
City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes
June 24, 2008

Commission Members Present:

Lisa Walker
Jean Lafayette
Todd Skelton
Adrian Emery
Matt Nolan
Raina Volkmer

Staff:

Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager
Heather Austin, Senior Planner
Karen Brown, Recording Secretary

Council Liaison – Keith Mays - Not present

Commission Members Absent:

Chair Allen

City Attorney – Not present

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Commissioner Emery called the meeting to order. A motion was made to appoint Commissioner Emery as honorary Chair since the Chair and Vice Chair were not present. Motion moved and seconded and voted approved. Karen Brown called roll. Chair Allen and Commissioner Lafayette were not present.
2. Let the record show that Commissioner Lafayette arrived at 7:20.
2. **Agenda Review**
3. **Consent Agenda** – There were no consent agenda items to discuss.
4. **Staff Announcements** – Julia Hajduk introduced the new member of the Commission; Raina Volkmer. She was appointed by the City Council last week. She also attended the previous Commission meeting and is now ready to fully participate.

Other announcements made by Julia included that in the near future the Commission will be seeing a new Memorandum of Understanding between PGE and the City to provide concept planning for the portion of the unincorporated urban area between Tualatin/Sherwood Road and Hwy 99 that will be part of the Adams extension.

Staff has hired an intern to assist with a sign inventory. The intern will begin work Monday. There will be work sessions in the coming months to discuss the findings made during the study and to discuss possible further changes to the sign code.

I-5/99 Connector open houses are taking place this week.

There is also an Urban Reserve Open House that is being coordinated by Metro and Washington County to review the study areas of Rural Reserve and Urban Reserve that need to be identified. The next meeting will be in Tualatin July 10th in Tualatin.

5. City Council Comments – Mayor Mays was not present but had asked Julia to inform the Commission that the Council has adopted the Budget and the Urban Renewal Agency Budget early this evening in a special Council meeting.

6. Community Comments – None given

7. Old Business – Brookman Road Concept Plan continuation of discussion.

Julia states that the hearing does not need to be re-opened as it is essentially still open. She explained that tonight's meeting and the following meeting are to answer the questions that were brought up in the previous meeting. Then, new notices will be sent out for a 3rd meeting in which the public can come and verbally testify. Written testimony will be received at any time until the close of the next public hearing and will be enclosed in the next Commission Packet after it is submitted.

Julia went on to say that there are two guests attending the meeting; David Shierman with the Sherwood Park's Board, and Dan Jamison from the Sherwood School District. They are here if the Commissioners have questions about the existing conditions and the Steering Committee recommendations.

Julia introduced David Shierman from the Parks Board and stated that she, David and Kristen Switzer (from the City of Sherwood) met last week and explained Planning Commission comments from the last meeting and the concept plan that had been discussed in the last public meeting. They shared with him that the concept plan had identified the need for 6.21 acres of community/neighborhood parks. The assumption was that Tot Lots would be part of residential development, but that the Planning Commissioners reaction was that they thought that was contrary to what the Park Board had originally indicated.

Commissioner Emery asked if the Park Board wants Tot Lots or would prefer one big park. David's response was that after looking at the concept plan they really like the distribution of 3 major parks spread out throughout the area. What they don't want to see happen is parks losing out on prime lands by having several tiny, less than 2 parcel lots which aren't really big enough to utilize well. If a contractor wants to put one (a tot lot) in to enhance the attractiveness of the area, that is fine, but they don't want that to be counted as part of their 6 acres of designated park area. They would rather see the larger parcels. They are open to developer trading off SDC fees in lieu of being given quality land in which a park can actually be built on. They support that the use of wetlands as open space, but want to advocate for open areas for people to play and to put playgrounds. They do like what they have seen in the drawing on the concept plan and want to reinforce that. He recognized that in the past the Tot Lots have come up and it seems that the developers are putting them in more and more on their own. They would rather leave those off to the side, as it is much harder for the Parks Department to maintain 10 little lots rather than 3 big parks. They would rather focus on fewer, larger parks.

Commissioner Emery asked Julia if there is something that needs to be done in the code to prevent the Tot lots. He remembers it being a concern of people especially the Parks Department about the amount of money spent to maintain the small parks.

Julia agreed that this was a good conversation to be having. What she was understanding from the Park's Board is that they don't mind the Tot Lots but that they don't want those to be the only parks and that they don't want the City to have to maintain them either.

