



**City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140**

August 12, 2008 – 7PM (Business Mtg.)

Work Session – 6:00 PM

The Planning Commission will hold a work session before the regular business meeting. Topics for the work session include:

- I-5/99W Connector Update
- Adams North Concept Plan update
- Commercial/Industrial Design Standards
- TSP update

Work sessions are informal meetings where the Commission and staff can discuss topics but no formal action is taken from these meetings. Work sessions are open to the public in accordance with public meeting laws.

In the event the work session topics exceed one hour, the Commission to reconvene the work session at the close of the business meeting

Business Meeting – 7:00 PM

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
2. **Agenda Review**
3. **Consent Agenda** – Draft minutes from 6/10/08, 6/24/08 and 7/22/08
4. **Staff Announcements**
5. **Council Announcements** (Mayor Keith Mays, Planning Commission Liaison)
6. **Community Comments** (*The public may provide comments on any non-agenda item*)
7. **Old Business: Brookman Road Concept Plan continuation of discussion.** The Planning Commission will discuss next steps in the hearing process but will not take any action or public testimony at this time.
8. **New business – SP 08-10/CUP 08-01 - Verizon Addition** - The applicant is requesting land use approval to add 1550 square feet to the existing Verizon switching utility facility located in Sherwood's Old Town overlay zone for a total building size of 5200 square feet. The applicant plans to install a "façade wall," new street trees and public amenity area along SW Pine Street. The expansion requires a conditional use permit due to its status as a utility building in a designated retail commercial zone
9. **Comments from Commission**
10. **Next Meeting: August 26, 2008**
11. **Adjournment**



MEMORANDUM

22560 SW Pine St
Sherwood, OR 97140
Tel 503-625-5522
Fax 503-625-5524

To: Planning Commission

From: Heather Austin, AICP, Senior Planner

Date: August 5, 2008

RE: Commercial and Industrial Design Standards- Work Session on August 12, 2008

At the August 12, 2008 Planning Commission work session, staff will provide the Commission with a presentation of the proposed code changes to implement revised commercial design standards and new industrial design standards.

These changes are based on direction provided by the Planning Commission in previous work sessions, codes utilized by other jurisdictions in the Metro region, and the results of the surveys the Planning Department made available on the City website and encouraged participation by commercial and industrial developers and property owners.

At the work session on August 12th, staff will provide the Planning Commission with copies of the proposed code changes that the Commission will then be asked to review over the following weeks and provide feedback at either a subsequent work session or public hearing in September.

The date of the next work session and/or public hearing will be determined at the work session on the 12th and publicly noticed per the requirements of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code and via e-mails to the interested parties list maintained by the Planning Department.

Planning Commission Work Session

Work Topics for Limited TSP Update

The current City of Sherwood Transportation System Plan was initiated in March 2003 and adopted by Council in April 2005. In the years since adoption of the TSP, significant improvements and planning efforts have been accomplished in the City. In addition, minor areas in the plan need to be clarified.

Staff believes a Limited Update to the Transportation System Plan is warranted to clarify, improve and update the Transportation System Plan.

The update will be limited to the following general four categories and topics:

Update the Plan to reflect constructed improvements made since plan adoption

1. Review and update the plan and existing conditions maps (street, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit), functional class, and traffic control to reflect changes and improvements made since plan adoption

Incorporate Recent Planning Efforts

1. Incorporate findings from the adopted Area 59 Plan
2. Incorporate Brookman Addition concept plan as appropriate
3. Blend in the Elwert/Kruger/99W intersection findings as appropriate
4. Incorporate the Gerda/TS Road and Galbreath/Cipole road intersection studies
5. Incorporate I5-99W Connector planning as appropriate

Review the plan for consistency with regional and state goals and policies

1. Review plan for consistency with Metro's and other regional goals and policies
2. Review safety goals to determine if additional policies are appropriate
3. Update map locations with the latest Washington County adopted Safety Priority Improvements System (SPIS) listing

Improve development review tools and clarify specific items

1. Update to reflect the ODOT Final Rail Order for the Oregon Street crossing removing the emergency only crossing
2. Review and update functional class and connectivity; specifically for
 - a. A connector route to serve the area north of 99W between Elwert Road and Cedarbrook Way
 - b. A connector route to serve the area north of Tualatin Sherwood road between Gerda and Adams roads
 - c. Remove the Columbia Street connection to Oregon Street and evaluate classification
 - d. Review feasibility of connections

Planning Commission Work Session

- e. Add notes to the map to describe minimum connection concepts, and that additional studies are required by development
- f. Clarify local/neighborhood street standard application
- 3. Provide recommendations for roundabouts and signals at various locations
- 4. Provide indexed map with transportation, pedestrian and bicycle projects, with a separate off-street (trail) project listing. Provide an individual listing for project length and cost indexed to maps
- 5. Identify Action Plan (will be funded) vs. Master Plan (desired) projects for transportation, pedestrian and bicycle projects
- 6. Update cross-sections as appropriate
- 7. Update current revenues to account for SDCs and TIF and revise funding suggestions as appropriate
- 8. Add guidelines to access management
- 9. Update proposed number of lanes map

City of Sherwood, Oregon
DRAFT Planning Commission Minutes
June 10, 2008

Commission Members Present:

Chair Allen
Jean Lafayette
Matt Nolan
Adrian Emery
Lisa Walker

Staff:

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

Council Liaison – Keith Mays

Commission Members Absent:

Todd Skelton

City Attorney – Chris Crean

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Karen Brown called roll. Commissioner Skelton was not present.
2. **Agenda Review** –
3. **Consent Agenda** – The consent items include the minutes from the May 13th, 2008. Commissioner Lafayette asked for clarification on page 2, item 5 f. Chair Allen confirmed that the 6 alternatives being talked about are in fact related to the I-5/Hwy 99 connector. Julia added that it is her understanding that it is not a public hearing, but rather a discussion/presentation. Two scrivener's were found on page 2 as well.

Commissioner Lafayette made a motion to approve the consent agenda as amended. All were in favor, motion carried.

4. **Staff Announcements** – Julia announced that she, Mayor Mays and Chair Allen had interviewed several applicants for the Planning Commission vacancy and forwarded a recommendation to the City Council for approval of the appointment of Raina Volkmer.
 - a. One thing that Julia noticed during the application/interview process was that 3 of the 4 applicants had been through the development process with the City of Sherwood and all 3 had issues with the process they had gone through. This made Julia more aware of the need help the “Non-Developer” Developers through the process.
 - b. Staff has interviewed an intern to help with a sign inventory. There will be more information coming out about that inventory soon.
5. **City Council Comments** – Mayor Mays was present but unless there were questions for him he had no new information to present. No questions were posed.

6. **Community Comments** – Chair Allen invited anyone attending the meeting to speak to the Commission on any issues not on this meetings agenda. No one came forward to speak.
7. **New business** – Public Hearing SP 08-06 Sherwood Old Town Dental

Chair Allen read rules regarding conduct and process during the hearing and asked for any exparte' contact disclosures. None were given.

- a. Heather Austin presented the Staff Report for Sherwood Old Town Dental which is a proposed remodel of the existing building. The request is to 290 sq. ft. to the existing structure, and to update and remodel the exterior and interior of the building. The updates include adding new windows, and removing existing skylights. The proposed changes will bring this building more into compliance with the criteria for buildings in Old Town Sherwood. The expansion will occur mainly in the northeast part of the site where the path currently lies. The front door will be pulled forward toward Railroad Street, bringing the building more into compliance with the requirement that the front entrance be located on the property line. Staff is recommending approval of this application with very few conditions. Condition D-3 has been resolved since the staff report has been written. Heather talked with the City's Public Works Department Sanitary Sewer Manager and he has said he will not be requiring sign-off on the public works line. No frontage improvements are being required because the site is on Railroad where the Downtown Streetscape project has already completed all of the frontage improvements. There are currently two street trees that meet the requirements there. There are two parking spaces that will remain.

Commissioner Lafayette pointed out a statement on page 15 of the Staff Report finding states that it does not show conduit connecting the building to the public conduit system. She asked that the finding be stated more clearly that it is Broadband conduit being referred to and that the recommended condition be modified accordingly. Heather agreed with the changes.

- b. Applicant invited to address the Commission. Brian Orthel of Carlson Veit Architects, representing the applicant, indicated that they had a chance to review the conditions and Staff Report and are willing to abide by the conditions set out in those reviews. There is one question in the report about bicycle parking coverage. They will be sure the design is modified to provide cover for those spaces. There are no further questions on behalf of the Applicant.
- c. Chair Allen asked for any questions from the commission or any members of the audience. No one responded. The public testimony portion of the hearing was then closed on SP 08-06 Sherwood Old Town Dental.
- d. Final staff comments included Heather saying the Planning Staff fully supports the recommendations given by Commissioner Lafayette for findings and conditions.
- e. Chair Allen summarized by saying there was the deletion of condition D-3 and clarification of findings on page 15 related to Broadband conduit and clarification of condition D-1.

- f. Commissioner Walker noted a scrivener's error on page 9. In the recommended condition it references installing a bicycle; she believes it should be bicycle parking. Heather agreed to update the document.

Motion: Commissioner Lafayette recommended approval of SP08-06 based on the staff report, findings of fact, public testimony, staff recommendation, agency comments, applicant comments and conditions as revised. Commissioner Nolan seconded the recommendation.

All members present were in favor, none opposed. Motion carried.

8. **New business** – Public Hearing SP 08-01 Brookman Road

Chair Allen read the rules regarding conduct and process during the hearing and asked for any exparte' contact disclosures. Chair Allen disclosed that he lives in the Arbor Lane subdivision which may potentially be impacted by the concept plan. Commissioner Emery disclosed that a friend of his that lives on Pinehurst called him to ask what it was going to look like. Commissioner Emery explained what he thought would be done, but does not feel this will affect his judgment. Commissioner Lafayette asked about the requirements for disclosure at previous meetings in which Brookman Road was discussed. Chris Crean, the City Attorney indicated that since this is a legislative matter the same level of disclosure is not required, as would be with Quasi Judicial; however due to the public interest involved with this project it would be wise to disclose any exparte' meetings attended. Commissioner Lafayette and Commissioner Nolan disclosed that they both attended the 1st open house regarding this project. Chair Allen and Commissioner Lafayette disclosed that they had both attended the City Council work session.

Chair Allen reminded people interested in speaking that they will each be given up to 5 minutes to testify. He indicated that no action will be taken during this meeting, but rather it will be = the first of a series of opportunities to have conversations about this area. This is an important decision for the city and the community. He stated that the Commission does not take this decision lightly and they expect it to take some hard work. From the process standpoint the Commission's role is to make a recommendation to the City Council about what, if any, changes need to be made to the plan. Annexation is an issue that will be determined by the City Council, citizens and voters of Sherwood, not by the Planning Commission. Chair Allen went on to explain what the role of the Commission was for those new to Planning Commission processes.

Commissioner Lafayette asked for clarification on whether someone had to be on record with the Planning Commission in order to testify in front of the Council. Julia responded that it would be a new hearing rather than an appeal hearing, so citizens could testify in front of the City Council without having testified at this meeting.

Julia Hajduk presented the Staff Report including a power point presentation. The Planning Commission is being asked to hold a public hearing, review, provide recommendation to Council on the Draft Concept Plan, the proposed Comprehensive Plan text changes and the proposed Comprehensive Plan Zone Map. There will be additional implementation actions needed before any development can occur and

there are recommendations made in the Staff Report to add additional policies to the Comp. Plan text to insure this happens.

The Concept Plan was developed over a 10 month period with a 16 member committee. There were 2 public open houses, a project web-site with regular updates, on-line opportunities to comment following the open houses, monthly updates in the Sherwood Gazette, e-mail notices and extensive mailings done prior to each public event.

Julia reviewed and explained the Steering Committee recommendation.

Chair Allen mentioned that there are several PUD's along the south border of the community. He asked what the ultimate zoning would be for that area by comparison. Julia's response was that most of them would be Low Density Residential with smaller lot sizes that are closer to MDRL. The density will be comparable along the northern edge.

Julia explained that the Steering Committee, along with the help of the consultant team, identified the buildable lands by taking out the flood plains, streams, potential wetlands, the Middleton Cemetery and the footprint of existing structures that were over a certain value. To determine the appropriate mix of land use a land use market analysis was developed by Johnson Gardner. The report analyzed a 20 year demand for residential, commercial and industrial land uses. Based on their analysis they recommend between 10 and 26 acres of non-residential zoning. The plan provides 14.09 acres of commercial and industrial land. Julia indicated that that had been a question at the joint City Council/Planning Commission work session. That is still being looked into. There still may be the potential to do more employment if that is the direction people want to go. It would require re-analysis and potentially re-running the traffic figures as well. The market analysis assumed the current transportation system and did not assume an I-5/99 connector in this area, which could potentially change things. The plan was designed to not preclude a connector.

This plan was developed with the market analysis, the buildable lands analysis and the assumptions that were made. The densities identified in the area include 230 dwellings, which equates to 10 dwelling units per net acres which is in compliance with the Metro Density targets, and approximately 480 jobs. The Steering Committee recommended forwarding the Concept Plan to the Planning Commission with a couple issues flagged:

- Local Street Connectivity. Regarding the local street connectivity, there is sensitivity to a connection of Red Fern. Red Fern is identified in the Transportation System Plan (TSP) as the only North/South connection between Middleton and Ladd Hill. There was significant opposition to vehicular connection to the existing residential neighborhood. The Steering Committee is recommending allowing the extension to stay, but making it clear that it is dependent on the traffic volumes and cannot exceed 1000 vehicle trips per day, (which is generally acceptable for local street maximum threshold.) They also recommended keeping an option open (in case the traffic volume cannot be achieved) for pedestrian, bike and emergency access only.

- Brookman Road realignment near the S curves on the eastern edge - The plan in the Steering Committee recommendation shows Brookman Road currently staying where it is, being brought up to collector standards which means it would need to be evened out a little bit in the S curves but, for the most part, staying the same. One proposal was a more “straight shot” approach to Ladd Hill. In the second open house there were comments made more supportive of that alignment as opposed to the S curves. Julia indicated that one reason people along this portion of Brookman Road spoke out about this plan is that their septic tanks are in their front yards and widening the street will not be of any benefit to their lots. They have lots that are relatively smaller than lots in other areas which may not be as ripe for redevelopment. The Steering Committee considered those facts but continued to recommend this alignment, with the caveat that this issue be brought up to the Planning Commission. One reason they continued to recommend this alignment is because it was believed that it would help slow traffic down and it is less of a “straight shot” to Red Fern. The straighter connection to Red Fern could invite higher speeds which was a concern at the first open house.
- Density in the Cedar Creek area - At the Steering Committee meeting topic was discussed regarding density. Should there be lower density areas near the flood plains? At that time Metro had responded to the question if they would accept going below 10 units per acre. Since then Metro has responded by saying if you were to go lower density here, they would not allow lower density target overall, which would mean having a higher density somewhere else in the plan. The Planning Commission will need to decide to keep the plan as it is recommended at MDRL with the understanding that developers can still do habitat friendly development and use some incentives there, perhaps requiring PUD's in this area or allowing it develop without any additional regulation or possibly consider up-zoning in other areas to allow lower density near the flood plane in order to have less impact on the vegetation.
- Sustainability - the Steering Committee wanted to be sure that the Planning Commission and the Council understand their desire to encourage sustainable development practices. Regulating low impact development may not be the way to go, but encouraging in the comp. plan as well as in general that habitat friendly development or maybe a task force to create incentives would encourage developers.

Julia stated that the proposed Comprehensive Plan changes include the draft concept plan policies folded into Chapter 8. Staff prepared a proposed Comprehensive Plan map based on the conceptual design overlaying the existing tax lots. Julia indicated that for the most part the proposed zoning follows the lot lines but there are a couple areas that include some split zones. Julia states that the area to the west near Old Pacific Hwy. has multiple zones over a few tax lots and for that reason, staff is recommending requiring a Master Plan that would allow a Council level review to determine the exact location of those zones.

Commissioner Lafayette asked if this will be part of the Capacity Allocation Program, and will they have the same trip limits as the rest of the City. Julia's response was yes to both questions. As long as the Capacity Allocation Program exists, that is in the code limiting the trips per day.

Julia continued with the presentation, stating that the required finding for any Comp. Plan changes must address the local standards, the state standards and the regional standards. The Staff Report analyzes all of the standards. The Concept Plan generally meets all of those standards. There are a few areas where staff is recommending some conditions to meet standards, primarily the transportation planning rule. Staff has talked with ODOT regarding compliance with the Transportation Planning rule. There was some miscommunication between ODOT and staff. ODOT has asked to leave the record open to work out the details. Julia passed the ODOT comments out to the Commission labeled as exhibit 5-F. She also noted that there have been two additional letters received from the public since the packets went out which are labeled 6-B and 6-C.

Julia continued by stating that there are several implementation actions that will need to be taken after the concept plan is adopted including updating Master Plans and the Development Code.

