public easement already in place.

**Brian Shahum**, from Mercury Development acknowledged that they would abide by the Commission's decision regarding the fence and stated he agreed with Commissioner Rettig's comment. He said the open fence would not create improved connectivity for the nearby townhomes and apartments and stressed safety concerns. He said he did not think the connection would have the desired effect and would not bring the two neighborhoods together. He emphasized the decision to put the fence was based on neighborhood meeting comments for more security and sound barriers and noted the requirement in 16.92.030 to have a minimum six foot high site obscuring wooden fence or evergreen screening; they chose a combination of the fence and screening. He thanked staff for the assistance.

**Jim Toporek**, *Studio 3 Architecture* began his testimony by describing the purpose of Building 1 and said it was the face of the project on Langer Drive so windows and color were added based on the comments of the Commissioners at the prior hearing. He noted the undulation, wrapped balconies, and two additional sets of windows added to the north side of Building 2 and stated that with the pedestrian plaza it created a more inviting threshold into the project for pedestrians and vehicle traffic along Langer Drive.

Chair Simson thanked the applicant and stated that having pedestrian scale along Langer Drive was in the code. She asked for questions from the Commission for the applicant. None were received. The applicant had twenty two minutes remaining for rebuttal. She asked for public testimony.

**Robert James Claus**, Sherwood resident came forward and stated it was ultra-vires; beyond the scope of authority of the City Engineer to be able to tell the Commission the amount of the SDCs for this project. He said he did not want to hear evidence that SDCs had to (or not) be paid from someone who was a percipient witness. Mr. Claus asked staff to display the site and commented that the site was two

parcels with Avamere adjacent to the site. He said it was an illegal site because of the way Avamere happened. Since the Langers owned both parcels he understood there was a friendly easement. Mr. Claus asked if the Commission had an application signed by the Langer family, because Dave Zimel was a lessee unless he had bought the site. He commented on the Sherwood Plaza public hearings and said the Langer group indicated it was their property; if it was their property and a separate parcel, Avamere had to be cleaned up with an easement across Sherwood Plaza, because if the land had changed hands it was an illegal use; Avamere was required to have two exits.

Mr. Claus suggested the Commission continue the hearing and said the site had a thirty year history that included granting easements to Avamere. He commented that there should be a condition not to sell the apartments, because the zoning was contingent on the use.

Mr. Clause advised going back to square one and finding out what the Commission was issuing. It was not a conditional use, staff was saying in effect those were the same parcel and the use comes over from the shopping center that may be illegal. He suggested counselling with the city attorney and asked what happened if the applicant said they were selling the parcel; making it illegal. He said it would be transferring a use to another use with separation of ownership and suggested the Commission find out what was happening, because there would not be another chance.

**Nancy Taylor**, Sherwood resident said that she read the information for both hearings and asked the Commission to question the traffic impacts of the application. She commented on moving the light down to Century Blvd. from the McDonalds intersection and asked when it would happen and where the \$900,000 would come from. She said the approval was contingent on the traffic light being moved, but that the money would not be there to move the signal. Ms. Taylor commented on the difficulty crossing Hwy 99W at the Y during traffic and said this would be the same. She said the report indicated that eighty-two units would generate fifty one cars in the high peak time and asked for additional review. She said eighty-two units each with two people with jobs and cars was a potential for 164 cars and commented that it was the same traffic engineers that did a study that resulted in a fatality involving an individual crossing between the Walmart and Target sites. She asked the Commission to look at the traffic numbers and question them. She said she did not think fifty one cars during peak traffic time was a rational number; maybe a book number, but books don't save lives, rational thinking and safety did.

**Susan Claus**, Sherwood resident, commented that Avamere was supposed to have two exits and after the development was completed there was a curbing put in so that the second exit flowing into the Plaza could no longer be used. She said Avamere had over forty-nine units and required two exits, but the second exit had never been resolved. Ms. Claus commented about allowing the secondary residential use to the larger part zoned Retail Commercial and suggested if it could be divided that was giving away zoning. She said it had to remain part of the center and not parceled or sold.