David from the Park's Board agreed that they are not against the developers putting in the Tot lots, but that they don't specifically recommend them. In his opinion what often happens is that eventually the Homeowners Association default on the maintenance of the areas, then the Parks Department is stuck with something they wouldn't have endorsed, including lesser quality play equipment. They are hoping not to see that happen. They don't want those lots to count against their inventory of park land.

Per Julia, one of the Comprehensive Plan policies is to develop an open space requirement for all new development. Right now other than Multi-Family or a PUD there is no requirement to dedicate open space. She stated that staff and the Commission should continue to work with the Park's Board and look at other ordinances to see what works. Julia discussed potential options such as if a developer provides a certain percentage of open space or is under a certain size perhaps allowing a fee-in-lieu which would allow the City to buy parks somewhere nearby.

David added that if a smaller development doesn't have an acre of land, a park could eat into their profit and they (the Parks Board) appreciate that, but a developer could potentially pay the fee then the Board could use that fee combined with other funds to buy an appropriate piece of land. The cost of land for a park is extremely expensive, but he feels the whole community enjoys and benefits from parks. Staff and the Parks Board will continue working on determining an appropriate percentage of required park land to add to the development Code.

Commissioner Walker asked what size area the Park Board considers as Tot Lots.

David's response was to say they are less than 2 residential lots, approximately 1500 to 2000 sq. ft. One point of reference is that if kids can't even throw a football within the area, it shouldn't be considered a park. Some of these areas even include a piece of playground equipment, but there is really not much the children over the age of about 5 can do.

Julia read from a report produced by GreenWorks that says a Tot Lot or mini park is 2400 sq. ft. up to 1 acre. A neighborhood park is 2 to 5 acres. The idea of 2 to 3 neighborhood parks totaling the 6.21 acres will provide a couple of neighborhood parks.

Commissioner Nolan referred to a map on page 15 of the Draft, April 22, 2008 plan and stated that he sees 4 parks.

Commissioner Walker referred to page 26 for Parks, Trails and Schools and that page says 6 parks, trails and schools. Some of the 6 look like Tot Lots and Commissioner Walker asked if the Park's Board was ok with that.

Julia reminded everyone that this is a "concept" plan. The idea is that we need several larger scale, 2-5 acre parks. David agreed with that.

Commissioner Walker and Commissioner Nolan asked what the largest proposed park is on the plan. It is not to scale but it does not look to them that what Julia is saying is being shown. Julia indicated she would coordinate with the consultant to get more detailed information. Julia asked

if the Commission would like to see the sizes of the proposed areas, and if they don't equal the 2-5 acre recommendation do they want to see areas combined?

Commissioner Nolan summarized what he believed he heard the Park Board asking for is usable parks for people to go into and have a picnic and play a game of Frisbee or football with their families. As he is looking at these plans he doesn't see any that would qualify for that type of use.

Commissioner Emery suggested deciding on a size, like 2 acres. Julia agreed to confirm the sizes then get back to the Commission.

Commissioner Lafayette asked about the area in the East. She doesn't see any proposed parks in that area.

Julia stated that there had originally been a park shown off of Ladd Hill, but there was a lot of public testimony saying they thought it was a bad spot, and that it would be more appropriately located in the area of the Red Fern connection.

Commissioner Lafayette would like to know the acreage of the original area of the park. Julia agreed to provide that information.

David referred back to page 15 as the page they had looked at. Basically if the area is divided into thirds, there is a park in each area. They felt that was a good distribution. Obviously, the size will need to be detailed more closely. The Park Board was hoping to stay away from considering the greenways as part of the parks. They are accessible, but they are not usable in their idea of a park area where people can actually play.

Commissioner Walker asked the size of Murdock Park for a reference. David indicated that he wasn't sure off the top of his head, but estimated around 4 acres. So the proposed areas they would like to see would be at least half that size.

Commissioner Walker asked for the total acreage of the parks again. Julia told her there were 6.21 acres.

Commissioner Walker didn't remember the alternatives having any more park areas. Julia indicated that some of the plans had more parks, beyond what the Comprehensive Plan calls for, however it was hard to say we were going to identify the area as a park without any funding mechanism in place. The plan assumes that all of the floodplains and wetlands will remain undeveloped and in addition have the 6.21 acres used for parks. That number of 6.21 acres was based on projected population in the area. Julia will review the plan to insure that the number of parks proposed is the appropriate size to meet the needs of the area.