Julia concluded her presentation by stating that what staff is asking the Planning Commission to do is to hold a public hearing and then direct staff to either forward a recommendation to the City Council or to come back with additional information based on the input received at this meeting.

Chair Allen asked if there is a planning horizon that they are supposed to hit.

Julia responded by saying that 20 years is the standard comprehensive planning horizon.

Chair Allen offered that what he understands is that they could make decisions about what the structures and/or uses are and if they are planning for a 20 year horizon and based on the current market nothing happens there for the next 15 years, that would be acceptable.

Julia confirmed that statement but added that it doesn't mean nothing would be done in those 20 years, but that the area would continue to be analyzed. She agreed with Chair Allen that they don't have to make a decision that result in an immediate build out of every acre of the development.

Chair Allen asked about density in the area. Does the target density mean that whatever is zoned residential needs to be zoned at 10 units per acre. If there is less residential zoned, would the density have to be made up somewhere else? Julia's response was no, but that whatever is zoned residential has to be 10 units per acres.

Chair Allen asked about the traffic counts on Red Fern, and what an example of 1000 trips per day looks like as well as what the traffic counts are on Dewey Drive.

Julia stated that she believed the count on Dewey is 4000 to 5000 trips per day and indicated that she would get the other information requested and bring it to the next meeting with the traffic consultant.

A Commissioner asked if there had been any modeling of the different impacts of the different alignments would create and Julia replied yes. She stated that this information could be found in the Steering Committee packets and the different existing condition reports.

Commissioner Lafayette asked about how staff complied with the historic preservation and identification of historic resources.

Julia replied that there were no issues or concerns raised about historic structures and they are respecting the historic street pattern and the historic elements but that can be discussed further after hearing input from the public.

Commissioner Lafayette asked if an area is zoned IP for a school would that then change the density requirements.

It was discussed generally, but no area was specifically zoned as that would commit them to locating a school, and she doesn't believe they are ready to do that at this time. Julia wants to wait to hear the school district speak and if the Commissions wants her to get something specific from them in writing she will do that.

Commissioner Nolan asked what was accounted for in terms of schools in the plan.

Julia said it hadn't been discussed in great detail but the plan was for a 10 acre school site. The School District was included in the conversations and commented. The identification of three potential sites was more to determine where it would be most appropriate for a school to be sited that would fit into this area. Julia indicates that she planned to get a more formal response from the school district about their needs.

Commissioner Lafayette asked if they are being premature in making recommendations for Brookman Road when that may in fact end up being the I-5/99 connector.

Julia's response was that the re-alignment of Brookman Road would allow for separation between the new road and an intersection. If it does end up being Brookman Road then the plan will need to be reevaluated. The plan needs to continue to move forward knowing things can be modified in the future once more is known.

Commissioner Emery, as part of the committee working on the I-5/99 corridor, added that he recently learned that even if they located the connector North of Sherwood, they still will plan some type of connection south of Sherwood, in the Brookman Road area.

Commissioner Lafayette states that she has concerns about the comprehensive plan updates that need to be made. What will be seen and the time frame for those code updates?

Per Julia, it is highly likely that the plan the commissioners are looking at today will not be the plan that gets adopted. There may be modifications made. Whatever does get adopted will generally be adopted by reference. It will be a separate document, but referenced in the comp. plan. There will be specific policies and goals that are in attachment 3 to the staff report that will be in the Comp. Plan. Whatever concept plan is ultimately adopted will be finalized and attached as a reference document just like the Transportation System Plan and the Water Master Plan.

Commissioner Walker asked if the Master Plan would be built from that point, based on the concept plan at some time in the future. Julia confirmed that is correct for the Western area.

Commissioner Lafayette summarized by saying that for example they had looked at pictures of Area 59 a lot, and now as development is coming in they are going back and looking at the same pictures and are saying this is the area we are looking at now and this is how it's going to be developed and the based on the lines making minor adjustments as long as the net acreage doesn't change.

Julia corrected by saying they are not actually making adjustments to the zoning, rather what you will see that is mandated is the zoning and the transportation system.

Commissioner Lafayette asked if similar to the Transportation Plan can the items that are changeable in the conceptual plans be marked differently than those that are not?

Julia agreed that those distinctions can be made.

Commissioner Nolan asked what the rationale was behind choosing to go on the low side of the recommended employment. The reports recommend between 10 and 26 acres, yet the recommendation is for 14 acres. He states that we continue to hear that Sherwood needs a more diversified development base and less residential.

Julia stated that she believes a large part of the decision was based on design. It was a better design with the high density and the mixed use center. They also originally looked at more retail and scaled that back some to help alleviate the traffic impacts to the existing neighborhood.

Commissioner Nolan asked why the I-5/99 corridor wasn't given more consideration. If that connector goes through 1000 feet south of Brookman Road wouldn't the development be vastly different than what is being proposed?

Julia said they didn't want to develop a plan with the assumption that it was going to be there. It may be there in the future, but it is not there now.

Commissioner Emery added that of the 6 alternatives being considered, 3 of them are for some type of connector and 3 are not for a connector and enhancing what we have now, which is basically failure. The 3 connectors being considered are similar to what Hwy. 217 looked like originally basically they are envisioning 2 lanes starting out and signalized with possibly only 3 signals between here and Wilsonville. Eventually, like 217, there would be overpasses and more traffic signals Chair Allen moved the meeting onto the public testimony portion of the meeting.

Dan Tatman from Middleton Road addressed the Commission. He has been a resident of this community for 25 years. He has testified in front of Metro as well. His main question /comment is about annexation. He would like to see the entire area brought in as one annexation rather than piecemeal. This would let the property owners know if their property was in or out. Since they have been placed in the UGB in 2002 their property has been "on hold". They cannot sell the land for single home dwellings, because the map shows "housing". The developers don't want to buy it, because they don't know when the process will end. One of the things he learned in business is that you never get anything done unless you have deadlines. All he has heard are

open ended discussions and has not seen any goal dates for when the process will be complete and have only been told some time in the future. Some of the homeowners have plans that don't include waiting 10 to 15 years. They include 2 or 3 years. His suggestion is that someone step up and put some actual times on the process. His additional comment was on the I-5/99 extension. In the 25 years he has lived here it has been proposed at least 2 if not 3 times. Each time a study has been done, then find out it is cost prohibitive and then the plans are dropped. He believes that any engineer or accountant will tell you that it is almost impossible to come through the Brookman area with the creek and the slope, plus it's just a dead end.

Neil Shannon from Red Fern drive read a statement he had prepared. (That statement is available for review in the Planning Department inside City Hall labeled Exhibit 6 D.) He is speaking tonight mainly to discuss the impacts on the Arbor Glen neighborhood, specifically the residents of Red Fern Drive. He understands the issues of connectivity. He believes these issues are caused by geography and history, not by a lack of planning. The primary issue he sees is the placement of the Pacific & Western Railroad running diagonally through the neighborhood. New level crossings will not be allowed and over and under crossings are cost prohibitive. He believes that no connection should be considered if traffic levels are projected to exceed 1000 vehicle trips per day.

Sue Drouin of Brookman Road expressed her main concern is the alignment of Brookman Road. Her home is the 3rd house in on Brookman Road of the 5 parcel on the Ladd Hill Road end. She has lived there 18 years and has seen many accidents in the S curves over the years. Sight distance is a very big problem for that area. At one time an alternative in the concept plan showed extending Brookman Road straight out to Ladd Hill Road. She would like to know why that is not the preferred route to go and when the livability of the property owners will be addressed.

Chair Allen explained that this is the time to voice her feelings and is when the issues of livability will be addressed. He also stated that when this, or any other plan, gets adopted it will not be like flipping a switch and the bulldozers show up the next day. People will still own their property and get to decide what they choose to do with that property. Sherwood doesn't have a history of condemning property and turning over to developers.

Ms. Drouin had written a letter in January and asked if the Planning Commission had seen the letter. Julia indicated that it had gone to the Steering Committee and she would be sure to get a copy to the Commissioners.

Ms. Drouin continued with other concerns. In the notice she received there were two items of concern. One item said that the plan may reduce the value of property. She would like to know what was meant by that and whom they were thinking of. It also says it may affect the permissible use of land. What does that mean to the property owners?

Chair Allen answered that the notice is required by state law and requires that exact language to be used and sent to anyone within an impacted area and anytime there are zoning changes considered.

Lori Wokal of Brookman Road echoes the sentiment of her neighbor and previous speaker Sue Drouin concerning safety and livability as her major concerns. The wells that supply their homes are located 20' to 22' from the existing road, so any improvements would likely impact their

water. Lori has lived on Brookman Road for over 20 years. She had planned to stay there the rest of her life; however this decision will have an impact on that plan. As a school bus driver she would like to see any new school located more in a residential area for safety's sake.

David Villapando of Lodgepole Terrace addressed the Commission and distributed a copy of a Sherwood Police Department incident report. Mr. Villapando indicated that his backyard abuts the "S" curves on Brookman Road. In 2005 a young driver crashed into his backyard just minutes after his children had been playing in the yard. Sometime after the first incident a drunk driver crashed through the fence and into the backyard, as well as a third incident involving a motorcyclist again crashing into Mr. Villapando's yard. The City Police has records of all of these events. He expressed concern for the safety of his family and property with the current road. These incidents have all happened with lower traffic rates. His question is what will happen with increased traffic and no precautions like speed bumps put into place.

Commissioner Walker asked if he is in favor of the other proposal for the straightening of Brookman Road.

He stated that he would prefer that nothing would be done in the S curves and that possibly it could be used as a pedestrian area where no cars would be allowed. He would like to see at the very least that no increase in traffic is allowed. Julia added that the documents he shared will be labeled as 6 F.

Kris Sjobring of Red Twig Drive spoke in agreement with the 3 previous speakers that safety is a huge issue and to point out how narrow Red Fern Drive is at this time. He is in favor of straightening Brookman Road as a safer alternative. He also wanted to state his opinion on the record about the way schools are paid for. He feels that the developers should pay for the housing they create.

Commissioner Lafayette asked if he is saying that taking into consideration the statements made earlier that by straightening Brookman Road the traffic would increase on Red Fern Drive; for safety's sake he would feel better if the road was straightened.

His response was that he is more concerned with the "S" curves and the volume of traffic that would be allowed through.

Jeff Johnson of Pleasant Hill Road commented on traffic slowing and would suggest a roundabout somewhere in the area to possibly achieve slowing. He also commented that with 1230 new homes with an American average of 4 people per house gives you 5000 additional people. He believes that some area for schools and a park need to be set aside.

Bill Wetmore of Lodgepole Terrace indicated that over the years he has witnessed the wrecks on the "S" curves and agrees that adding more traffic will create a much bigger hazard. He would be in favor of the straightening of Brookman Road.

Kim Urban of Red Fern Drive voiced her agreement with the statements made by Neil Shannon that most the residents on Red Fern do not want to see the road punched through. If the road did go through though, she hopes that some type of limitations would be made on parking to increase visibility and the safety of the children in the neighborhood. The current traffic flow is already barely acceptable when it comes to a safety standpoint for the kids.

Ken Smith of Red Fern drive spoke in support of his neighbors on Red Fern Drive. At his count there are nearly 23 children that live in the area as well as a day care that manages about 9 children all under the age of 10. He agrees that North/South connectivity is important, but believes that better and safer choices need to be made.

Philip Lapp of Brookman Road indicates that he has lived there since 1960 and farms the south side of Brookman Road. His main concern is the traffic increase on Brookman Road. This is already a hazardous area, and increased traffic will impact the people already in the area. It will absolutely affect his livability as he tries to continue to farm his land. His farm by its nature produces dust and noise and that may be an issue for new homes coming into the development. He would ask that if you could do anything to decrease the traffic flow that would be appreciated.

David Hufshmid of Willow Drive testified that he lives on the corner of Willow Drive and Red Fern and believes that this will negatively impact the neighborhood and foremost the safety of the children. Increasing the auto traffic as well as the pedestrian traffic will only drag down the livability. The value in the neighborhood will also be negatively affected by additional traffic.

Joanne Cannon of Shady Grove Drive strongly agrees with previous speakers from the Arbor neighborhood that the safety of the children is the main concern. She asked if it would be possible to cut Brookman Road straight across to a round-about at Ladd Hill through the farming area, but an area without a great deal of housing.

Julia responded by saying that looking at the map as Ms. Cannon described would run outside the UGB and outside the City of Sherwood's ability to plan.

Kevin Austermann of Red Fern Drive wanted to echo the sentiment of his neighbors. He is strongly opposed to the plan to extend Red Fern Drive. He would be interested to see what 1000 trips per day looks like and what the actual count on Red Fern is now.

Dana Hardman of Middleton Road feels that Brookman Road should not be changed. The aesthetic value and beauty will be gone if this development is allowed.

Chair Allen closed the public testimony portion of the meeting for tonight.

Chair Allen wanted to discuss communication moving forward with this process. People that were required to receive public notice have received them. State rules say that by being told at this meeting tonight that the subject will be continued that is all the further notice that has to be given. He stated that in reality if someone is on the E-mail list for the Brookman Road project, they will continue to receive notices and recommended ensuring staff had anyone's e-mail address if they wanted notice.

Chair Allen asked if an additional mailed notice could be provided prior to the meeting where the Commission believes they will be taking their final action. Julia confirmed that could be done. Chair Allen then asked that staff commits to sending out that notice. Julia agreed.

Chair Allen stated that he believes that there needs to be another focused session on at least a few topics discussed at the next meeting. They would like to hear back from the School District as

well a transportation representative about things like actual counts and examples of what projected counts look like. He would really like to see what the actual counts are on Dewey Drive and what the estimates before Dewey Drive open and how do the actual counts compare. He would also like to know if any modeling has been done on Red Fern and if Red Fern opens how much traffic will be caused by the eastern development vs. cut-through traffic. He would like to see data that shows if people use Red Fern and get to Sunset, how many go west and how many go east.

Commissioner Lafayette added that she would like to see what the gain/loss is by keeping the connection with the S curves vs. straightening the road out and be sure the Commission gets a copy of that diagram.

Commissioner Walker asked if there were other versions of the Brookman Road Expansion that were considered.

Julia said there were 3 alternatives that were brought to the first open house. She will provide the Commission with copies of the 3rd option that was originally discussed.

Commissioner Walker asked if the TSP take the median age and proximity to a school to determine the width of a street.

Julia explained that proximity does affect speed zones, but street width is not addresses.

Julia stated that many of the questions raised by the Commission will be addressed when the traffic consultant attends a future meeting.

Chair Allen stated that he is also interested in learning more about job generating land vs. residential land. What would the impacts be of pushing toward a higher amount of job generating land? For example he referenced the land around Boons Ferry Road at Durham, 3 story brick office types of buildings. What kinds of impacts on job densities and traffic impacts.

Commissioner Nolan brought up the issues of park sizes and locations based on the Parks Master Plan. Was this area talked about in that plan? Julia will provide the Commission with the existing conditions report, and will invite a Parks Board member to attend a meeting soon.

Commissioner Lafayette brought up the idea of an inventory of historic building in the area; this would be the time to do so.

Chair Allen suggested continuing this meeting until June 24th, 2008 with the expectations that the next couple of meetings will not be public testimony meetings, but rather fact finding meetings to answer questions that have been raised and talk about what other questions may arise, then target another public testimony meeting 3 or 4 meetings out. Specific questions and public input can still be submitted to Julia via e-mail or regular mail to be considered during the next few meetings.

MOTION: Commissioner Lafayette proposed a motion to continue PA 08-01 to June 24th, 2008. The motion was seconded and carried.

9. Public Utility Easements in Old Town - Heather Austin addressed the commission by explaining that this issue has come up with all of the development in Old Town. The Code requires an 8' public utility easement along the frontage of properties as well as collector and arterial streets requiring visual corridors which conflicts with the zero lot line standards in Old Town. Julia has made a Director's Interpretation that in Old Town, the Old Town standards apply and supersede the PUE and Visual Corridor Standards.

MOTION: Commissioner Lafayette moved to endorse the Planning Director's Interpretation regarding Public Utility Easements and Visual Corridors in Old Town. The motion was seconded and all voted to endorse the interpretation.

10. Commission Comments - Commissioner Lafayette wanted to comment on the lack of bicycle racks in the city, specifically at the Albertsons. Julia responded that the current code requires bike racks in all new developments; however that may not have been a requirement at the time many of the properties were developed.

Commissioner Lafayette also had a question regarding the status of the water reservoir and when will the paving be complete on Division. The completion of the street was a condition of the Ball Fields and staff at that time gave a final occupancy without the Division Street improvements being complete.

Julia will check with the project manager within the City and follow up with more information.

Chair Allen closed the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

End of minutes.

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes

DRAFT

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.