Ms. Claus commented about the enhanced pedestrian access and thought that putting it at the corner between the two shopping centers was a false analysis. She said the pedestrians living in those units would go out the shared access [Trumpeter] and cross the street in the middle of the shopping center to the theater and the other uses in that center. She suggested the wrong crossing would be enhanced.

Ms. Claus commented that the intersection that at Langer Drive and the exit off of Hwy 99W was a troubled intersection at peak times and needed stop signs. She advocated that the impact of eighty-two units should fix the intersection that already had traffic problems. She commented on the accident on Langer Farms Parkway and said the traffic consultant had noted that it was unknowable that everybody would flow from the Walmart to the Target center. Ms. Claus commented that it was human nature and the kids living in the apartments were not going to go to the end of the property, but take the shortest route.

Ms. Claus commented that parking was always a problem and asked if there was additional parking in the back part of the Plaza. She said even though the applicant was above the minimum, the minimums are too low. She reiterated legal issues associated with residential zoning on the Retail Commercial zone.

**Tony Bevel**, Sherwood resident, said he did not like hearing that the minimum required was being done. He thought Sherwood was better than that and expressed concerns that eighty-two apartments would mean a lot of kids who would not pay attention and cross the street where they should not. He suggested a couple of highly visible enhanced signage in the area to slow down traffic and prevent further incidents. He acknowledged the Walmart/Target accident and said it happened where the person should not have crossed. He said it could happen near this development and suggested the Planning Commission really look at pedestrian safety. He said he would hate to have another incident just to save the developer money and the Planning Commission had a chance to minimize that by putting in a lot of pedestrian safety.

Chair Simson asked for applicant rebuttal.

Ms. Skinner responded that the parcel was one tax parcel and was not part of the Avamere tax parcel. The proposed apartments were on the same parcel with the Retail Commercial, as one lot. She read from the code: “the Retail Commercial zoning district provides areas for general retail and service uses that neither require larger parcels of land nor produce excessive environmental impact.” The code said, “multi-family housing subject to the dimensional requirements of the High Density Residential zone when located on the upper floors, in the rear, or otherwise clearly secondary to commercial buildings are allowed.” Ms. Skinner said the zoning for the parcel allowed it, whether the parcel was split in two or not the zoning remained the same and the apartments would remain “clearly secondary” to the existing commercial building that sits in front.

Ms. Skinner stated the professional traffic engineers and the City Engineer had more knowledge and expertise and had come up with the conditions. She said they used a nationally accepted traffic manual and that the traffic study showed 545 net trips; inferring that the 51 trips was correct. Ms. Skinner noted that staff and professional engineers studied traffic on a daily basis and the applicant was not opposed to conditions set. She said the applicant was doing more than required in providing more parking spaces and more screening.

Brian Shahum stated they were not aware of the loss by the Walmart and did not want that to happen again. He said the apartment complex would be high end apartments with good finishes and more parking, bicycle racks, open space, and trees than required. He said they were trying to do something that would be nice for Sherwood; that his family had been in Sherwood for a long time as they built the center in the 1970’s. He hoped the community would understand all the hard work put into the project.

Chair Simson asked for questions for the applicant.

Vice Chair Griffin asked regarding overflow parking. Mr. Shahum replied that there would be addition spots behind the commercial building that were not counted and there was over four hundred spaces in the shopping center that were open to use in addition to the seventeen garages.

Vice Chair Griffin asked what kind of large delivery truck traffic delivered to the center. Mr. Shahum responded that two trucks came twice a week for the Dollar Tree and smaller delivery trucks either early in the morning or late in the evening so they would not be parked there continuously. He said they had looked at the back and the development would have more space.

Chair Simson clarified that the applicant was in agreement with all the existing conditions. She asked if the applicant was in agreement if the Commission moved toward safety enhancement for the crosswalk. Mr. Shahum confirmed.

Chair Simson allowed for staff rebuttal.

Michelle Miller referred to Exhibit K in the packet and pointed out the twenty four foot wide emergency access easement to Avamere and said it was the access Mr. Claus expressed concern about. Vice Chair Griffin noted that a Goodwill Truck was parked over the access easement. Mr. Shahum contended that the Goodwill truck was east of the exit and accessible.

Chair Simson received confirmation that staff had located the break in the fence on the back side of the cover parking and that was why the applicant requested to move the opening from a centrally location to the north.

