



**City of Sherwood  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Sherwood City Hall & Public Library  
22560 SW Pine Street  
February 14, 2006  
Regular Meeting - 7:00 PM**

**A G E N D A**

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. Agenda Review**
- 3. Consent Agenda: Minutes - January 10, 2006**
- 4. Brief Announcements**
- 5. Community Comments (*The public may provide comments on any non-agenda item*)**
- 6. Old Business:**

**Area 59 Concept Plan**

The Planning Commission will continue a review of a concept plan for a new 85 acre neighborhood. The Commission will consider a revised concept plan.

*(Kevin A. Cronin, Planning Supervisor, Planning Department)*

- 7. New Business:**

**CUP 05-04/SP 05-16/AV 05-02 – American Legion Parking Lot Addition:** The applicant is requesting approval of a conditional use permit, site plan review and administrative variance to expand the existing American Legion Post site by demolishing a single family home on one of the two contiguous tax lots owned by the Legion and adding a surface parking lot. The administrative variance requested is for a reduction of the width of the perimeter landscaping buffer. This land use application was originally reviewed as a Type III process with a public hearing before the Hearings Officer. The Sherwood Hearings Officer found that the parking lot constitutes a “new structure in Old Town” and therefore requires a Type IV review. The site is located at 15914 SW First Street (formerly 185 NE First Street) and is identified by Washington County Tax Map 2S132BA, Tax Lot 3100.

- 8. Comments from Commission**
- 9. Next Meeting: February 28 – SE Sherwood Master Plan Report & Chapter 9 – Historic Resources**
- 10. Adjournment**

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**January 10, 2006**

---

**Commission Members Present:**

Chair Adrian Emery  
Vice Chair Patrick Allen  
Dan Balza  
Matt Nolan  
Todd Skelton  
Russell Griffin

**Staff:**

Kevin Cronin, Planning Supervisor  
Julia Hajduk, Senior Planner  
Cynthia Butler, Administrative Assistant  
Gene Thomas, P.E. – City Engineer  
Rob Dixon, P.E. – Community Dev. Director

**Commission Members Absent:**

Jean Lafayette

**Guest Speakers:**

Steven Oulman, AICP – DLCD  
Constance Beaumont - DLCD

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Chair Adrian Emery called the meeting to order at 7 PM. It was noted that Commissioner Lafayette was out of town and unable to attend.
2. **Agenda Review**
3. **Consent Agenda** – Minutes: Patrick Allen presented a motion to approve the November 22<sup>nd</sup> minutes, Matt Nolan seconded. Vote was taken: Yes – 6 No – 0 , motion carried. Patrick Allen presented a motion to approve the December 13, 2005 minutes, Matt Nolan seconded. Vote was taken: Yes – 5 No – 0 Abstain – 1, motion carried. Chair Emery stated that he abstained from the 12/13/05 minutes as he was absent for the session.
4. **Brief Announcements** – Kevin Cronin said that the Economic Development Grant (EOG) was approved and that a Request for Proposal (RFP) is currently being advertised to be received by January 27, 2006. Kevin said that SURPAC will review prior to coming back to the Planning Commission. Kevin said that the final scope of work on Goal 5 is in the last phase that will provide each jurisdiction with the necessary line items and budget information needed to implement the Goal 5 program. Kevin said that Senior Planner, Julia Hajduk, is the contact person for Goal 5 issues. Julia stated that she will be preparing a memo to update the Commission on the proposal in upcoming weeks. Kevin said that in his absence at the December 13, 2005 meeting regarding Chapter 9 – Historic Resources, he reviewed the minutes and is up to date on events. Kevin stated that he is waiting to receive additional comments from Commissioner Lafayette, and will also get the City Attorney’s review completed prior to the February 28<sup>th</sup> session.
5. **Community Comments** (not on the agenda) – None.
6. **General Information:** **2005 Annual Report – Planning Department** – Kevin said that the 2005 Annual Report is provided for Commissioners for informational purposes only and the information will also be posted to the Planning Department website.

**Legal Issues Workshop – Planning Department – Kevin**

said that the material provided to the Commission was for informational purposes only and if the Commission had any questions he would be happy to answer them.

**7. SE Sherwood Master Plan Update** – Kevin said that Staff was meeting with area property owners on Friday, January 13<sup>th</sup> to receive an additional alternative at property owner's request. Kevin stated that the final public workshop for the project will be held Wednesday, January 18<sup>th</sup> at the new City Hall and Library on Pine St. at 7 PM. Kevin said that Vice Chair Allen and Commissioner Nolan have indicated that they will also attend to help answer questions. Kevin stated that OTAK will again facilitate the open house. Kevin said attendance at the last open house for the project was about 40. Kevin will provide a presentation possibly the end of February.

**8. New Business:**

**A. The Oregon School Citing Handbook – Total Growth Management (TGM) Program Presentation** by Steven Oulman, AICP, and Constance Beaumont from the Department of Land Conservation & Development (DLCD). A 25-minute PowerPoint presentation was given by representatives of DLCD. A copy of presentation slides was submitted as part of the record. The presentation information is designed to help cities and school districts site new educational facilities, and was presented as an information only item for the Planning Commission prior to the discussion and recommendation of the Area 59 project.

**B. Area 59 Concept Plan** – The Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) for Area 59 met six times since December 2004 to develop a concept plan for a new 85 acre neighborhood, including an elementary and middle school. In addition to the CAC recommendations, Kevin presented his Staff Report and recommendation.

Kevin Cronin stated that prior to beginning the Area 59 reports, he would like to present Certificates of Appreciation to members of the CAC for their diligent work and commitment to the project. Six of the Nine members were present to receive them.