City of Sherwood, Oregon
DRAFT Planning Commission Minutes
July 22, 2008

Commission Members Present:

Chair Allen
Jean Lafayette
Matt Nolan
Raina Volkmer
Lisa Walker
Todd Skelton

Council Liaison – Not Present

Staff:

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

Commission Members Absent:

Commissioner Emery

City Attorney – Not Present

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Chair Allen opened the meeting at 7:05. Karen Brown called roll. Commissioner Emery was not present.
2. **Agenda Review**
3. **Consent Agenda** – Minutes not reviewed at this time. Deferred to next meeting.
4. **Staff Announcements** – None given
5. **City Council Comments** – None given
6. **Community Comments** – None given
7. **Old business** – Brookman Road Concept Plan continuation of discussion from public hearing opened June 10th 2008. Commissioner Allen asked for any exparte' contacts or information to be disclosed. He disclosed that he is a member of the Arbor Lane Subdivision. Commissioner Volkmer also disclosed that she lives in the Arbor Lane Subdivision, on Red Fern Drive.

Julia briefly discussed the Hybrid Concept Plan which was developed after receiving feedback from the public hearing and the last Planning Commission meeting. She explained the modifications that were made:

She stated that one of the main questions that arose from the public testimony was how straightening the eastern end of Brookman Road would affect traffic so the plan was modified to allow further study of this.

Also, in response to feedback from the Planning Commission when parks were discussed, OTAK was asked to re-look at the numbers of park area designated.

The last item of the Hybrid plan includes looking at how traffic would be affected if there were higher numbers of commercial and industrial employment land consistent with the high-end range provided in the market analysis. She asked OTAK to move more employment land in. This resulted in needing to increase the densities a little bit to make up for the loss of the High Density Residential. Changing that also helped make sure the parks numbers were more accurate.

Julia stated that these changes were made for a hypothetical discussion. DKS and Associates, analyzed these changes to see what would change, if anything, in the Transportation System.

Chair Allen asked for clarification about the density changes. His understanding is that the need for raising the density came from the fact that the residential units that were lost were higher density and therefore the density needs to be increased, not because there is a certain number of dwelling units that are required.

Julia confirmed his understanding was correct and went on to say that the remaining area zoned residentially had a minimum density of 10 units per acre.

Chair Allen also asked about the land that has been identified for employment. What is the time horizon for the market analysis and are they constrained by the top end of that analysis or is there a case that could be made to go further with the employment land vs. residential? He also asked about the school's needs mentioned in the previous meeting. If they (the Planning Commission) create a concept plan that doesn't specifically define a school site, will the last 10 acres developed, automatically get developed by the school, if the district has not acted sooner?

Julia responded to the latter question by stating that she met with Dan Jamison of the school district after the last Planning Commission meeting to get more clarification of what he meant as a "place holder." She indicated that Mr. Jamison conveyed to her that of the 3 areas identified as potential school sites in the draft concept plan, the most desirable area would be the one along Brookman Road. However, he does not want any institutional zoning applied at this time. They want to look at their options both inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundaries. Julia indicated her understanding was that the District would like to have it on the record though that there is a long term need for school land in the area.

Chair Allen noted that just by stating that "on the record" will not have much of an impact on the planning process. Julia responded that her understanding is that the District understands that will not affect the planning process but rather may come into play if land acquisition issues arise in the future.

With no further questions of staff on the draft hybrid plan, Julia introduced Chris Maciejewski from DKS Associates.

Chris Maciejewski from DKS Associates addressed the Commission by presenting a Power Point presentation in response to questions Julia had asked him that have come up in recent Brookman Road discussions. He indicated that they have been working on questions about the recommended concept plan as well as working with OTAK on the Hybrid concept plan.

The first issue reviewed is whether the east end of Brookman Road and the 90 ° curves would be a better scenario for the transportation system versus a straighter connection to Ladd Hill. DKS and OTAK reviewed the topography and existing conditions and found an area that there may be a slot where they could run a collector street up to Ladd Hill with a more straight connection as opposed to improving/widening the existing "S" curves. He indicated that the new road alignment would not change circulation patterns greatly, it would not affect traffic on Red Fern greatly, and it would not affect off sight impacts or intersection requirements. He stated that, at this time, it looks like it would be roughly the same cost to build the collector as straightening out the S curves and widen Brookman Road. It is estimated to cost \$3,000,000.00 to build either scenario.

Commissioner Lafayette asked if the projected connector followed property lines.

Julia referred to a map in attachment 3 of packets to view the property lines and indicated that it did not specifically follow property lines.

Chris went on to speak about another modification DKS was asked to review and respond to. The hybrid plan changed to increase the amount of Office and Industrial land use (which, Chris reminded, is important to keep straight from the Retail/Commercial areas as RC is a much higher trip generator.) Chris indicated that increasing the number of employees by 500 to 600 people on the west end, with fewer houses, while maintaining the 10 unit per acre density resulted in a net increase of approximately 100 p.m. peak hour trips. The reason for this is that employment trips are traveling in the off peak direction as most p.m. commuters are coming home to Sherwood, the employment traffic will be going out. The surrounding intersections are less impacted even though there are more trips.

The third issue Chris was asked to look at was Red Fern. Chris indicated that looking specifically at Red Fern Drive there was not a significant change in the projected volume on Red Fern if it is opened to through traffic versus local traffic between the Steering Committee Plan and the hybrid plan. Vehicles per day are estimated at 1200 vehicles per day if no other measures were in place to restrict traffic. They were able to verify that it would remain mostly local traffic as it would not make a very attractive cut through route between Ladd Hill and Sunset Blvd. based on stop sign configuration and a circuitous route.

Julia had also asked Chris to provide examples of familiar roadways in the community with similar trips of 1000 per day. He was able to give 5 samples; Woodhaven on the south side of Sunset has about 1200 trips per day, Brookman Road currently carries roughly 1100 vehicles per day, the connection of Lincoln between Oregon Street and Willamette carries about 1000 cars per day, Pine Street just north of Sunset is

approximately 1100 per day (prior to the recent paving improvements, but after Washington Street was closed.) Willamette Street just south of the Pine improvements is around 800 vehicles per day. The information they could obtain about Dewey Drive is that it carries about 4000 cars a day. That count was taken before the cut through of Dow Drive was opened, so that number may have gone down some.

Chair Allen asked if the traffic from Red Fern is going left or right. Chris indicated that he would have to look back at his technical information to get that answer.

Chair Allen indicated that he felt that if 80% of the traffic is going west then there would be a benefit to opening the street.

Chris continue with his presentation and went on to say that with the shift in the traffic to more employment land rather than residential there would not be the need for turn lanes at the intersection of Hwy 99 and Sunset Blvd. as previously discussed in the Steering Committee recommended plan.

Chair Allen asked what would really be improved by opening up Red Fern Drive?

Chris that it will mainly be the trips coming out of the northwest corner traveling into the Woodhaven area. From an emergency response, it would add a second way into the area, which is always preferred. There would also be the connectivity for pedestrians and bicycles which people appreciate.

Chair Allen asked about the affects opening Red Fern would have on the Ladd Hill, Sunset connection.

DKS did not find that the Red Fern connection impacted the need for mitigation measures at Ladd Hill and Sunset as the trips per day would only be increase by 20 to 30 trips per day.

Chair Allen surmised that opening Red Fern would be an attempt to add connectivity that doesn't really buy much connectivity.

Chris agreed that often local street improvements are not about avoiding mitigation elsewhere, they are designed to help local circulation. Opening Red Fern won't have a major impact on the collector/arterial system.

Julia asked Chris how to limit the trips to 1000 trips per day. Is there something physically that can happen?

Chris indicated that the easiest path is to build the connection and then monitor the area. If the number of allowed trips is exceeded, then you turn it into an emergency vehicle access only, by installing breakaway barriers or removable posts. It is more difficult to build the area as a trail connection, then to come back and decide you now want a street. If you really wanted to build it, his suggestion would be to build it and put money aside for monitoring and then possibly constructing emergency vehicle access only later as a mitigation program.

Chair Allen asked about the potential benefit of stop signs.

Chris said that stop signs are more of a safety issue. When stop signs are placed in areas where they are not warranted, people begin to ignore them and when children are present that can create a significant problem. He would recommend speed cushions rather than stop signs. He agreed with Chair Allen that parked cars act as traffic calming devices as well. If the residents all parked on the street and it was very narrow, there probably would not be a lot of cut through traffic.

Commissioner Lafayette pointed out that this is ultimately a developer driven process. She feels it makes sense to allow the connection while having a back-up plan that says if it exceeds what it is supposed to be, then the access will be cut. She stated that, as a Commission, they try to ensure transportation connectivity in everything they do, and to take this out of the tool box now, just in case 20 years from now there might be more than 1000 trips seems like bad Planning policy to her.

Chris added that some sensitivity analysis was done which asked what if one of the connections did not exist would it still be likely that the trips would exceed the 1000 trip threshold. They found that if you only had one of the two connections, the trips would still be near 1000.

Chair Allen asked Chris to speculate about who would be using the road. He was asking about the people living in the four block area just below the Red Fern connection. Chris would not anticipate them using the Red Fern connection. When they analyzed the connection to see who would use it, it was primarily the residents in the northeast corner. One of biggest factors Chris could see in decreasing the cut through traffic was to leave Ladd Hill as the through street. As an alternative, DKS tried taking Ladd Hill to Brookman as a through connection. If you are traveling north and have to come to a stop then the travel time was roughly the same as traveling through Red Fern. If you are allowed to travel down Ladd Hill without stopping it was much quicker and more likely to go all the way through to Sunset. He indicated that an important point to specify in a plan for the future is that Ladd Hill would remain a through street with Brookman Road stopping at Ladd Hill.

Commissioner Walker asked about the safety and feasibility of taking a left onto Ladd Hill from Brookman Road.

Chris referred back to the earlier information given about the location of the proposed connection to Ladd Hill from Brookman Road. The location of the connection is on the point of a horizontal curve. From a sight distance point of view is the best place to be.

A discussion ensued between the Commission, Chris and Julia about proving results of traffic counts. From past experience the Commission is skeptical about the traffic counts provided being accurate. Per Chris it is not typical to go back and redo traffic counts after something has been built unless there are complaints, so they don't have a lot of data to refer to showing their accuracy. Commissioner Nolan added that typically the traffic always end up being worse than what the traffic studies say they are going to be.

Per Chris the difference between the 1000 count threshold and the 1200 counts could be just be a day to day variation. It could be 20 additional trips over the peak hour. If he were to video tape two different streets, one with 1000 trips and one with 1200 the difference would barley be noticeable. The 1000 trip threshold is a planning threshold, not a hard engineering threshold.

Julia suggested a “traffic study 101” session to increase the comfort level of the Commission with the traffic consultants estimates. Chair Allen gave several examples of failures in the past where decisions were made based on traffic engineers estimates, and reassurances given to the Planning Commission that something would work only to find out once implemented the results to the traffic were terrible.

Chris suggested that DKS could provide information at a work session to assist the Commission on knowing: what questions to ask when the developers’ traffic engineer is saying one thing and the City’s engineer is saying something else, what parts of the traffic studies to look at and question the assumptions; which questions to ask to help increase the confidence level about the traffic information being provided.

Chair Allen then moved the meeting discussion onto parks.

Julia explained regarding parks, that once the residential densities were revised, that the parks numbers were also revised to now show 8.29 acres of neighborhood and community parks. This is more in line with what the Parks Board had asked for and more in line with the Comprehensive Plan with the parks now all being over 2 acres in size. Based on a request from Commissioner Lafayette at the last meeting Julia prepared an assessment of what percentage of parks we have per subdivision. (Attachment 1 of the PC packet).

Commissioner Walker asked if the 8.29 acres shown in the Hybrid plan would all be considered active under the guidelines used to produce the comparison chart.

Julia confirmed that it is all active.

Commissioner Lafayette calculated that the 8.29 acres would be 3.3% of the project.

Julia went onto say that the Planning Commission can recommend whatever they feel would be appropriate but that there should be some type of basis used. The basis the Steering Committee used and was recommended by the consultant was using the existing Comprehensive Plan and the acreages required based on the estimated population.

Chair Allen if it would be possible to receive color copies of the Green Play (a company that had done a park study for the City) maps showing the colored zones.

Julia agreed to get copies to all Commissioners.

Referring back to the minutes from the previous meeting, Chair Allen thought what he understood the Parks Board speaker to say was that they were not against Tot Lots, but

that they didn't want them to count against the total acreage, and that level of parks proposed met their requirements.

Chris from DKS found information to answer the earlier question about what way does the traffic flow from Red Fern onto Sunset. Chair Allen invited him back up to the microphone. Per Chris the Northbound traffic on Red Fern under existing conditions using PM peak hour date, 2/3 of the traffic go left, (toward Hwy 99), and the other 1/3 turns right. If the connection is made between Red Fern and the Brookman Road land use all of the new traffic would also be turning left toward Sunset. The connection would only be attractive as an alternate route to people traveling toward Hwy 99.

Julia asked if the Commission wanted the hybrid plan to be the one used from this point forward and if that is the plan they would like people to comment on at the next public meeting. The Commission discussed that the hybrid plan is part of the iterative process but people can comment on anything up to this point as well.

Chair Allen reiterated his concerns about continuing with planning acting as if the I-5/Hwy. 99 connector does not exist. He is worried that Brookman Road may become **the** connector and how that would affect everything they are discussing. The other issue he is thinking about is not having enough jobs close to Sherwood.

Commissioner Nolan agreed with Chair Allen about the issue of the I-5 connector.

Julia will work on a plan to recommend proceeding with that in mind. Regarding the employment land, she would like more input from the Commission on how to base the suggestion for needing more employment land. There is a market study in place now that gives a range, there is an Economic Opportunities Analysis that may provide a better range, to base the suggestion on.

Chair Allen used the Lake Oswego/Kruse Way area as an example of the market analysis saying you could never pencil office space on Kruse Way, which has since been proven to be "spectacularly wrong." It seems to him that the projection is at such a fine level of detail. In the future when we are really concerned about the cost of energy and driving miles to work, will we wish we had thought about that now and increased the amount of employment area beyond just retail/commercial?

Julia agreed to look into this further.

Commissioner Lafayette pointed out that the Johnson-Gardner numbers are based on Brookman Road not being the I-5 connector. What happens to their numbers if it does become the connector?

Chair Allen stated that a Sensitivity Analysis would be beneficial that considers what affects there would be if Brookman Road becomes the connector as well as the projection of significantly higher gas prices. There are some studies saying that the value of suburban residential lands will go down as people move away to be closer to their jobs. What if you put more jobs closer to where people live? The study by Johnson-Gardner was done nearly a year ago. Have things changed?

Julia will work on developing a process plan to discuss with the Commission at the August 12th meeting.

Julia is proposing inviting the public back to the 1st meeting in September, not necessarily to make a decision, but to have an opportunity to comment on the most current information. She is planning on having questions answered and being able to clarify things with the Parks Board at their August meeting.

Commissioner Lafayette asked how active the original Steering Committee is in the process and the development of the Hybrid plan.

Julia indicated that the Steering Committee members are no longer convening as they have made their recommendation. That does not mean they cannot be asked to be re-convened but that was not in the plans.

Commissioner Lafayette would like the Steering Committee to be invited to comment on the Hybrid plan. Per Julia, they are on the interested parties list and will get a specific update with the Hybrid Plan attached and at Chair Allen's suggestion a note saying, the Hybrid represents the evolution of the plan in a direction that the members of the Planning Commission are comfortable with.

Julia wanted to clarify that the Hybrid Plan is the plan the Commission wants to use for the base line to be used and comments.

The Commission agreed.

Motion made to continue – all were in favor.

8. **New business** – No new business
9. **Commission Comments** - None
10. **Next Meeting: August 12, 2008.** – Verizon Substation Expansion in Old Town, Commercial/Industrial Design Standard work session, I-5/99W presentation work session and Brookman Road Concept Plan process update

Chair Allen closed the meeting at 8:45

End of minutes.



Home of the Tiaklatin River National Wildlife Refuge

MEMORANDUM

22560 SW Pine St
Sherwood, OR 97140
Tel 503-625-5522
Fax 503-625-5524

To: Planning Commission

From: Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager

Date: August 1, 2008

RE: Brookman Addition Concept Plan

At the Planning Commission meeting on July 22, 2008, the Commission had the second of two planned informational work sessions. At that meeting it was determined that additional information may be needed/considered, specifically:

- Consideration of how decisions for the I-5/99W connector project may affect the land use assumptions in this area.
- Consideration of whether even more employment could be supported in this area with or without a connector in the vicinity of this area
- Conversation with the Parks Board about the amount, size and overall percentage of parks shown in the concept plan area
- Further discussion of historic resources and whether more information and analysis was necessary

It was discussed that staff would consider the remaining issues and come back to the Commission with a "game plan" on how to proceed but that no formal action would occur at the meeting on August 12, 2008. Staff will be prepared with a brief outline and discussion at the meeting on the 12th with the intent to continue conversations to the August 26th meeting and not continue the public hearing portion until the September 9, 2008 meeting.