Michelle explained that the signal removal on Sherwood Blvd to 12<sup>th</sup> Street was proposed as part of the TSP along with all of the improvements included in a feasibility study. Whether or not the signal move happened it was separate process from this development. She reiterated that if the properties were ever to be separated through a minor land partition staff would review if it was still conforming to the code and there would still be oversight by the Planning Department. Ms. Miller said the lease was long term and included the ability to develop the property; they would manage the apartment complex until their lease expires.

Mr. Shahum did not disclose the rent rates, but noted that they would be slightly below the Cannery Row Apartments. Commissioner Pearson commented that his concern was affordable housing, but he did not consider Cannery Row as affordable. He was concerned in particular for seniors who were being priced out of the market.

Chair Simson closed the public hearing and began deliberation.

Commissioner Pearson proposed to move the pedestrian access through the fence to the corner of the property near Langer Drive. Ms. Miller informed that any point along Trumpeter would support connection to public access, but if the opening was closer to Langer Drive the connection to the Sunfield development became less relevant.

Chair Simson stated she had looked at a lot of apartment complexes in Sherwood as a result of the application and many did not have fences, but the more she looked at the proposed, the more challenges she saw for an opening. She acknowledged Commissioner Rettig's comment of a burden on the title and said she was torn.

Vice Chair Griffin agreed and stated there should not be an opening. He said the distance was not great enough and it was unsafe to have an opening between two garages or near a dumpster where people could hide and wait.

**Motion: From Commissioner Alan Pearson not to have a break in the fence, Seconded by Commissioner Rob Rettig. Chair Simson, Vice Chair Griffin, Commissioners Pearson and Rettig voted in favor. Commissioner Meyer voted against. Motion passed.**

Condition C.4 was removed from the conditions of approval.

Chair Simson commented about the pedestrian crossing upgrades. She noted that advanced signage worked coming from the east, but not as well from the other direction, because of the sweeping corner where the TriMet buses parked. The sign and pedestrians would not be seen because of the congested

intersection. She said she did not understand what SDC credits would be available, but from experience she thought the crossing should be at least as safe as the pedestrian activated crossing in front of the Sherwood Library. She voiced that people exiting Hwy 99W were already trying to deal with the traffic from the shopping center and she did not think that pedestrians were visible. She stated now was the time to take the opportunity to improve the crossing with more than striping.

Commissioner Meyer stated he liked the idea of the high visibility crossing similar to outside the library as discussed and said it sounded like some of the costs could be offset by credits that could be earned. He agreed with Chair Simson's concerns and thought it was the correct location to encourage pedestrian traffic. He commented that education was a big part of safety.

Commissioner Pearson agreed and commented on a new pedestrian activated crosswalk on Murdock Road (near Willamette Street) and he did not care what the cost was if it saved a life. He said the first duty of government was to protect the citizens. He acknowledged that there would be jaywalkers and advocated trying to entice safe behavior with a well-lit, well-marked crosswalk.

Josh Soper, City Attorney recognized comments from the Commission and cautioned that in general it was not advisable to try to impose a requirement on the applicant beyond what the data and current regulations supported. That was how the City ensured that all applicants that come before the Commission were treated equally. He repeated that, in this case, the City had looked at the data and required what the data suggested.

Chair Simson said she would not want to be an applicant where the "goal posts were moved," but she appreciated the applicant acknowledging that in exchange for SDC credits, they would improve an intersection and make it safer for their residents.

Vice Chair Griffin commented that it was foolish to pretend that residents would use any of the crosswalks, and he thought it was unfair to force the applicant to pay for the intersection improvements. He said it did not matter how many flashing lights were placed there; the intersection could not be seen in time around the corner by the Taco Bell. He said signage needed to be further down and asked if the Sunfield Lakes or Arbor Terrace developments, with many more residents, had been required to put in a safety crossing. He asked why the applicant would be required to when no other development had to.

Commissioner Meyer stated people cannot be regulated and it did not matter how many crosswalks or signs were put in, people would do what they wanted, but the Commission could try to make the crossing as safe as possible. It was then up to the people to choose to use it. He agreed that some would cut across, but felt it was the best place to control the traffic.