Commissioner Lafayette calculated that 6.21 acres of park is barely 2 ½ % of the total acreage and even counting only what is being built as residential, it's 5%. She remembers in previous projects asking the developer to consider 10% area for parks, so she is questioning the low percentage of park area.

David answered by saying that the number he had given earlier had just been a stab. They hadn't looked at national standards, and will need to do a bit more research.

Julia read from the Comprehensive Plan which was quoted in the Greenworks document. “A minimum 1 acre neighborhood park to serve needs of 500 people or 1 park to a neighborhood of 2000 to 4000 people.” There is actually a little bit more park acreage identified in the Concept Plan than would be necessary based on the number of people. The Steering Committee recommended taking the total amount of acreage required for a community park and folding it into the acreage provided for a neighborhood park. She stated that in the city of Wilsonville they require 25% and the City of Happy Valley requires 20%.

Commissioner Nolan pointed out a potential discrepancy between the dwelling units and the calculation of park land required. After some discussion, Julia indicated that she would speak to the consultant and check the math between the number of dwelling units and the total acreage required.

Commissioner Lafayette asked David if the Park Board is satisfied with the connectivity of off street trails. He indicated that they were very happy to see the tie into to the existing trails.

Commissioner Emery thanked the speaker and invited Dan Jamison to speak to the Commission.

Dan Jamison Superintendent for the Sherwood School district spoke to the Commission. He started out by apologizing for possibly not being able to comment with a great degree of specificity about the Concept Plan, however he will be able to provide some demographics, anticipated growth and where they believe they will need to build in terms of capacity in future years. If more information is needed he would volunteer to work with Julia and get more information as requested.

He stated that in February of 2008 the school district did what they call a Dwell-Ratio analysis. He has been very interested in the fact that Sherwood is drawing young families. They looked at the last major developments in Sherwood and asked what the numbers were of school aged children yielded by type of dwelling unit. They looked at condominiums, multi-family dwellings and single family units throughout the community. They were able to arrive at a ratio of children per unit type. They then took the number of dwelling units provided in an initial analysis of the concept plan (from previous comments raised during discussion, the dwelling units may be off a little) of 1270 residential units tentatively planned. The school district believes that the number of student yielded once the Brookman Concept Plan area is fully developed would be 372 - 619 students for the single family units and 97 – 168 for the multi-family type dwelling, for a total of 469 to 787 students, based upon current trends in Sherwood. They also looked at the ratio of elementary vs. secondary schools. The ratio is running about 60% to 40% with a heavy preponderance of younger age children. They then compared and contrasted that with the current yield and current capacity, taking into account the new elementary and new middle school along with the expanded capacity of the high school. They believe they are well equipped with the high school. The high school remodel will take them out comfortably to 1500 to 1600 students. They anticipate an enrolment next year of about 1175. They hope to have capacity for at least 5 to 6 years, maybe even as many as 8 years. In the middle school, they have capacity as well. The new middle school will have an initial capacity of 500 students and has been designed to allow for an expansion on the north side of the building adding room for up to 900 students. They are feeling very good about the class sizes that are moving through. Where they see that they will be pressed for space is at the elementary level. The current capacity is presently at 1800. The number of children enrolled is 2150 to almost 2200 elementary age students. In the

Brookman Road area they are going to need a place holder for a new elementary school. What they would like to see ideally is 10, flat, buildable acres. The topography in the Brookman Road area is not really conducive to finding such a site. With that in mind he believes that the district may need to look in other peripheral areas for land. The area that looked good a year ago was near Middleton Elementary, but ideally, the schools need to be spaced out as evenly as possible. He volunteered to work with Julia to get a recommendation to forward to the City Council.

Commissioner Emery asked if there were any issues with the School District building outside the UGB. Dan's response was that they have already been in dialogue with Metro about this and are prepared to push hard at a State level and ask for some latitude since Sherwood has some very unique needs. His "hopeful answer" is yes.

Julia added that the reason a spokesperson from the School District was invited to speak was that right now there is not a plan to zone any area for a school within this area. She mentioned that the Planning Commission raised a concern for the School District about this at the last meeting and asked Dan to share his thoughts about that.