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Department

Pre App. Meeting: January 31, 2007
App. Submitted: June 4, 2008
App. Complete: July 2, 2008
Hearing Date: August 12, 2008



Michelle L. Miller,
Associate Planner

Proposal: The applicant requests land use approval and a conditional use permit to renovate and expand the Verizon Switching Station, an existing utility building located in Sherwood's Old Town Overlay District. The building houses equipment for the operation of the utility. No employees work at the facility, but maintenance personnel periodically check on the equipment. The applicant proposes to add 1,550 square feet to the existing 3,650 square foot structure making the total building size 5,200 square feet. The site is approximately 10,000 square feet, comprising two lots. The applicant is not proposing to change the use of the structure; it will remain a utility switching station. In addition to the building the applicant proposes improved landscaping to the site, along with an eight-foot high façade wall located along SW Pine. The applicant's submitted materials are attached to this report as Exhibit A.

I. BACKGROUND

- A. Applicant
David Bissett Architecture, LLC
Contact: David Bissett
208 1st Avenue, Suite 300
Portland OR 97204
- Owner
Verizon Northwest
Contact: Kord Kurisu
13028 Harbor Heights Drive
Mukilteo WA 98275
- B. Location: The site is addressed as 22312 SW Pine Street, and Tax Lot: 2S132BA1200 and 1300.
- C. Parcel Size: The site area includes two tax lots each approximately 5,000 square feet or 0.11 acres for a total of approximately 10,000 square feet.
- D. Existing Development and Site Characteristics: The existing windowless structure is comprised of brick and concrete and houses a switching station for the telecommunications company. The primary building entrance is located off of the parking area on the alley side with additional access along the northern side of the building. City records indicate that the building was remodeled in 1986 (Building Permit No. 990) but does not give a construction date for the original building. The property was formerly owned by General Telephone Company, who acquired the property in 1928. The existing one-story building is 3,650 square feet in size and located near the northern boundary of the site on SW 3rd Street. There is a screened HVAC area with a screen wall adjacent to the building. There is also a cinder block enclosed structure located next to the brick building that houses additional equipment for the operation of the switching station. This structure, while in Old Town, is not included on the Sherwood Cultural Resource Inventory.

Utility poles with overhead lines run along SW Pine Street. The site contains a paved parking lot with vehicle access from the alley. Slatted chain link fencing surrounds the parking area. Curb-tight sidewalks are located along SW Pine Street. SW 3rd Street bordering the north side of the property is not improved and this graveled area is used for parking and access to the neighboring properties.

The existing landscaping includes one street tree, hedges along part of the eastern boundary of the property, landscaping around the perimeter of the eastern portion of the site and the sidewalk along SW Pine Street. There are three other trees on the property-side of the sidewalk around the landscape area. The site is generally flat. This property does not have any inventoried significant riparian, upland or wildlife habitat according to Metro's inventory of regionally significant habitat and the Comprehensive Plan inventory map.

- E. Zoning Classification and Comprehensive Plan Designation: The property is zoned Retail Commercial (RC) within the Old Town Overlay. Chapters 16.28 and 16.162.030 of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code list the permitted and conditional uses in this zone within the Old Town Overlay.
- F. Adjacent Zoning and Land Use: The site is surrounded by properties zoned Retail Commercial (RC) and Medium Density Residential Low (MDRL), all within the Old Town Overlay zone. The site to the north, across SW 3rd Street is vacant and zoned RC. The south side of this property is bordered by a public alley. A pet groomer and counseling office are located along SW Pine to the south and zoned RC. A house is located east of the property zoned MDRL, and has been converted to apartments.
- G. Review Type: The applicant is proposing a modification to the Conditional Use Permit requiring Site Plan review. Additionally, while the expansion is only 1,550 square feet, site plan review of new or existing structures in the Old Town Overlay District is subject to a Type IV review before the Planning Commission. The City Council is the appeal authority.
- H. Public Notice and Hearing: Notice of the land use review of this application was posted on site, at 5 conspicuous locations throughout town and mailed to property owners within 100 feet of the site on July 22, 2008 in accordance with Chapters 16.72.020 and 16.72.030 of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code. Notice is to be published in The Tigard Times on July 31, and August 7, 2008.
- I. Review Criteria: Sherwood Comprehensive Plan Part 3, Zoning and Community Development Code, 16.28 (Retail Commercial- RC), 16.58.030 (Fences, Walls and Hedges), 16.82 (Conditional Uses) 16.90.020 (Site Plan Review), 16.92 (Landscaping), 16.94 (Off-Street Parking), 16.96 (On-Site Circulation), 16.98 (On-Site Storage), Division VI (Public Improvements), 16.142 (Parks and Open Space), Division IX (Historic Resources).

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

As of the date of this report, no written public comments were received.

III. AGENCY COMMENTS

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

Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD), ODOT Outdoor Advertising Sign Program and Kinder Morgan Energy all replied stating that they had no comment about this application.

Clean Water Services submitted general comments that were received on June 26, 2008 for the proposed development and noted that a Sensitive Areas Pre-Screening Site Assessment (SAPSSA 08-000489) was issued for this remodel and expansion on January 3, 2007. The comments addressed the storm drainage and water quality issues of the site and are attached as Exhibit B.

Sherwood Engineering Department: The Engineering Department provided comments on July 21, 2008 which have been incorporated into this report and are also attached as Exhibit C. The Engineering Department also provided some general comments, which are provided below:

Grading and Erosion Control:

Retaining walls within public easements or the public right-of-way shall require engineering approval. Retaining walls with a height of 4 feet or higher located on private property will require a permit from the building department. City policy requires that prior to grading; a permit is obtained from the Building Department for all grading on the private portion of the site.

The Engineering Department requires a grading permit for all areas graded as part of the public improvements. The Engineering permit for grading of the public improvements is reviewed, approved and released as part of the public improvement plans.

Other Engineering Issues:

Public easements are required over all public utilities outside the public right-of-way. Easements dedicated to the City of Sherwood are exclusive easements unless otherwise authorized by the City Engineer.

An eight-foot wide public utility easement is required adjacent to the right-of-way of all street frontages. This easement is for the installation of franchise utilities such as power, communications, gas and/or other utilities deemed necessary by the City.

All existing and proposed utilities shall be placed underground.

At the City's discretion the applicant may be required to install infrastructure for Sherwood Broadband as noted in City Ordinances 2005-17 and 2005-74.

Obtain a right-of-way permit for any work required in the public right-of-way (reference City Ordinance 2006-20).

PGE, ODOT, Sherwood School District, BPA, Pride Disposal, Washington County, and NW Natural Gas were also provided copies of the proposal and site plan and given the opportunity to provide comments. As of this date, no comments have been provided from these agencies.

IV. SITE PLAN REVIEW – REQUIRED FINDINGS (SECTION 16.90.020.4)

A. The proposed development meets applicable zoning district standards and all provisions of Divisions V, VI, VIII and IX.

The relevant criteria are found in Divisions V, VI, VIII and IX. Compliance with these criteria is discussed in Section V – Applicable Code Provisions, below.

FINDING: Compliance with the relevant criteria in Divisions V, VI, VIII and IX are discussed and conditioned if needed in Section V below, therefore, this standard is satisfied.

- 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.**

This site is currently served by public utilities. The property is served by Pride Disposal for solid waste disposal. The nearest public parks are Veterans Memorial Park and Stella Olsen Park, which are adequately sized to serve any employees of this site. Public safety, electric power and communications are all currently serving this site and will continue to do so.

FINDING: As discussed above, this standard is satisfied.

- 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.**

No covenants, agreements or other documents are specifically required for on-site features. Verizon owns the facility and will be responsible for management and maintenance of structures, landscaping and other on-site features. At a recent site visit conducted on July 31, 2008, staff noted a significant amount of debris and litter surrounding the property. The landscaping did not look maintained and the site appeared neglected. The applicant needs to ensure that adequate maintenance of the landscaping is achieved with the improvements and future development to the site.

FINDING: The applicant has not met this standard, but will be conditioned to provide for an acceptable method of maintenance of the features and landscaping further within this report.

- 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 Divisions V and VIII of this Code.**

The Metro inventory of regionally significant habitat does not list any portion of this property as sensitive wildlife habitat. There are no significant trees or vegetation on this site that are not part of a pre-existing landscaped area, and no trees are proposed for removal. There are no wetlands, scenic views or topographical features on this site.

FINDING: Based on the discussion above, the proposed development fully complies with this standard.

- E. 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 16.108.080 Highway 99W Capacity Allocation Program, unless excluded herein.**

FINDING: This proposal is within the Old Town Overlay and is therefore exempt from this standard.

- F. For developments that are likely to generate more than 400 average daily trips (ADTs), or at the discretion of the City Engineer, the applicant shall provide adequate information, such as a traffic impact analysis or traffic counts, to demonstrate the level of impact to the surrounding street system. The developer shall be required to mitigate for impacts attributable to the project. The determination of impact or effect and the scope of the impact study shall be coordinated with the provider of the affected transportation facility.

The site will generate very few trips as there is no regular employees and no customers. The City Engineer has not required a traffic study.

FINDING: Due to the estimated daily trip rate, this standard is not applicable.

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

1. 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.

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

3. 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, metal roofs, and artificial stucco material 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.

4. As an alternative to the above standards G.1-3, the Old Town Design Standards (Section 16.162) may be applied to achieve this performance measure.

Because this structure is within the Old Town Overlay, the Old Town Design Standards are required to be utilized. Compliance with these standards is discussed further in this report in Section 16.162.

FINDING: This standard is discussed and conditioned where necessary under Section 16.162 below, in compliance with Subsection 4 of this standard.

V. APPLICABLE CODE PROVISIONS

The applicable zoning district standards are identified in Division II. The relevant criteria in Divisions II, V, VI, VIII and IX are discussed below.

A. Division II - Land Use and Development

The applicable zoning district standards identified in Division II are: 16.28 (Retail Commercial) and 16.58.030 (Fences).

16.28 – Retail Commercial (RC) Zoning District

Compliance with this section is discussed below:

Conditional Uses (16.28.030.E)

The following uses are permitted as conditional uses, provided such uses meet the applicable environmental performance standards contained in Division VIII, and are approved in accordance with Chapter 16.82.

E. Public and private utility buildings, including but not limited to telephone exchanges electric substations, gas regulator stations, sewage treatment plants, water wells, and public work yard.

FINDING: The applicant proposes to continue to use the site for the communication utility switching station. The buildings contain equipment to manage this utility. The applicant meets this criterion as a proposed modification to the conditional use.

Dimensional Standards (16.28.050)

Section 16.28.050 has the following dimensional standards for the RC zones

Lot area	5,000 sq ft (2,500 sq ft in Old Town, per §16.162.060.A)
Lot width at front property line	40 feet
Lot width at building line	40 feet
Front yard setback	None, per §16.162.060.B
Side yard setback	None, per §16.162.060.B
Rear yard setback	None, per §16.162.060.B
Height	40 feet, per §16.162.060.C

This site is comprised of two lots, each approximately 5,000 square feet, fifty by one hundred feet each. No setbacks are required per the Old Town Dimensional Standards in Section 16.162.060.B. However, all requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) must be met. The height of the building does not exceed 40 feet.

FINDING: Based on the discussion above, the proposal meets the dimensional standards of the Retail Commercial (RC) zone.

16.58.010- Clear Vision Areas

This Section provides requirements for maintaining clear vision areas at intersections of 2 streets, a street and a railroad or a street and an alley or private driveway. In commercial and industrial zones, the minimum distance shall be fifteen feet, or at intersections including an alley, ten feet, except that when the angle of intersection between streets, other than an alley, is less than thirty degrees, the distance shall be twenty five.

The applicant is proposing to use the existing drive onto the alley for the ingress and egress to the site. The clear vision standard of ten feet applies. The applicant has indicated the clear vision triangles on the site plan (A2.1) however; inspection after the landscaping is fully installed will be needed to ensure full compliance.

FINDING: Staff can not confirm this standard has been fully met until the final inspection of the site, but it is possible to demonstrate compliance with this standard if the applicant meets the condition below.

CONDITION: Prior to final inspection approval, submit plans for verification that the clear vision areas of the access drive onto the alley are in compliance with this Code Section.

16.58.030 - Fences, walls and hedges

Fences up to forty-two inches (42”) high are allowed in required front building setbacks. Fences up to six feet (6’) high are allowed in required side or rear building setbacks. Additionally, all fences shall be subject to the clear vision provisions of Section 16.58.010. Chain link fencing is not allowed along any residential street frontage.

FINDING: The applicant proposes to keep the hedge along a portion of the eastern boundary of the site, adjacent to the residential use. This standard has been met.

16.82 Conditional Use

3. Findings of Fact

No conditional use shall be granted unless each of the following is found:

A. All public facilities and services to the proposed use, including but not limited to sanitary sewers, water, transportation facilities, and services, storm drains, electrical distribution, park and open space and public safety are adequate; or that the construction of improvements needed to provide adequate services and facilities is guaranteed by binding agreement between the applicant and the City.

FINDING: This site is currently served by public utilities. The property is served by Pride Disposal for solid waste disposal. The nearest public parks are Veterans Memorial Park and Stella Olsen Park, which are adequately sized to serve any employees of this site. Public safety, electric power and communications are all currently serving this site and will continue to do so.

B. Proposed use conforms to other standards of the applicable zone and is compatible with abutting land uses in regard to noise generation and public safety.

The building will continue to be operated as a switching station and does not emit a discernable noise from the outside of the building. With respect to public safety, the fire department has endorsed the proposal (Exhibit D). However staff did have communication with a neighbor concerned about the decrease of the on-site parking lot and the possible use of the alleyway for parking of the Verizon vans

Staff is concerned that there will be a greater incidence of Verizon vehicles parking in the right of way at the northern property line and also within the right of way in the alley and block safe vehicle passage of the nearby residents causing hardship. However, Old Town standards do not have parking requirements. Several parking spots will remain on-site with the addition. If the applicant parks vehicles in the right of way, it will be a violation of the law and a code compliance issue.

FINDING: The continued use of the building as a utility switching station is compatible with the abutting land uses despite the concern about parking in the right of way. If the applicant uses the alley for parking it will be addressed through the code compliance process. This criterion is met.

C. The granting of the proposal will provide for a facility or use that meets the overall needs of the community and achievement of the goals and/or policies of the Comprehensive Plan, the adopted City of Sherwood Transportation System Plan and this Code.

FINDING: The use of the building is to provide telecommunication services to the community and this is an expansion of that use. There will be very little impact to the transportation system as the staffing of the site is minimal and the public does not frequent the building, thereby it will not detrimentally impact the community. This criterion is met.

D. Surrounding property will not be adversely affected by the use, or that the adverse effects of the use on the surrounding uses, the neighborhood, or the City as a whole are sufficiently mitigated by the conditions proposed.

The property has been owned by a utility company for over 85 years. The use as currently proposed, provides little noise, traffic or impact to the neighborhood as it is used for a switching station housing equipment for that use. The building is within the height parameters of the zone.

The applicant proposes to mitigate the utilitarian design of the existing building with improved streetscape and architectural details to the façade wall thereby improving the pedestrian scale and walkability of the streetscape.

FINDING: As discussed above, this criterion is met.

E. The impacts of the proposed use of the site can be accommodated considering size, shape, location, topography and natural features.

FINDING: The new addition will be on-site and be of the same use as already exists on the site. The impacts will be minimal as the building will be sited within the existing asphalted area keeping the existing driveway. The applicant has placed the addition within the interior of the site. This criterion is met

F. The use as proposed does not pose likely significant adverse impacts to sensitive wildlife species or the natural environment.

FINDING: The use is an expansion of an existing switch station for a utility. The new addition will be located on the existing site which had been asphalted. The increase in building size is not likely to pose significant adverse impacts to sensitive wildlife species or natural environment. This criterion is met.

G. For a proposed conditional use permit 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 16.108.080 Highway 99W Capacity Allocation Program, unless excluded herein.

FINDING: The location is within Old Town Overlay Zone and thus not required to satisfy the requirements of the 99W CAP. This criterion is not applicable.

B. Division V - Community Design

The applicable provision of Division V include: 16.90 (Site Planning- discussed previously in Section IV of this report), 16.92 (Landscaping), 16.94 (Off-Street Parking and Loading), 16.96

(On-site Circulation), and 16.98 (On-site Storage). Compliance with the standards in these sections is discussed below:

Landscaping Materials

16.92.020.1 Varieties - Required landscaped areas shall include an appropriate combination of 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 Section 16.92.020.

The applicant has proposed new landscaping along SW Pine Street and grass along the eastern boundary of the site. Grass is proposed to be used along the alley as well. The applicant has not verified the type of plants that will be used in the landscape plan, but has indicated that a variety of types of both evergreen and deciduous plantings will be used.

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

16.92.020.2 Establishment of Healthy Growth and Size - Required landscaping materials shall be established and maintained in a healthy condition and of a size sufficient to meet the intent of the approved landscaping plan. Specifications shall be submitted showing that adequate preparation of the topsoil and subsoil will be undertaken.

FINDING: The applicant has provided a preliminary landscape plan that indicates that all of the landscaped areas will be comprised of drought tolerant materials using an automatic irrigation system. The applicant has not submitted a landscape plan that illustrates the soil preparation for the plant materials. This criterion is not met but can be met with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit a landscape plan that demonstrates a planting preparation plan for the proposed landscape.