Vice Chair Griffin noted the difficulty of the intersection and thought it was risky to add more pedestrian traffic to the location.

Chair Simson explained that the crosswalk was chosen by staff as the best location, because traffic was already controlled by the shopping center and the 99W exit. She said she understood the applicant could get SDC credits and it would be a net cost to them of zero. Ms. Hajduk clarified that the SDCs that they would not be paying, because they received credits, would be SDCs that would be unavailable for other transportation projects throughout the City. In essence, the pedestrian crossing improvements would supersede a planned project in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Commissioner Pearson said the Commission would be imposing a condition that was not mandated by law, but the applicant had agreed to do it and fortunately it was cost neutral. He said jaywalkers had a responsibility to walk the extra feet to a safe crossing.

Chair Simson asked staff to craft language for the condition to improve the pedestrian crossing as discussed. Mr. Kilby clarified that there was a difference between enhanced and signalized signage and what the Commission was asking the applicant to do was to signalize the intersection. He said if the applicant made the proposal to add the improvements, because they could receive SDC credits, it would need to be memorialized in the decision so when it was built the City would be allowed to give SDC credits. If they built it on their own, the City may not give those credits.

Chair Simson noted that the required condition was a crossing with a warning sign and striping and no lights. She said by adding verbiage to the requirement to be signalized would allow for SDC credits.

Mr. Galati, asked what level of signalization the Commission wanted. He said the stop sign on Sunset Blvd was not as expensive as the RRFB on Pine Street and what was being proposed for Langer Farms Parkway was almost \$90,000 just for the construction, exclusive of engineering services.

Chair Simson called for a recess at 9:13 pm and reconvened at 9:26 pm. She asked for a straw vote from the Commission. Commissioners Pearson and Meyer were in favor of a signalized crossing. Vice Chair Griffin said if the applicant was able to recuperate the expenditure he thought it might be good. Chair Simson indicated that the Commission was in favor of a signalized crossing for the safety of the intersection if the applicant was in agreement.

Ms. Miller responded that the applicant was willing to do the signalized intersection if it was required. The applicant could recoup a majority of the cost excluding the engineering and design cost.

Mr. Soper indicated that the Commission would have to require the signal because it was not what staff determined was required based on the current regulations and standards and data. (Chair Simson commented that the data was based on a closed grocery store location). Mr. Soper said the Planning Commission would be imposing the signal as a requirement and the applicant was not offering.

Commissioner Pearson commented that the Commission was requiring the signal because they were mandated by law to require it based on the applicant's willingness to do it. The only reason the Commission was requiring it was because of the legal requirement. The applicant could not recuperate the expense unless the Commission required it.

Mr. Soper explained that there was no legal requirement for a signalized intersection. If the applicant improved the crosswalk as an act of charity, they would not be able to recoup the expense.

Commission members took note that it was outside the Commission's purview.

Mr. Kilby interjected that the applicant was in support of what the traffic consultant had indicated was warranted. If the Commission required a signal, it would be over and above what was required and staff was prepared with a finding and a condition if the Commission chose to require it. He explained that by using that process the improvements would become required and SDC credits could be earned, but only a portion of the cost would be refunded; a small drop in the bucket compared to the cost of the actual improvement.

Based on that, Vice Chair Griffin advocated the Commission require what the code required and not beyond. He advocated that it was not fair and questioned what happened with the next developer.

Mr. Kilby asked if the Commission was comfortable with the condition as written.

Chair Simson said the city had a duty to do something to that intersection, but to put it on the applicant was not the right place.

The following motion was received.

**Motion: From Vice Chair Russell Griffin to approve the application for SP 16-04, Sherwood Plaza Apartments, which was continued from June 28, 2016, based on the applicant's testimony, public testimony received, and the analysis, findings and conditions in the current staff report with the modifications as so stated previously by Chair Simson. Seconded by Commissioner Alan Pearson. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor.**

**7. Planning Commissioner Announcements**

Vice Chair Griffin recapped the success of the Voices for Performing Arts (VPA) play of *My Fair Lady* with over 1500 tickets sold over four nights.

**8. Adjourn**

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 9:35 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Kirsten Allen, Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: September 13, 2016