Dan stated that they would like to have a "place holder" to protect the district's interest in case other options don't pan out. They are already looking at property external to that area as they feel it is a matter of 5 to 6 years when they are going to need to build again.

Julia asked for clarification if by "place holder" was he thinking of zoning, or an overlay of types of zones. Dan indicated that he would like to see a 10 acre conceptual place holder as an agreement while they continue to explore all options.

Julia referred to page 26 of the Concept Plan that references 3 potential spots and asked if that was enough of a "place holder" or is he asking for specific properties to be identified?

He indicated that he would not ask that specific properties be identified, but rather work at a conceptual level.

Commissioner Lafayette asked how the process works for buying the land once an area has been chosen and the zoning has been applied. Dan explained that based on recent experience, once the most desirable area is chosen the School District then engages in site analysis and conversations with the current owners. If an equitable agreement can be made then the district will purchase the land. If agreements cannot be reached between homeowners and the School District, then they have the option to move forward with condemnation of the land. That is obviously the worst case scenario and would be several years down the road.

Commissioner Lafayette questioned that if once the land is identified for the benefit of the community and some particular individual property owner is notified that their property is the one that has been chosen for development, how will the "place holder" property be able to be held while still maintaining the rights of the property owners? She wasn't requesting an answer at this time, but would ask that staff work on an answer for that question before it gets asked by someone else.

Commissioner Emery asked if the land in Area 59 was purchased for a higher price due to the fact that it was known it was set aside for a school. Dan indicated that demand for the area drove

the price up considerably. The School District paid fair appraised market value. Mr. Jamison returned to the audience.

Julia addressed the Commission by referring to the existing conditions report prepared for the Steering Committee which was included in the Commission packet. She pointed out that it includes the Design Alternative Packet that shows the 3 design alternatives with detail that were available at the first open house, the Open House Summary Report, the Hybrid Plan that was created during meeting number 5 by the Steering Committee that was then shared at the 2nd Open House and the Open House #2 Summary report.

Commissioner Nolan asked to verify some numbers regarding traffic. He remembered seeing a report that showed 700 trips per day currently on Red Fern and he thought there had been a comparison of a comparable street of 1200 trips per day, at the intersection of Woodhaven and Sunset. Julia confirmed both of those statements.

Commissioner Walker asked about an earlier question about another comparison using Dewey and Meinecke. Julia confirmed that at the next meeting the Transportation Consultant will be available to discuss traffic questions.

Commissioner Nolan asked about Woodhaven Drive South of Sunset showing 1200 trips per day to 2 cul-de-sacs. Commissioner Emery confirmed that this is likely true, as this route is used for staging for drop offs and pick-ups from Middleton Elementary School. The likely route down Timbrel is monopolized by bus traffic.

Julia announced that the next Planning Commission meeting will be held July 22nd, 2008. Julia hopes to have more information regarding a question that was asked early about what the results would be on the traffic if the area moved toward my job generating zoning as well as more information on park sizes as well.

Commissioner Lafayette asked for some type of summary document laying out what the current park percentages are in the code book and existing developments in the City.

Julia agreed to bring some information to the next meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Lafayette moved to continue PA 08-01 to July 22, 2008. The motion was made, seconded and voted on unanimously.

8. New business – There was no new business to be discussed.

9. Commission Member Comments- Commissioner Nolan had been to an I-5/Hwy 99 open house early in the evening. He wasn't able to stay long, but indicated that what he did see was 4 plans presented; one improving the existing system including widening Tualatin/Sherwood road, another option showed going North of the City and coming through near Cipole and Tonquin Rd and over to I-5. The 3rd option was to travel down Tualatin/Sherwood Road to near 124th and then cutting over to Tonquin, then again to I-5 and the final option was to go South of Brookman Road. There was some discussion amongst the Commissioners about the possible options.

Commissioner Emery suggested that they could invite the I-5/99 connector participants to a commission meeting. The Commission was in favor of the idea. Julia suggested a work session at the July 22nd meeting to discuss these issues.

Commissioner Lafayette announced that the next I-5/99 connector meeting would be held, Wednesday, June 25th from 6:00 to 8:30 at Tualatin High School. The next meeting after that will be Thursday, June 26th at Wilsonville High School.

The meeting was closed at 8:25 pm.

End of minutes.