16.92.030 Landscaping Standards

16.92.030.1- Perimeter Screening and Buffering

A minimum six (6) 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 or industrial uses.

The applicant proposes keeping the existing hedge that extends partially along the eastern property line separating the site from the residential zone. The applicant has not proposed additional screening or fencing along this boundary.

FINDING: The applicant has not met this criterion, but can meet the criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit a site plan showing a minimum six foot high sight obscuring fence or evergreen screen separating the residential property to the east from the Verizon site along the entire boundary.

16.92.030.2 – Parking and Loading Areas:

Total Landscaped Area (16.92.030.2.A) – A minimum of ten percent (10%) of the lot area used for the display or parking of vehicles shall be landscaped in accordance

with this Chapter. In addition, all areas not covered by buildings, required parking, and/or circulation drives shall be landscaped with plants native to the Pacific Northwest in accordance with Section 16.92.

There is an un-striped parking area that will decrease in size with the new addition to the building. The applicant indicates that it is not really for parking, but for equipment storage. It appears that this "parking area" is approximately 150 square feet, requiring 15 feet of overall landscaping that is easily provided on site at the driveway landscape planter. The applicant has not provided a detailed planting list to determine whether the site will be landscaped with plants able to survive in the Pacific Northwest and generally described the plants as shrubs, vines or trees.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, the applicant has met this standard with respect to the correct amount of landscaping of the lot area; however the applicant has not met this criterion with respect to the type of plants described. The applicant could meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide a detailed landscape plan along with certification that the plants are native or are the most appropriate plants given the location and soils.

Adjacent to Public Rights-of-Way (16.92.030.2.B) - 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 16.58.030.

Perimeter Landscaping (16.92.030.2.C) - 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.

Interior Landscaping (16.92.030.2.D) - 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.

Landscaping at Points of Access (16.92.030.2.E) - When a private access way 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 16.58.010.

The applicant proposes landscaping to buffer the area between the private drive onto the site and the alley with low lying plants and grass. Additionally, the siting of the building on the north does not provide an adequate amount of room for any significant landscaping. The proposed façade wall will serve as adequate screening of the parking lot. The applicant has been conditioned earlier to provide additional screening for the residential property to the east.

FINDING: As discussed above, the applicant meets this criterion or has been conditioned to meet these criteria previously in this report.

16.92.030.3 - Visual Corridors

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 of the Community Development Plan, Part II, and the provisions of Section 16.142.

SW Pine Street is an arterial street and a visual corridor is generally required to be 15 feet for arterials. However, the site is within Old Town and the Old Town standards have been determined to supersede the visual corridor standards. Regardless, the site has a landscaped buffer of approximately 7 feet along SW Pine Street.

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

16.94.010 – General Off-street parking and loading

16.94.020.2. - Bicycle Parking Facilities

This section provides standards for bicycle parking facilities. The following standards must be addressed/met:

- 1. Bicycle parking shall be conveniently located with respect to both the street right-of-way and at least one building entrance (e.g., no farther away than the closest parking space). Bike parking may be located inside the main building or protected or otherwise covered near the main entrance. If the first two options are unavailable, a separate shelter provided on-site is appropriate as long as it is coordinated with other street furniture.**
- 2. Visibility and Security. Bicycle parking shall be visible to cyclists from street sidewalks or building entrances, so that it provides sufficient security from theft and damage; Bicycle parking requirements for long-term and employee parking can be met by providing a bicycle storage room, bicycle lockers, racks, or other secure storage space inside or outside of the building;**
- 3. Bicycle parking shall be least as well lit as vehicle parking for security.**
- 4. Areas set aside for bicycle parking shall be clearly marked and reserved for bicycle parking only.**
- 5. 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.**

FINDING: The applicant does not propose any bicycle parking. Typically, utility buildings require two bike spaces for every 40 parking spots. Although this is considered a utility building, it only has sporadic and limited staff contact. Also, there will not be any public visitors to the site necessitating bicycle parking, therefore this section is not applicable.

16.94.030– Off-Street Loading Standards

16.94.030.1 Minimum standards

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.

FINDING: Section 16.162.070.D.2 of the Code states that off-street loading is not required for properties within the “Smockville Area” of the Old Town Overlay. Therefore, this standard is not applicable.

16.94.030.2 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 16.94.020 shall not be used for loading and unloading operations.

As discussed above, off-street loading is not required. In addition, there are no off-street parking areas required to fulfill the requirements of Section 16.94.020 because this property is within the “Smockville Area” of the Old Town Overlay.

FINDING: Based on the analysis above, this standard is met.

16.96 On-Site Circulation

16.96.010 – On-site pedestrian and bicycle circulation

On-site facilities shall be provided that accommodate safe and convenient pedestrian access within new subdivisions, multi-family developments, planned unit developments, shopping centers and commercial districts, and connecting to adjacent residential areas and neighborhood activity centers within one half mile of the development. Neighborhood activity centers include but are not limited to existing or planned schools, parks, shopping areas, transit stops or employment centers. All new development, (except single family detached housing), shall provide a continuous system of private pathways/sidewalks.

This property is adjacent to two public streets (SW Pine Street and SW 3rd Street) and a public alley. Because there are no setbacks required in this zone in Old Town, the structure could be built from one side property line to the other. Since the site will not be accessible to the public and have a limited number of employees visiting intermittently, the pedestrian access is primarily through the use of the sidewalk along SW Pine Street.

FINDING: As discussed above, this standard has been met.

16.96.010.2 – 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: There is only one structure on this parcel and joint access is not proposed with any other parcels. This standard is not applicable.

16.96.010.3 Connection to Streets

A. Except for joint access as per Section 16.96.010.2, 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 existing site plan shows no existing private sidewalks. The interior of the site is asphalted from alley drive to the new doors. Since no public access is proposed and no entrance connects to a public street, this section is not applicable.

16.96.030 Minimum Non-Residential Standards

16.96.030.1.A – Commercial Driveways

Commercial driveways must be improved with a hard surface. The required minimum width for 1-49 parking spaces is 1 driveway of 24 feet or 2, one-way driveways of 15 feet each.

FINDING: There is an existing parking lot that currently is paved. The one way driveway is proposed to be 17 feet wide, meeting this standard.

16.96.030.2 Sidewalks and Curbs

A. Industrial and Commercial: 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 500 feet of the site, future phases of development, and whenever possible to parks and open spaces.

As discussed above, there are no existing sidewalks to the street as there is no public access, and limited and intermittent employee access. SW Pine Street is an improved street with sidewalks. The applicant proposes to improve the streetscape along SW Pine with this development extending along the full site frontage.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

B. Curbs shall also be required at a standard approved by the Hearing Authority. Private pathways/sidewalks shall be connected to public rights-of-way along driveways but may be allowed other than along driveways if approved by the Hearing Authority.

FINDING: There is no connection to the private entrances and the public street. Several of the entrances are interior to the site and within the asphalted area. Since there will be little human contact at the site, and pedestrians will not visit this site, this standard can be met with the existing asphalted area that connects to the alleyway.

C. Private Pathway/Sidewalk Design. Private pathway surfaces shall be concrete, asphalt, brick/masonry pavers, or other durable surface, at least 6 feet wide and conform to ADA standards. Where the system crosses a parking area, driveway or street, it shall be clearly marked with contrasting paving materials or raised crosswalk (hump). At a minimum all crosswalks shall include painted striping.

FINDING: The public sidewalk serves to connect the passerby through the site along SW Pine. Both the alley and SW 3rd Street are unimproved and therefore there are no existing sidewalks along this right of way. Since there will be little human contact at the site, and pedestrians will not visit this site, this standard can be met with the existing asphalted area that connects to the alleyway and nearby sidewalk on SW Pine. This criterion is met.

16.98.020 – Solid Waste and Recycling Storage

All uses shall provide solid waste and recycling storage receptacles which are adequately sized to accommodate all solid waste generated on site. All solid waste and recycling storage areas and receptacles shall be located out of public view. Solid waste and recycling receptacles for multi-family, commercial and industrial uses shall be screened by six (6) foot high sight-obscuring fence or masonry wall and shall be easily accessible to collection vehicles.

The applicant proposes using the current garbage/recycling service and storing the containers in the interior of the site. Pride Disposal has not reviewed the plans therefore staff cannot determine whether this standard is met. The area appears to be out of public view, but it is unknown whether the applicant proposes curbside collection or a truck entering the site. If the applicant chooses to upgrade to container service in the future or store the containers outside, screening will be required.

FINDING: This standard has not been met as Pride Disposal has not verified the proposed disposal method and if the location is acceptable. If the applicant chooses to upgrade to container service in the future or store the containers outside, screening will be necessary as conditioned below.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit verification from Pride Disposal that the location of the trash and recycling receptacles are designed to be serviced by the garbage trucks.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide a detailed description of the proposed disposal method and provide adequate screening as needed for the location.

16.98.030 – Material Storage

16.98.030.2 Standards

Except as per Section 16.98.040, all service, repair, storage, and merchandise display activities carried on in connection with any commercial or industrial activity, and not conducted within an enclosed building, shall be screened from the view of all adjacent properties and adjacent streets by a six (6) foot high, sight obscuring fence. In addition, unless adjacent parcels to the side and rear of the storage area have existing solid evergreen screening or sight-obscuring fencing in place, new evergreen screening no less than three (3) feet in height shall be planted along side and rear property lines. Where other provisions of this Code require evergreen screening, fencing, or a landscaped berm along side and rear property lines, the additional screening stipulated by this Section shall not be required.

Exterior material storage is not anticipated and has not typically been associated with this existing use. Any storage of materials will be required to meet the standards of Section 16.98.030.2.

FINDING: This standard is not applicable as materials storage is not proposed or anticipated with this application.

C. **Division VI - Public Improvements**

16.108– Streets

16.108.030 – Required Improvements

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.

This site is bordered on three sides by public right-of-way: on north is SW 3rd Street, on the west is SW Pine Street and to the south is a public alley.

SW 3rd Street: The northern property line of this site fronts right-of-way for SW 3rd Street. Currently this section of road exists as a gravel driveway providing access to a single family residence to the east and a commercial building to the north as well as Verizon on the south. Both Verizon and the commercial building tend to use this area for parking, while the residents to the east use the right-of-way as access to their property. Given these circumstances, and because this section of street is a dead end, staff does not anticipate the need for additional street improvements with the exception of undergrounding overhead utility lines. However, in the event that the City does make improvements to the street, the applicant should be required to sign an agreement not to remonstrate for their portion of the costs of those improvements should a local improvement district be formed.

Public Alley: The site's southern property line abuts the public alley, and the applicant proposes to maintain access to their site via the alley. The alley currently exists as a gravel road accessing the applicant's site and the rear yards of neighboring properties. Because the alley receives little use and because the applicant is actually reducing the number of parking spaces accessed via the alley, Staff does not anticipate the need for additional alley improvements, with the exception of undergrounding overhead utilities, as a result of this development.

SW Pine Street: Pine Street is classified as an arterial street in this area and serves as access to Old Town. A new overlay of asphalt was placed during the recent Downtown Streets Project. The existing sidewalk is in fair condition and the applicant proposes to create a pedestrian amenity area complete with additional hardscape and benches. Sheet A2.1 notes the benches for this area will match City Standards, most likely matching benches used in the Downtown Streets Project. With the minimal nature of the proposed improvements to the subject property, requiring additional improvements along Pine matching the Downtown Streets Master Plan would not be proportional to the size of the Applicant's improvements. Given this, and considering the street trees and pedestrian amenities proposed, staff does not recommend additional improvements for SW Pine Street with the exception of undergrounding the overhead utilities.

FINDING: As discussed above, this standard has been met or will be conditioned to meet this standard below.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit a signed non-remonstrance agreement to participate in future road improvements along SW 3rd should a local improvement district be formed.

16.108.070 – Highway 99W Capacity Allocation Program

All regulated activities shall acquire a Trip Allocation Certificate prior to approval of their base application. Lack of a Trip Allocation Certificate shall be the basis for denial of a base application.

Because this proposal is located within the Old Town Overlay, Section 16.90.020.E of the Code exempts it from compliance with the Highway 99W CAP.

FINDING: This standard is not applicable because of the location of the property in Old Town.

16.110 - Sanitary Sewers

Sanitary sewers shall be installed to serve all new developments and shall connect to existing sanitary sewer mains. Provided, however that when impractical to immediately connect to a trunk sewer system, the use of septic tanks may be approved, if sealed sewer laterals are installed for future connection and the temporary system meets all other applicable City, Clean Water Services and State sewage disposal standards.

The applicant's narrative does not propose any changes to the existing sanitary service. This approach is acceptable to the City of Sherwood's Engineering and Public Works Departments.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

16.112 - Water Supply

Water lines and fire hydrants conforming to City and Fire District standards shall be installed to serve all building sites in a proposed development in compliance with 16.112.

The City contracts with Tualatin Valley Water District (TVWD) for review and approval of engineering plans related to the water system. The applicant does not propose any change to the water system. The City is not aware of any existing problems related to the water system, but notes that TVWD will have the final say on any necessary improvements to this system.

FINDING: As discussed above, this standard has been met.

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 system consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The applicant's narrative notes that "the property has an existing storm water catch basin that it (sic) proposed to be moved to make way for proposed addition. We are

decreasing the amount of impermeable surface on site, so will improve runoff from the site. The nearest storm water line is on (SW) Second Street; one block to the south, so a direct connection to the storm water system is impractical and we feel the cost of connecting to the system would not be reasonable for such a small addition to an existing facility.”

The above statement regarding the nearest storm system on Second Street appears in conflict with sheet A1.1 of the applicant’s design. Sheet A1.1 shows an existing storm line in the Alley near the southeast corner of the site. While this design does not show the connection, a site visit confirmed the applicant’s existing catch basin, (see #18 on sheet A1.1), drains directly to this line.

If the applicant can relocate their onsite catch basin such that it does not affect the existing public storm system, (i.e. extend their onsite storm line to the relocated catch basin), then public improvements to the City’s storm system can be avoided.

FINDING: If the applicant proposes to alter the public storm system within the alley, then an engineering submittal or right-of-way permit will be required. Because the applicant’s development is reducing impervious area and because this reduction meets specific requirements listed in CWS standards, (see Table 4-1), the applicant is not required to provide additional storm water treatment. The applicant has met this criterion or may meet this criterion with the following condition

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of the building permit, receive approval from the engineering department for a right of way permit, including any necessary public storm water improvements.

16.116- 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.

The applicant has submitted fire flow calculations for the site and after review of the site plans Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue indicates sufficient flow to provide adequate fire protection and endorses the proposal.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

16.118 - Public and Private Utilities

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 feet in width unless a reduced width is specifically exempted by the City Engineer.

C. Where necessary, in the judgment of the City Manager or his designee, to provide for orderly development of adjacent properties, public and franchise utilities shall be extended through the site to the edge of adjacent property(ies).

- D. Franchise utility conduits shall be installed per the utility design and specification standards of the utility agency.
- E. Public Telecommunication conduits and appurtenances shall be installed per the City of Sherwood telecommunication design standards.
- F. Exceptions: Installation shall not be required if the development does not require any other street improvements. In those instances, the developer shall pay a fee in lieu that will finance installation when street or utility improvements in that location occur.

Public easements are required over all public utilities outside the public right-of-way. Easements dedicated to the City of Sherwood are exclusive easements unless otherwise authorized by the City Engineer. Typically, an 8-foot-wide public utility easement would be required along the SW Pine Street frontage. However, because this property is in Old Town, and the Old Town standards require buildings to be constructed at or near the front property line and alleys are provided which allow for utilities within them, the PUE standard has been determined to not be applicable in Old Town.

The Sherwood Broadband Manager had no comment.

FINDING: As discussed above the applicant has met this standard or will meet this standard with the following condition, if applicable.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of the building permit, obtain a right-of-way permit for any work required in the public right-of-way. (reference City Ordinance 2006-20).

16.118.030 – Underground facilities - Except as otherwise provided, all utility facilities, including but not limited to, electric power, telephone, natural gas, lighting, and cable television, shall be placed underground, unless specifically authorized for above ground installation, because the points of connection to existing utilities make underground installation impractical, or for other reasons deemed acceptable by the Commission.

The applicant's narrative is unclear regarding their intentions for the existing overhead wires. Page 6 of their narrative states "We are proposing to put the existing overhead power lines underground along Pine Street. The utility lines that run along the alley", (and here the sentence just ends).

FINDING: As discussed above, staff can not determine if this standard has been met, but the standard can be verified to be met with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to receiving engineering approval, submit plans that show the overhead utilities placed underground.

D. Division VIII - Environmental Resources

The applicant has received a CWS service provider letter indicating no floodplain or wetlands are located on the site, therefore the standards regulating floodplain and wetlands are not applicable to this project. The following sections in Division VIII are deemed applicable to this proposed development: 16.142 (Parks and Open Spaces). Compliance with the applicable standards is discussed below.

16.142 – Parks and Open Spaces

16.142.030 Visual Corridors

FINDING: As discussed above in Section 16.92.030.3, this standard is not applicable as SW Pine Street is within Old Town and the standard is superceded by the Old Town standards.

16.142.050 Trees Along Public Streets or on Other Public Property

Trees are required to be planted by the land use applicant a minimum of one (1) tree for every twenty-five (25) feet of public street frontage within any new development. Planting of such trees shall be a condition of development approval. The trees must be a minimum of two (2) inches DBH and minimum height of six (6) feet.

The frontage of this property along SW Pine Street is 100 feet, which requires four (4) street trees. There is an existing street tree located on the frontage adjacent to this property. The applicant proposes to add an additional three street trees along the frontage of SW Pine Street. The applicant has not indicated the type of tree proposed.

No trees are located on SW 3rd Street or proposed on the applicant's site plans. As SW 3rd is not to be improved at this time, street trees would not be required until the roadway would be developed. The applicant has been conditioned previously in this report to sign an agreement to not remonstrate against establishment of a local improvement district should the City determine that improvements are necessary.

FINDING: This standard is not met, but can be met with the following condition or has been addressed in this report.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit a copy of the landscape plan to the Planning Department for review and approval which include no less than 4 street trees on SW Pine (one existing and three additional) spaced approximately every 25 feet comprised of trees from Appendix J in the City of Sherwood Development Code.

16.142.060 - Trees on Property Subject to Certain Land Use Applications

All site developments subject to Section 5.202 shall be required to preserve trees or woodlands to the maximum extent feasible within the context of the proposed land use plan and relative to other policies and standards of the City Comprehensive Plan, as determined by the City. Trees removed on the property within one year prior to the submittal of the development application shall be subject to the requirements of this section.

The applicant is proposing removal of two trees on site and along SW Pine Street that are apparently in poor health and could be damaged during the undergrounding of the utilities proposed. The applicant proposes to retain one magnolia tree. The applicant did not submit an arborist report for staff to confirm the size of trees proposed for retention and removal or to confirm the health of the trees. The applicant is required to mitigate for the removal of any tree at a 1:1 ratio unless removal is necessitated by the installation of utilities, streets and other infrastructure. Diseased or dying trees are also exempt. However, this

information has not been verified by a certified arborist. The trees proposed to be retained on site must be protected during construction.

FINDING: Based on the analysis above, this standard is not met but can be met as conditioned below.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of grading or erosion control permits from the Building Department, submit an arborist's report of all trees on-site. Indicate the diameter at breast height (DBH) and condition of each tree. If the arborist report indicates that the trees proposed to be removed are diseased or dying, no mitigation will be required.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, pay the fee for the removal of the trees that are subject to mitigation at a 1:1 per caliper inches at \$ 75 per inch. Alternatively the applicant may plant the same caliper inches of trees to mitigate for the trees removed.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to issuance of building permits from the Building Department, install tree protection fencing surrounding the drip-line of the existing trees on the site that may be impacted by construction.

16.162 – Old Town Overlay District

16.162.030.G Permitted Uses

Uses permitted outright in the RC zone, Section 16.28.020; the HDR zone, Section 16.20.020; and the MDRL zone, Section 16.16.020; provided that uses permitted outright on any given property are limited to those permitted in the underlying zoning district, unless otherwise specified by this Section and Section 16.162.040.

FINDING: This standard is discussed and conditioned above under Section 16.16.020- RC zoning. This standard has been met.

16.162.070.A Community Design-Generally

In reviewing site plans, as required by Section 16.90, the City shall utilize the design standards of Section 9.202.08 for the “Old Cannery Area” and the “Smockville Design Standards” for all proposals in that portion of the Old Town District.

FINDING: This standard is met as the standards of Section 16.162.090.F “Old Town Smockville Design Standards” are applied further in this report.

16.162.070.G Community Design- Downtown Street Standards

All streets shall conform to the Downtown Street Standards in the City of Sherwood Transportation System Plan and Downtown Streetscape Master Plan, and as hereafter amended. Streetscape improvements shall conform to the Construction Standards and Specifications, and as hereafter amended.

FINDING: As discussed above under Division VI- Public Improvements, SW Pines Street was constructed as part of the Downtown Streetscapes Project in compliance with the Downtown Street Standards. This standard is met.

16.162.070.H Community Design-Color

The color of all exterior materials shall be earth tone. A color palette shall be submitted and reviewed as part of the land use application review process and approved by the hearing authority.

FINDING: The color palate the applicant submitted shows neutral earth tones for the building. This standard has been met.

16.162.090 Old Town Smockville Design Standards

C. REMODELING OF EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL STRUCTURES

Remodeling Standard 1: Original Elements

Elements that are original to a vintage, traditional or historic structure (defined in this standard as primary, secondary, or any structure 50 years or older that is eligible for landmark designation and professionally surveyed) are an important characteristic. These elements enhance appeal and retain the overall historic fabric of a neighborhood. In most cases, buildings with these original parts can and should be restored, first by restoring the original and, if that is not possible, replacing only those parts that are missing or badly damaged with in-kind material. With few exceptions, total replacements are unnecessary unless the original materials were not historically compatible or traditional at the time of construction. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation should be consulted in situations not covered by these standards. Where alterations to an exterior structure are proposed, they shall conform to the following:

a. Doors: The original door and opening shall be retained, unless beyond local repair. If a new door must be used the style should match the original whenever possible.

b. Windows: Original windows shall be retained and, if necessary, restored to working condition. If desired, they can be insulated using the energy conservation methods listed below. Original glass should be retained whenever possible. If all of the above is not possible, then the frame shall be retained and a true retrofit sash replacement shall be installed that matches the glass pattern of the original window.

c. Chimneys: Chimneys made of brick or stone shall be retained, and repaired using proper masonry techniques and compatible mortar that will not chemically react with the original masonry and cause further deterioration. If the chimney is no longer in use, the opening should be covered with a metal or concrete cap. If the chimney is to be used, but has been determined to be unsound, the chimney masonry should be retained, as above, and a new flue inserted into the opening.

d. Skylights: Skylights should be placed on the side of the structure not visible from the public right of way, and should be of a low profile type design.

e. Gutters: Original gutters should be retained, if possible. Half round gutters and round downspouts are highly desirable, and can be obtained from local manufacturers.

f. Architectural Elements: Window trim, corner board trim, sills, eave decorations, eave vents, porch posts, and other types of original architectural trim should be retained. If parts are missing, they should be replicated using the same dimensions and materials as the original. If only a portion is damaged, the portion itself should be repaired or replaced, rather than replacing the whole element.

g. Siding: Original siding should be maintained; first repairing damaged sections then, if that is not possible, replacing damaged or missing sections with in-kind matching material. In some cases, original siding may have been overlaid during a

later historic period with combed cedar siding, which is a historically appropriate material that may be retained if desired.

h. Weatherization & Energy Conservation: Modern energy conservation results can be obtained, by using traditional conservation methods. Attics and floors should be insulated to conserve heat loss in the winter and insulate against the heat in the summer. Windows and doors should be caulked around the inside trim, and copper leaf spring type weather stripping or similar installed to seal leaks. Storm windows (exterior or interior mounted) should be put up during the winter months to create insulation. Windows can be further insulated in winter using insulated-type curtains or honeycomb blinds; in summer, curtains or blinds reflect heat. Using deciduous trees and plants for additional sun protection.

The proposed façade wall and the addition to the building will be comprised of the same architectural elements that are on the existing building. The applicant proposes similar bricks and trim to match up with the existing structure. The façade wall will improve upon some of the uniformity and utilitarian nature of the original switching station by providing new architectural details and elements as described within this report.

FINDING: As discussed above, this standard has been met.

D. Remodeling Standard 2: Front Facing Presentation

Traditionally, the portions of a structure facing the public right of way were considered the most important for presenting an aesthetically pleasing appearance. Skylights were not used, and there was very little venting since the structures were not tightly enclosed and wrapped as they are today. Therefore, keeping all modern looking venting and utilities to the side that is not visible from the public right of way is important and greatly adds to the appearance.

a. Skylights: Skylights shall be placed on the side of the structure not visible from the public right-of-way, and shall be of a low profile design.

b. Roof vents: Roof vents should, wherever possible, be placed on the side of the structure least visible from the public right of way, and painted to blend with the color of the roofing material. Where possible, a continuous ridge vent is preferred over roof jacks for venting purposes. In the case of using a continuous ridge vent with a vintage structure, care should be taken in creating inconspicuous air returns in the eave of the building.

c. Plumbing vents: Vents should, wherever possible, be placed on the side of the structure least visible from the public right of way, and painted to blend with the color of the roofing material.

There are no skylights installed on the existing building or proposed by the applicant. Any roof vents are obscured by the parapet. There are a few vents on the building along SW Pine Street painted to match the color of the brick. This will also be minimized with the added landscaping proposed. The façade wall will provide screening for the addition to the mechanical room and changed from cinder block to brick.

FINDING: Because the applicant is not proposing any venting to be exposed to the front facing presentation this criterion is met.

E. COMMERCIAL STRUCTURES:

Commercial Standard 1: Volume & Mass

- a. **Orientation:** All buildings will be sited with the primary facade facing the public right-of-way. For corner buildings with a corner-facing entry, both street-facing elevations will be considered “facades” for purposes of this Standard.
- b. **Setback:** All buildings will be located directly upon the property line with zero setback from the public right-of-way. Portions of the facade, such as recessed entryways or similar features, are exempted from this Standard provided they total less than 50% of the total facade width.
- c. **Width:** Buildings shall extend from side lot line to side lot line to create a solid streetscape along the public right-of-way. An exception to this standard may be granted to provide for plazas, courtyards, dining areas, or pedestrian access. [See Standard 5, below, regarding vertical divisions).

The proposed façade wall located near SW Pine will serve two functions that meet the intent of this section. The wall will be situated to be near the sidewalk to create a sense of a solid streetscape. The landscaping and new street furniture will add details and activity to the utilitarian building. Because the building is not accessible to the public, it is not necessary to attract pedestrians off the street into the building as a typical commercial business.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

Commercial Standard 2: Openings

To maintain and insure a pedestrian-friendly scale within Sherwood’s traditional commercial core, storefronts and upper facades shall reflect the following:

- a. **Verticality:** All facade window openings shall maintain a generally vertical proportion (1.5:1 height/width ratio or greater, i.e. a 24” wide window must be a minimum 36” tall). An exception to this standard is allowed for large fixed storefront windows. Transom panels, spanning the entire storefront glazed area, are encouraged.
- b. **Transparency:** Ground floor storefronts should be predominately “transparent,” with a minimum of 75% glazed surface area, including entry doors.
- c. **Symmetry:** Openings should generally reflect the bi-lateral symmetry of the traditional commercial development pattern. Asymmetrical facades that result from corner or other non-central entryways, or that result from varied massed forms joined into a single use are excluded from this Standard.
- d. **Prohibited Opening Types:** To maintain the traditional commercial character of the core area, the following are prohibited:
 - 1. Sliding or “French” entry door sets on the Facade (such doors are permitted on side and rear elevations only).
 - 2. Roll-up garage doors (metal or wood), on the Facade (such doors are permitted on side and rear elevations only). Uses requiring large garage openings on the facade may use sliding or bi-fold doors, or metal with six over six windows. Wood and glass doors are encouraged.
 - 3. Reflective glazing, “mirror glass” and similar.
 - 4. Horizontal slider windows (i.e. vertically oriented slider windows).
 - 5. Arched or “fan light” type windows, except where inset into an articulated structural opening.

The existing building has very limited pedestrian scale as it is a solid walls with no variation of detail or windows. In order to improve upon that, the applicant proposes a façade wall with landscaping, and street furniture to give the site pedestrian friendly elements along SW Pine. Since no windows exist or are proposed on site, the applicant

shows “green screens” with openings above that serve to emulate the transparency intended with this section. The screens can support vine plantings adding to textural elements to the building.

FINDING: Based on the above discussion, this standard has been met.

Commercial Standard 3: Height

In order to increase opportunities to transit, reduce transportation impacts, and promote pedestrian activity, multiple story commercial or mixed-use construction is encouraged. All new commercial and mixed-use construction in the zone is subject to the following standards:

- a. **Maximum:** No building may be greater than 40 feet in overall height.
- b. **Minimum:** No single story building shall have a plate height of less than 16 feet high at the public right-of-way.
- c. **Variation:** Building height shall be differentiated a minimum of 6” from the average height of adjacent buildings to avoid a solid street wall of uniform height. An exception to this standard will be made for buildings that incorporate a projecting vertical division in the facade treatment that visually separates the facade from adjacent buildings, such as a column, pilaster or post.

The existing building is approximately 20’ 6” in height. There are no adjacent structures where the height must be varied.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

Commercial Standard 4: Horizontal Facade Rhythm

To maintain the rhythm of Sherwood’s traditional architecture, all new commercial construction shall respect the three-part “base-shaft-capital” facade system common to pre-WWII commercial designs.

- a. **Base:** Buildings shall provide a visually articulated foundation or “base” feature, at ground level, typically rising to the bottom of the sill height. A “base” may be created by detail or a change in material or form that differentiates the base from the upper portions of the facade. (i.e. a brick or tiled “base” on a concrete building, or a paneled wood base on a horizontal sided wood building) This standard may also be met by projecting elements or change in surface planes that employ a common b. material, i.e. a projecting brick sill and “apron” on a brick wall or a cast concrete shoulder that projects away from a concrete wall.
- c. **Stringcourse:** Prominent horizontal lines shall be maintained between all floor levels, visually dividing the facade into horizontal sections that reflect the interior levels. Such features may be projecting or incised bands of common materials (as in brick or concrete) or applied trim, as in a wooden “bellyband.”
- d. **Cornice Details:** All buildings shall have a “cap” element at the uppermost portion of the facade that visually terminates the main facade surface. Cornice details may be integrated into a stepped or decorative parapet or consist of an articulated line that projects from the main surface plane. Modest marker blocks stating building name and date of construction are strongly encouraged.

The proposed addition consists of a new structure approximately 1,550 feet in size and away from the public view. The new addition is quite similar to the existing building in color and materials. It will have the entrance near the alley where a maintenance staff person will intermittently check on the equipment switching station.

The applicant proposes within the public view on SW Pine a façade wall, approximately eight feet high. Green screens will be located along the frontage with metal accents. This wall is made of two toned red brick with opening-like windows approximately two thirds up from the base of the wall. Two “bands” with accent colored concrete will wrap around the wall on the bottom and near the top of the wall. The cornice details of the façade wall will have a cap element at the uppermost portion of the façade that visually terminates the main façade surface plane. This cornice detail is relatively modest in keeping with the Old Town Design standards.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

Commercial Standard 5: Vertical Facade Rhythm

Reflecting the narrow underlying land divisions common in Sherwood’s downtown and creating visual interest that enhances the pedestrian scale, commercial facades shall have strong and clearly articulated vertical elements.

- a. **Multiple Bays:** All storefronts shall be divided into vertical “bays” through the use of structural members such as columns, pilasters, and posts, or by the use of other surface detailing that divides large walls into narrower visual panels. No structure shall have a single “bay” larger than 30 feet, based upon the lot width of the “Original Smockville Plat” of the Town of Sherwood. Buildings occupying one or more original town lots (i.e., greater than 30 feet in width) shall be visually divided into multiple bays of 30’ or one-half the overall lot width, whichever is the lesser. For example, the facade of a 50-foot wide structure shall be visually divided into two 25’ wide bays. An 80’ foot structure may be divided into two 30’ bays and one 20’ bay or into four 20’ bays, either of which will meet this standard.
- b. **Edge Definition:** All storefronts shall use a pilaster, engaged column, or other structural or decorative vertical element at each side lot line, to create visual division from the adjacent structure. (See Standard 3(C), above, regarding the use of projecting elements) For structures that do not extend from sideline to sideline (as per Standard 1(C) above) the outermost building corner will be treated as the edge for compliance with this Standard.

The proposed façade “reads” as four vertical bays because of the screens and the window-like details along SW Pine Street This wall is close to the sidewalk and will provide pedestrian scale along this edge of the property

The existing north wall located along SW 3rd Street is also comprised of two different bricks with the aluminum framing trim. There is no other façade rhythm to this wall which exceeds thirty feet in length. As both vehicles and pedestrians enter Old Town , this wall is in full view from SW Sherwood Blvd; becoming highly visible and serving as a focal point. If constructed today, the window-less wall face would not meet the Old Town design standards. Adding similar details along this north face will enhance the vertical façade rhythm and contribute to the pedestrian scale.

FINDING: This standard is met with respect to the site as viewed from SW Pine Street. The applicant does not meet this standard with respect to SW 3rd Street. The applicant could meet this standard with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, submit elevation plans of the north façade of the building showing improved vertical façade rhythm similar in design to the façade wall on SW Pine Street.

Commercial Standard 6: Sense of Entry

All commercial buildings shall have a clearly defined “sense of entry,” with the primary public access serving as a focal point in the visual organization of the facade. This can be accomplished via structural articulation, such as in a recessed entry, or through the use of trim, materials, or other elements. A clear and defined sense of entry facilitates retail activity and adds significantly to the pedestrian interest of the street.

a. **Doors:** Primary commercial entrances shall be primarily “transparent with no less than 50% of the total surface consisting of glass.

b. **Integration:** Entryways shall be architecturally integrated into the vertical and horizontal rhythms of the facade.

c. **Depth:** Recessed porches shall be no less than three (3) feet in depth.

The existing building has two entrances, both of which are not open to the public. This site is not going to be visited by customers so the necessity for giving the building a sense of entry is not appropriate given the utility use rather than a commercial-type use envisioned with this section.

However, one doorway is located at a very visible corner in Sherwood, a three way stop for vehicles on SW Third and SW Sherwood to SW Pine Street. The entrance doorway located on SW 3rd Street is a windowless metal door with a three foot concrete step accessway to the graveled street with a metal bannister. The applicant will need to improve the elements of the doorway that adds to the pedestrian interest of the street at this location. The other doorway is located in the interior of the property near the parking area on the south side of the building and is not visible from any public view.

FINDING: This standard is not met. The applicant could meet this criterion with the following condition.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION: Prior to final site plan approval, provide a revised plan that shows greater architectural detail, for the sole purpose of visual interest along the street frontage for the doorway on SW 3rd Street. This can be accomplished through the use of trim, materials or other elements.

Commercial Standard 7: Roof Forms

Traditional commercial roof forms, including flat, single-slope, or bowstring and other trussed roofs, are all typical of downtown Sherwood. Other roof forms, particularly gables, were screened from the public right-of-way.

a. **Gable, hipped or similar residential style roof forms are prohibited for commercial buildings unless screened from the public right-of-way by a parapet or false front facade.**

b. **Mansard-type projecting roof elements, other than small, pent elements of 6/12 pitch or less that are incorporated into a cornice treatment, are prohibited for commercial buildings in the Old Town Area.**

FINDING: The existing and proposed roof is flat which is a traditional commercial roof form meeting this criterion.

Commercial Standard 8: Exterior Surface Materials

Exterior building materials shall be consistent with those traditionally used in commercial construction in Old Town Sherwood. These materials include but are not limited to:

- Horizontal wood siding, painted (concrete fiber cement siding, or manufactured wood-based materials are acceptable under this standard provided they present a smooth finished surface, not “rustic” wood grain pattern)
- True board and batten vertical wood siding, painted
- Brick: Traditional use of red brick laid in common bond is preferred. Rustic, split-faced or “Roman” brick may be appropriate for bulkheads or detail treatments but is prohibited as a primary building material. Highly decorative “washed”, glazed, or molded brick forms are prohibited.
- Stucco (for foundations and decorative panels only)
- Poured concrete (painted or unpainted)
- Concrete block: Split faced concrete block is appropriate for foundations, bulkhead, or detail treatments but is prohibited as a primary building material. Smooth-faced Concrete Masonry Units (CMU) is prohibited when visible from the public right-of-way.
- Ceramic tile, as a detail treatment, particularly for use in bulkhead or storefront areas.

Use of the following exterior materials are specifically prohibited within the zone:

- Stucco, as a primary wall surface
- Stucco-clad foam (EIFS) and similar foam-based systems
- Standing seam metal sheet goods for siding or visible roofing
- T-111 or similar 4' x 8' sheet materials and plywood
- Horizontal metal or vinyl siding
- Metal/Glass curtain wall construction
- Plastic (vacuum-formed or sheetgoods)
- Faux stone (slumpstone, fake marble, cultured stone) and all similar stone veneer surface treatments) with the exception of 10% of frontal area is allowed of a brick-type faux material
- Shingle siding, log construction, fake “rustic” wood, pecky cedar and similar products designed to create a “Frontier” era effect.

FINDING: The siding of this structure is red brick and therefore, this standard is met.

Commercial Standard 9: Awnings and Marquees

Awnings and marquees projecting from the facade over the public right-of-way are a traditional commercial element and enhance pedestrian interest and use by providing shelter. Such features are encouraged but are not required in the zone. Where awnings or marquees are an element in a proposal they shall conform to the following and are eligible to receive a five foot height bonus:

- a. Scale: Awnings and marquees shall be proportionate in size to the facade and shall not obscure architectural detail.
- b. Placement: Awnings should fit entirely within the window or door openings, retaining the vertical line of columns and wall surfaces. Storefront awnings may be full width, crossing interior posts, to a maximum of 25 feet, provided the edge-definition (See Standard 5(B), above) remains visible.
- c. Materials: Awnings
 1. Cotton, acrylic canvas, or canvas-like materials are required for use in the zone. The use of vinyl awnings is specifically prohibited.

2. Fixed metal awnings of corrugated metal are permitted provided the pitch is 5/12 or less.
3. Wood shingle awnings are permitted provided the pitch is 5/12 or less.
- d. Materials: Marquees
 1. Natural or painted metal surfaces over an internal structural framework are traditional marquee design and are preferred.
 2. Painted wood marquees are permitted.
 3. Plastic panels or any form of internally illuminated marquees are prohibited.
 4. Glass or transparent elements that reveal other light sources are prohibited.
- e. Shapes: Traditional single-slope awnings are preferred. "Bubble" or rounded shapes are specifically prohibited except when used with rounded structural openings of the facade wall such as arch-topped windows.
- f. Lighting: Internal awning lighting is prohibited.
- g. Signage: Signs or painted graphics are limited to the valance or "edge" of the awning or marquee only.
- h. Height Bonus: In addition to awnings or marquees, the overall design shall include at least one of the following amenities:
 - Public art installation subject to Cultural Arts Commission and City Council approval.
 - Additional public bike parking: 1 additional space per residential unit.
 - A courtyard or plaza facing the street open to the public subject to Commission approval.

FINDING: This development does not propose any awnings or marquees; however, as they are encouraged and not required, this standard is met.

Commercial Standard 10: Secondary Elevations

By nature, non-street or alley-facing elevations were less detailed than the primary facade. Rear and sidewall elevation should accordingly be significantly less detailed than storefronts and built of simple materials.

- a. Public Rear Entrance: When a rear or alley entry serves as the primary or secondary public entrance, modest detail or highlight should create a "sense of entry" as in Standard 6, above. Rear entrances, even when intended as the primary entrance to the use, should remain essentially functional in character, reinforcing the primacy of the street-facing elevation.
- b. Corner Entrances: When a storefront includes a corner entry, both adjacent facades facing the public right-of-ways shall be treated as the "facade" for purposes of these Standards. When a storefront has a visible sidewall elevation as the result of Standard 1(C), above, that elevation shall be treated as a facade in addition to the primary facade.

As discussed above, the site is situated at the corner of SW 3rd Street and SW Pine Street, albeit a undeveloped one. Regardless, the north facing wall serves as a highly visible focal point as vehicles enter Old Town via SW Sherwood Blvd. Applying similar treatment to this wall as proposed by the applicant

FINDING: This site does have secondary access to the alley; however, this is not considered a public entrance. Therefore, this standard does not apply.

Commercial Standard 11: Additions to Existing Buildings

Additions to existing commercial buildings in the Old Town Sherwood area are subject to the same standards as new construction, except as limited by the following:

- a. **Compatibility:** Additions to existing properties that are visible from the public right-of-way will continue the existing character of the resource or return to the documented original character in scale, design, and exterior materials. The creation of non-documented elements outside the traditional vernacular character such as towers, turrets, elaborate surface decoration and similar “earlying-up” is prohibited. [Earlying-up is defined as the process of creating a false and more elaborate history than is appropriate within an area’s traditional development pattern. In Sherwood “earlying-up” would include the use of elaborate architectural styles, materials, or construction forms only found in San Francisco, Portland, or other larger cities].
- b. **Attachment:** Additions should “read” as such, and be clearly differentiated from the historic portion of the structure and shall be offset or “stepped” back from the original volume a minimum of four (4) inches to document the sequence of construction. An exception to this standard is allowed for the reconstruction of previously existing-volumes that can be documented through physical or archival evidence.
- c. **Storefront volumes:** Additions that extend the storefront/facade of a structure, even when creating a joined internal space, shall be treated as a new and separate building facade for review under these Standards.
- d. **Non-Compatible Materials:** Repair of existing non-compatible materials is exempt from Standards 11(A). Rear-facing additions to existing buildings may continue the use of these materials so long as they are a continuation of the attached materials.
- e. **Rear Additions, Excluded:** Storage with no physical attachment to the existing volume or other functional additions of less than 1,000 square feet located to the rear of an existing volume, and not visible from the public right-of-way are excluded from compliance with these Standards. Such functional additions shall include covered porches, loading docks, and similar features provided they are not intended for public use or access.

The applicant’s narrative and submitted plans show that the addition to the existing structure will continue the character of the structure. The applicant does not propose any “earlying-up”. The elevation clearly shows the addition, as the new portion of the building, is set back approximately five (5) feet from the existing building. In this way, the addition “reads” as such and is differentiated from the existing structure.

FINDING: This standard has been met.

Commercial Standard 12: Front-Facing Presentation

Traditionally, the portions of a structure facing the public right of way were considered the most important for presenting an aesthetically pleasing appearance. Skylights were not used, and there was very little venting since the structures were not tightly enclosed and wrapped as they are today. Therefore, keeping all modern looking venting and utilities to the side that is not visible from the public right of way is important and greatly adds to the appearance.

- a. **Skylights:** Skylights shall be placed on the side of the structure not visible from the public right of way, and shall be of a low profile design.

b. Roof vents: Roof vents should, wherever possible, be placed on the side of the structure least visible from the public right of way, and painted to blend with the color of the roofing material. Where possible, a continuous ridge vent is preferred over roof jacks for venting purposes. In the case of using a continuous ridge vent with a vintage structure, care should be taken in creating inconspicuous air returns in the eave of the building.

c. Plumbing vents: Vents should, wherever possible, be placed on the side of the structure least visible from the public right of way, and painted to blend with the color of the roofing material.

FINDING: As discussed above, no skylights, roof vents or plumbing vents are proposed to be added with this expansion. This standard is met.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Based on a review of the applicable code provisions, agency comments and staff review, staff finds that the proposal does not fully comply with the applicable review criteria. However, the applicable criteria can be satisfied if specific conditions are met. Therefore, staff **RECOMMENDS APPROVAL with conditions** of **SP 08-10, CUP 08-01 (Verizon Building Addition)**. Recommended conditions are as follows:

VII. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

A. General Conditions:

The following applies throughout the development and occupancy of the site:

1. Compliance with the Condition of Approval is the responsibility of the developer.
2. This land use approval shall be limited to the submitted preliminary plans prepared by David Bissett Architecture, LLC dated May 16, 2008 and included as Exhibit A with this report, except as indicated in the following conditions of the Notice of Decision. Additional development or change of use may require a new development application and approval.
3. The developer is responsible for all costs associated with 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 Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code.
5. Unless specifically exempted in writing by the final decision, the development shall comply with all applicable City of Sherwood and other applicable agency codes and standards except as modified below:

B. Prior to issuance of grading or erosion control permits from the Building Department:

1. Submit an arborist's report of all trees on-site. Indicate the diameter at breast height (DBH) and condition of each tree. If the arborist report indicates that the trees proposed to be removed are diseased or dying, no mitigation will be required.

C. Prior to Final Site Plan Approval:

1. Submit a landscape plan that demonstrates a planting preparation plan for the proposed landscape.
2. Submit a site plan showing a minimum six foot high sight obscuring fence or evergreen screen separating the residential property to the east from the Verizon site along the entire boundary.
3. Provide a detailed landscape plan along with certification that the plants are native or are the most appropriate plants given the location and soils.
4. Submit verification from Pride Disposal that the location of the trash and recycling receptacles are designed to be serviced by the garbage trucks.
5. Provide a detailed description of the proposed disposal method and provide adequate screening as needed for the location.
6. Submit a copy of the landscape plan to the Planning Department for review and approval which include no less than 4 street trees on SW Pine (one existing and three additional) spaced approximately every 25 feet comprised of trees from Appendix J in the City of Sherwood Development Code.
7. Pay the fee for the removal of the trees that are subject to mitigation at a 1:1 per caliper inches at \$ 75 per inch. Alternatively the applicant may plant the same caliper inches of trees to mitigate for the trees removed.
8. Submit elevation plans of the north façade of the building showing improved vertical façade rhythm similar in design to the façade wall on SW Pine Street.
9. Provide a revised plan that shows greater architectural detail, for the sole purpose of visual interest along the street frontage for the doorway on SW 3rd Street. This can be accomplished through the use of trim, materials or other elements.
10. Submit plans for verification that the clear vision areas of the access drive onto the alley are in compliance with this Code Section.

D. Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit:

1. Install tree protection fencing surrounding the drip-line of the existing trees on the site that may be impacted by construction.
2. Obtain final site plan approval from the Planning Department.
3. Obtain a right-of-way permit for any work required in the public right-of-way, (reference City Ordinance 2006-20) including plans that show street trees, undergrounding of utilities, public storm water improvements and public utility easements.

E. Prior to Issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the site:

1. Request a final site inspection from the Planning Department.
2. Prior to final inspection approval, submit plans for verification that the clear vision areas of the access drive onto the alley are in compliance with this Code Section.

F. On-going Conditions:

1. An on-going condition of the approval is that the site be maintained in accordance with the approved site plan. In the event that landscaping is not maintained, in spite of the assurances provided, this would become a code compliance issue.
2. Planning must review and approve plans for additional screening and an enclosure structure prior to upgrading the solid waste/recycling service to commercial-grade.

VIII. EXHIBITS

- A. Applicant's submittal materials dated March 27, 2008
- B. Clean Water Services comments dated June 26, 2008
- C. City of Sherwood, Engineering comments and recommendations dated July 22, 2008
- D. Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue comments dated July 25, 2008

End of Report

Exhibit A

Applicant's submitted materials for SP 08-10/ CUP 08-01 are available for review in the planning department at City Hall, 22560 SW Pine Street.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 26, 2008

FROM: David Schweitzer, Clean Water Services

TO: Michelle Miller Associate Planner, City of Sherwood

SUBJECT: Review Comments – SP 08-10 Verizon Addition CUP 08-01.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- This Land Use Review by Clean Water Services (District) for the expansion of the Verizon Switching Utility Facility located at 2S1 32BA-01200 and -01300 does not constitute approval of storm or sanitary sewer compliance with the NPDES permit held by the District. The District, prior to issuance of any connection permit, must review and approve final construction plans.
- All provisions of the development submittal shall be in accordance with current Clean Water Services (CWS) Design and Construction Standards, presently Resolution and Order No. 07-20 (R&O 07-20) and all current Intergovernmental Agreements between the City and CWS.
- Final construction plans must be reviewed and approved by CWS for conformance with current Design and Construction Standards.
- A Stormwater Connection Permit Authorization shall be authorized by CWS prior to construction of sanitary sewer, storm and surface water systems, and final plat approval.
- All public storm and sanitary easements shall be shown on the final stamped and signed construction plans.

SANITARY SEWER

- As proposed the project does not appear to require additional sanitary service. If additional sanitary service is required, connection to the existing service, capacity permitting may be allowed.

Exhibit B

STORM DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY

- Storm flow treatment shall be provided for all retained and new impervious areas per Table 4.1 in R&O 07-20. Utilization of existing on site water quality treatment systems may be permitted, capacity allowing.
- Proprietary Treatment Systems may be utilized for private storm flow treatment systems – flows from one tax lot and no flows from the public right of way per R&O 07-20 chapter 4.05.8.
- A hydraulic and hydrological analysis of the existing storm conveyance system in accordance with current CWS Design and Construction Standards is required. A downstream conveyance analysis is required. The applicant is responsible for mitigating downstream storm conveyance if the existing system does not have the capacity to convey the runoff volume of a 25-year, 24-hour storm event. Public underground detention systems shall not be permitted.
- The engineer shall verify public storm sewer availability to adjacent properties and extend public storm sewer to provide service to adjacent properties in accordance with current CWS Design and Construction Standards.
- Final construction plans shall show all existing and proposed public and private storm conveyance and easements.

SENSITIVE AREA

- A Sensitive Areas Pre-Screening Site Assessment (SAPSSA) 08-001380 has been issued on May 19, 2008 for this project. Sensitive Areas do not exist on-site or within 200' of the project, and this document will serve as the Service Provider Letter for this project.

EROSION CONTROL

- Provide erosion control in accordance with current CWS Design and Construction Standards.

Engineering Land Use Application Comments



To: Michelle Miller, Associate Planner
From: Lee Harrington, Engineering Department
Project: Verizon Communication Facility Addition, (SP 08-10)
Date: July 21, 2008

I reviewed the information provided for the above-cited project and have the following comments. Generally, the project will need to meet the engineering and design standards of the City of Sherwood and Clean Water Services (CWS). Additional requirements are outlined below.

Sanitary Sewer

The Applicant's narrative notes the site has water, sanitary and storm systems already in place. (See page 3 of the Applicant's narrative under response to code section 16.90.020.4.B). Staff does not find a proposal for additional sanitary service and/or sanitary upgrades, and thus assumes changes to the public sanitary system are not a part of the Applicant's design.

Water

Page 6 of the Applicant's narrative notes "The property is served by an existing water supply. There is going to be no increase in capacity for the proposed addition", thus improvements to the public water system are not anticipated.

Storm Sewer

Page 6 of the Applicant's narrative notes "The property has an existing storm water catch basin that it (sic) proposed to be moved to make way for proposed addition. We are decreasing the amount of impermeable surface on site, so will improve runoff from the site. The nearest storm water line is on Second Street; one block to the south, so a direct connection to the storm water system is impractical and we feel the cost of connecting to the system would not be reasonable for such a small addition to an existing facility."

The above statement regarding the nearest storm system on Second Street appears in conflict with sheet A1.1 of the Applicant's design. Sheet A1.1 shows an existing storm line in the Alley near the southeast corner of the site. While this design does not show the connection, a site visit confirmed the Applicant's existing catch basin, (see #18 on sheet A1.1), drains directly to this line.

Project: Verizon Communication Facility Addition, (SP 08-10)
Date: July 21, 2008
Page: 2 of 4

If the Applicant can relocate their onsite catch basin such that it does not affect the existing public storm system, (i.e. extend their onsite storm line to the relocated catch basin), then public improvements to the City's storm system can be avoided. If the Applicant proposes to alter the public storm system within the Alley, then an engineering submittal and/or right-of-way permit will be required.

Because the Applicant's development is reducing impervious area and because this reduction meets specific requirements listed in CWS standards, (see Table 4-1), the Applicant is not required to provide additional storm water treatment.

Transportation

This site is bordered on three sides by public right-of-way. To the north is SW 3rd Street. To the west is SW Pine Street and to the south is a public Alley.

SW 3rd Street: The northern property line of this site fronts right-of-way for SW 3rd Street. Currently this section of road exists as a gravel driveway providing access to a single family residence to the east and a commercial building to the north as well as Verizon on the south. Both Verizon and the commercial building tend to use this area for parking, while the residence to the east uses the right-of-way as access to their property. Given these circumstances and because this section of street is a dead end, Staff does not anticipate the need for additional street improvements with the exception of undergrounding overhead utility lines.

Public Alley: The site's southern property line abuts the public Alley and the Applicant proposes to maintain access to their site via the Alley. The Alley currently exists as a gravel road accessing the Applicant's site and the backs of neighboring properties. Because the Alley receives little use and because the applicant is actually reducing the number of parking spaces accessed via the Alley, Staff does not anticipate the need for additional Alley improvements with the exception of undergrounding overhead utilities.

SW Pine Street: Pine Street is classified as an Arterial Street in this area and serves as access to Old Town. A new overlay of asphalt was placed during the recent Downtown Streets Project. The existing sidewalk is in fair condition and the Applicant proposes to create a pedestrian amenity area complete with additional hardscape and benches. Sheet A2.1 notes the benches for this area will match City Standards, most likely matching benches used in the Downtown Streets Project. With the minimal nature of the proposed improvements to the subject property, requiring additional improvements along Pine matching the Downtown Streets Master Plan would not be proportional to the size of the Applicant's improvements. Given this scenario, and considering the street trees and pedestrian amenities proposed, Staff does not anticipate the need for additional improvements for SW Pine Street with the exception of undergrounding the overhead utilities.

Grading and Erosion Control:

City policy requires that prior to grading, a permit is obtained from the Building Department for all grading on the private portion of the site.

The Engineering Department requires a grading permit for all areas graded as part of the public improvements. The Engineering permit for grading of the public improvements is reviewed, approved and released as part of the public improvement plans.

Other Engineering Issues:

Public easements are required over all public utilities outside the public right-of-way. Easements dedicated to the City of Sherwood are exclusive easements unless otherwise authorized by the City Engineer.

An eight-foot wide public utility easement is required adjacent to the right-of-way of all street frontage. (Reference code 16.118.020.B). Planning policy may allow waiver of this requirement in Old Town if alleys are considered adequate for the proposed utilities.

All existing and proposed utilities shall be placed underground. In this case the Applicant's narrative is unclear regarding their intentions for the existing overhead wires. Page 6 of their narrative states "We are proposing to put the existing overhead power lines underground along Pine Street. The utility lines that run along the alley", (and here the sentence just ends). Staff recommends as a condition of this land use action that all existing overhead utilities be placed underground.

Obtain a right-of-way permit for any work required in the public right-of-way, (reference City Ordinance 2006-20).

All public easements must be submitted to the City for review, signed by the City and Applicant, recorded by the Applicant with the original recorded easements on file at the City prior to final occupancy of the building.

Miscellaneous:

At the City's discretion Applicant may be required to install infrastructure for Sherwood Broadband as noted in City Ordinances 2005-17 and 2005-74.

Recommended Conditions of Approval:

Prior to the release of building permits:

Submit to and receive approval from the Engineering Department for a right-of-way permit containing the following:

- Any proposed public storm water improvements.
- If required, a design for Sherwood Broadband, (reference City Ordinance 2006-20).
- All existing and proposed utilities placed underground.

Project: Verizon Communication Facility Addition, (SP 08-10)
Date: July 21, 2008
Page: 4 of 4

- Street trees as required by the Planning Department.
- An 8' wide public utility easement adjacent to all right-of-way, (unless waived by the Planning Department).

Prior to the release of the engineering right-of-way permit:

- Submit to the City for review and signing, any necessary public utility easements, (or receive a waiver from the Planning Department).

Prior to final occupancy of the buildings:

- Sign, record and return the original recorded documents to the City for all necessary public utility easements.
- Receive approval from the Engineering Department for all public improvements.

Thank-you for the opportunity to comment. Please let me know if you have questions.



TUALATIN VALLEY FIRE & RESCUE - SOUTH DIVISION
COMMUNITY SERVICES • OPERATIONS • FIRE PREVENTION

July 25, 2008

Lee Harrington
Sr. Project Manager
City of Sherwood
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140

Re: SP 08 – 10 Verizon Addition

Dear Mr. Harrington;

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed site plan surrounding the above named development project. Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue endorses this proposal.

Please contact me at (503) 612-7012 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Karen Mohling

Karen Mohling
Deputy Fire Marshal

Exhibit D

Date: 8-12-08

Agenda item: NEW BUSINESS SPOB-10

Other: \$ CUP 08-01 VERIZON ADDITION

I have read & understand Rules for Mtgs, Resolution 98-743

Applicant: Proponent: Opponent:

Name: DAVID BISSETT, ARCHITECT

Address: 208 SW FIRST AVE. #300

City/State/Zip: PORTLAND, OR. 97204

Phone: 503-226-6785

I represent: Myself

Other

APPROVED MINUTES

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Minutes
August 12, 2008

Commission Members Present:

Chair Allen
Jean Lafayette
Matt Nolan
Raina Volkmer
Lisa Walker
Todd Skelton

Council Liaison – Not Present

Staff:

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

Commission Members Absent:

Commissioner Emery

City Attorney – Not Present

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Chair Allen opened the meeting at 7:05. Karen Brown called roll. Commissioner Emery was not present.
2. **Agenda Review** – Chair Allen reviewed the agenda.
3. **Consent Agenda** – Minutes reviewed from June 10th, June 24th and July 22nd meetings. Commissioner Lafayette had scrivener items but nothing that would change the intent of the minutes. She made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Nolan. All were in favor, motion carried.
4. **Staff Announcements** – Julia had been asked at a previous Planning Commission meeting about the timing for the improvements on Division Street related to the water reservoir project. She spoke with the Public Works Director and he indicated that those improvements would be one of the later phases of the project and that he expects those to begin next spring.

Her second announcement was that at the last City Council meeting they initiated an amendment to the PUD section of the code. The purpose of the change is to allow PUD's to occur for things that do not involve a natural resource. Basically to allow PUD's to be applied for even if there is not a wetland or flood plain on the site. Julia indicated that this will be brought before the Commission in the near future.

5. **City Council Comments** – None given
6. **Community Comments** – None given
7. **Old business** –

Brookman Addition Concept Plan – PA 08-01

Chair Allen re-opened the Brookman Road concept plan hearing that had been continued from the last meeting. He asked for any new exparte' contact. He disclosed again that he lives in the Arbor Lane subdivision and could be impacted by decisions made.

Commissioner Volkmer also disclosed being a resident of Arbor Lane and living on Red Fern Drive.

Julia referred to the discussion in the prior work session regarding the I-5/99 connector held that evening. She would like to propose that the commission take a couple weeks and assimilate the information given and then in the next meeting on August 26th discuss what that information means to the Commission.

She indicated that she had prepared a memo for the Parks Board meeting last week to outline for them some of the issues raised by the Commission and to present the updated hybrid plan. After discussion, Julia noted that the memo was indicated to introduce the hybrid option and Commission questions with the intent to discuss the issues with the Parks Board at their meeting on September 8th

There was further discussion of whether any members of the Planning Commission should attend the Parks Board meeting. Chair Allen indicated it was his feeling that no one needed to attend, as they (the Planning Commission) have not come to a decision that they would want to represent.

Commissioner Lafayette noted that she hopes that emphasis is made that this is a good opportunity to make significant changes early in the process.

In discussion other comments on the concept plan, Chair Allen indicated that he is very interested in seeing what it would take to push the envelope on the "job generating" land element of the plan. He questioned if there is any information the Planning Commission could get that could help them understand the impacts of more job generating land and to help them lay a better foundation in the record for that. He would like to see if there is information that could be considered that allows a land use that goes even further than what they've been looking at so far. He would like to be able to discuss this further at the next meeting. He noted that in a previous meeting there was a discussion about what the projections say for the area. He feels that projections are basically good if what you're projecting looks very similar to something done in the past. What he would like to do moving forward is to see what it would take to change the paradigm in that area considering what the community and the "world" will look like in terms of energy availability and those types of things in the future. He would like to discuss this in future meetings prior to taking any final action.

Julia agreed to discuss this in the future but questioned how this can be shown in a supportable context and substantiate where the ideas are coming from. After discussions between Julia and Chair Allen, it was agreed that they would meet to discuss how best to address his questions.

Commissioner Lafayette moved to continue the Brookman Road Concept Plan to August 26th. Commission Nolan 2nd the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

8. **New business –**

Site plan SP 08-10/CUP 08-01 Verizon addition.

Michelle Miller presented the staff report. The application is for land use modification of a Conditional Use permit to renovate the Verizon Switching Station located at 22312 SW Pine Street. She noted that this is a unique building here in old town as there are no regular employees or visitors to the building. It is used as a utility switching station to house the mechanical equipment used by Verizon. The current building is approximately 3600 sq. ft. Verizon is proposing to add 1500 sq. ft., mostly within the existing parking area of the site. To comply with the Old Town Overlay the applicant is proposing some façade and landscaping improvements as well. She indicated that Staff is recommending approval with the conditions outlined in the staff report. Michelle noted that the main issue Planning Staff would like to see addressed is the North façade of the building and pointed to page 25 of the staff report referencing the Commercial Standard #5 Vertical Façade Rhythm. She stated that when entering Old Town Sherwood from South Sherwood Blvd. the North façade of the existing Verizon building is exposed in its entirety. This elevation does not match any of the Old Town Design Standards so Staff is requesting that the improvements being made to the Southwest Pine Street side of the building are mirrored on the North side. She indicated that some examples of improvements include screening or landscaping that would follow the Commercial Design Standards of the Vertical Façade Rhythm.

Commissioners Lafayette and Walker were trying to understand the area being proposed for improvements. Michelle clarified that the site has been improved with the exception of some minor landscaping and the proposed expansion to the South of the building into their existing parking area. To people traveling past the building the addition will not be visible, however the North side of the building is quite visible to people entering Old Town.

David Bisette from David Bisette Architecture, LLC addressed the Commission on behalf of Verizon. He began with commending staff, particularly Michelle and her working relationship with the applicants to find a resolution to updating this building. He confirmed that Verizon uses this building as a switching station and needs to provide a larger area for their equipment. On a very minimal basis, employees enter the site to check on and perform maintenance to the equipment; however there is no full time staff on site. For Verizon the improvements to this building are purely a utilitarian item and would prefer not to have any conditions applied. However, he indicated that he has explained to his client and helped them understand that due to the very visible location in an “Old Town” setting, appearance is an issue. Mr. Bisette indicated that the conditions are understandable however there are two conditions; C-8 and C-9 that they are not fully in agreement with. Those conditions address the North side façade. They have tried to work with staff to present a very clean application and not have a lot of issues to try to work out between Verizon, the Planning Commission and Staff. He is requesting approval of all of the conditions with some possible changes to the language regarding conditions C-8 & C-9. From their point of view, they are looking at the North side of the site as an existing condition as there is no work proposed in that area. He is suggesting adding wording that would say they will extend the landscaping to the North side. On the Pine Street side they are using screening and landscaping to create a false façade to screen the parking lot and the new addition. They are creating a colonnade and openings using a “green screen”. The green screen is a dark bronze anodized metal grid which is

used for a base for climbing landscaping to soften the look of the façade. He would like to recommend changing C-8 and C-9 to say they will add “green screen” panels and landscaping on the North side facade.

Commissioner Lafayette, Chair Allan and Mr. Bisette spent some time discussing which elevation is actually being addressed.

Chair Allen asked if David was familiar with the Old Town Façade Improvement Grant Program. He was not. Chair Allen suggested having Tom Nelson, the City’s Economic Development Manager address the Commission and Mr. Bisette about that as an option for this site prior to the close of the hearing.

Chair Allen asked for anyone testifying in opposition to the project.

Mr. Willie Plants, 15921 Second Street addressed the Commission. He testified that he lives directly behind the Verizon Building. His concern is that the addition will be taking away parking space for Verizon vehicles, and so vehicles will be using the alley for parking, blocking his access down the alley.

Chair Allen explained that he doesn’t see that the alley would be blocked, but that he will ask the applicant for clarification when he returns to speak.

Mr. Plant agreed.

As there were no other people signed up to speak, Chair Allen the invited Tom Nelson to address the commission about the façade grant.

Mr. Nelson Economic Development Manager, explained the process and applicability for this site to apply for a façade grant. He indicate that project costs will be matched up to \$15,000 per street façade and that funding has been set aside and currently they have budgeted another \$150,000 for this budget year.

David Bisette returned to answer questions brought up in the public testimony. Chair Allen asked that he address the parking question as well as the façade grant information.

David Bisette confirmed that Verizon will not be blocking in any way the access to the alley or to the existing driveway. Rather, they would use a portion of the existing parking for the addition to the building while still maintaining adequate parking for the limited traffic visiting the site. Regarding the grant application he will certainly propose the idea and information to Verizon.

Commissioner Walker asked staff about the page 7 of the staff report where the parking issues were discussed. She believes that leaving the parking issues up to Code Compliance would not be the best way to proceed. She asked how many parking spaces would be left after the addition.

Mr. Bisette explained that there will still be 2 to 3 spaces remaining, and that the people that visit the building are only there a few hours and will be able to park in the area marked as proposed concrete curb as well.

Commissioner Walker asked about 3 existing street trees and whether there will be screening in front of those trees.

Mr. Bisette replied that they will actually be landscaping on the street side edge and the wall façade and behind it as well, all intended to help buffer the parking and equipment, until the landscape matures.

Regarding the issue of the parking concerns raised and the findings in the staff report, Commissioner Lafayette noted that the finding might be better stated by saying that there are no parking standards within Old Town and so the applicant is not required to provide parking. If the neighbors do have an ongoing concern about the alley being blocked they do have a way to communicate that concern by contacting the City, the Code Compliance Officer or the Police Department.

Chair Allen brought up the question of what alleys are actually for. Isn't the whole purpose for an alley is for short term drop off and loading unloading?

Julia commented that that is actually an issue that is in the process of being discussed with the City Council at this time. Planning Staff did a presentation for the Council about a month ago where all the alleys were inventoried and conditions identified. They will go back to Council soon to continue the discussion.

Commissioner Nolan asked if it would be possible to ask the applicant to install no parking signs in the alley. A conversation ensued between commissioners about what the actual purpose of an alley should be.

Commissioner Lafayette asked Mr. Bisette if he was in agreement with the Commission's interpretation of the code regarding conditions C-8 & C-9 (that the green screen as proposed meets the conditions, but the conditions do not need to be reworded).

Mr. Bisette agreed.

Chair Allen summarized by saying he likes what they are doing and the new items proposed are nice. Partnering up with the grant program is a great way to go.

Commissioner Lafayette made a motion to approve SP 08-10/CUP 08-01 Verizon Addition based on the adoption of the staff report, finding of fact, public testimony, staff recommendation, agency comments, applicant comments and conditions as revised. Commissioner Nolan seconded motion. All members were in favor, none opposed, motion carried.

9. Commission Comments - None

10. Next Meeting: August 26, 2008

Chair Allen closed the meeting at 8:05.

End of minutes.