Kevin recapped the process to date and stated that the CAC concluded the final meeting on December 1<sup>st</sup> prior to making their recommendation to the Planning Commission, which is the Modified A/G Alternative. Kevin stated that the Modified A/G Alternative is a hybrid representation of the original A/G Alternative from the charrette and some aspects of the School District's proposal, which was presented by John Rankin on behalf of some of the property owners initially at the October 27, 2005 CAC meeting.

Kevin Cronin stated that Staff recommends Alternative A/G with conditions. Kevin said that Alternative A/G came out of the charrette and is essentially a hybrid of alternatives presented at the charrette. Kevin said that he is recommending that the Planning Commission accept this alternative with direction for Staff to work with the consultant on a revised version of Alternative A/G based on the conditions adopted by the Commission. Kevin stated that he would spend a few minutes to highlight the base map posted on the wall with color designations to identify Staff's proposed locations of school sites, housing, and park space.

John Rankin asked if he could provide his comments while Kevin was working on the map. Commissioners consulted Kevin and all agreed.

John Rankin referred to the Modified A/G Alternative that he presented on behalf of some of the property owners at the CAC meetings on October 27<sup>th</sup> and December 1<sup>st</sup>. John provided preliminary map handouts dated 1-8-06 for the record, and stated changes made to the Modified A/G Alternative since the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting included; added alleys, removal of 2 cul-de-sacs, park space widened, and increased density for housing. John stated that these items reflect more of City Staff's recommendations. John also stated that it was his understanding that the Parks Board preferred to drop the active park.

Kevin Cronin disagreed, and stated that the Parks Board wants and needs an active park.

Chair Emery asked if there were other comments while Kevin was completing a portion of his presentation. The School District asked if they could provide comments.

Mark Christie, School Board President thanked all of the participants in the process and said that the result will be a positive development that will be good for the community. Mark recapped that the Sherwood School District is a fast growing district, with recent demographics that show growth in the 6 percent range over the next year. Mark said this growth has been consistent over the past years as well, and the schools are either at or near capacity. Mark reiterated that the primary purpose for Metro designating Area 59 into the Urban Growth Boundary was specifically to site schools. Mark said that the School Board voted unanimously to put a General Obligation Bond on the November 2008 ballot. Mark said that the School District plans to remodel the high school to accommodate a capacity of approximately 1,600 students, and build a middle school with capacity of approximately 900 students, and an elementary school with capacity of approximately 600 students on the Area 59 site. Mark said that demographers have calculated at the current growth rate that capacity for all of the schools could be reached again in 2014 or 2015.

Dan Jamison stated that the School District met with John Ranking and some of the affected property owners on December 30, 2005. Dan said that they discussed the School District's Alternative G-5 and the Modified Alternative A/G. Dan stated that the School District could support the Modified A/G Alternative if they could work through some considerations on the Citing of the schools. Dan listed the highlights of key considerations; 1) minimum 29 acres, 2) wetlands later delineated that may encroach on the 29 acres, a commensurate amount of land would be provided to the School District either to the north or west, 3) timeline issues are tight for a bond measure and design needs, and the School District requested permission from property owners to access property for initial surveying if necessary, 4) the district would like to move the overall layout or footprint of Area 59 slightly to the west or to the north. Dan said that this would lessen the impact of the total number of properties in the project. Dan said that City Staff's recommendation does provide 29 acres and added the park area adjacent to the school sites. Dan said that the major components of City Staff's plan appear to be similar. Dan said they have one new line item tonight in regard to the Fillmore property that is included within both the A/G Alternative and the Modified A/G Alternative. Dan stated that tonight was the first time they have heard about the inclusion of the Fillmore property in either of the alternatives, and that the School District remains committed to not displace any resident from their homes. Dan said the School District could work and support both the A/G Alternative and the Modified A/G Alternative, except for the inclusion of the Fillmore property.

Patrick Allen asked how the 29 acres was derived. Patrick said he would like to clarify the space required specifically for the playing fields, and the specifically for the schools.

Dan Jamison stated that they believe that by conjoining the two schools they can reduce the amount of acreage required. Dan stated that the playing fields may be tight, and that with an active, sports and recreation-oriented community he is concerned that it may be tight. Dan said that 29 acres may be too small, but that this amount is considered the minimum required.

Patrick Allen agreed that the community is very recreation and sports oriented, but would also like a statistical breakdown on how the minimum was reached, including playing fields, parking, school facilities, etc..

Dan Jamison asked Norm Dull, of Dull Olson Weekes Architects to respond.

Norm Dull stated that approximately 120-130 square feet per student is calculated for elementary students, and 130-135 square feet per student for middle school students. Norm said that middle schools generally have a track with a football/soccer field located in the middle, and a softball or baseball field. Norm said that an elementary school generally there is a soccer field and possible a small softball field. Norm said that parking requirements range about 100 for elementary schools and 120 for middle school. Norm said that they did mock versions of the school sites using other school models as examples. In terms of two-story schools, Norm said that the overall footprint could be reduced by possibly 14,000 or 15,000 square feet in this configuration. Norm said that elementary schools generally have 24 classrooms and would accommodate 12 on the first floor and 12 on the second floor, but that gymnasiums do not work as well in two-story schools. Norm said that a two-story middle school could possibly reduce the footprint by 20,000 square feet. Norm clarified that the approximate reduced space would be by stacking the classrooms only.

Patrick Allen said that generally it sounds like the building space may be about 4-5 acres, depending on how much could be stacked.

Norm Dull confirmed about 4 ½ acres based on the approximate use of 160,000 - 180,000 square feet.

Patrick Allen said that he was figuring about 195,000 square feet, but both are in the range. Patrick said that of the 29-30 acres, just four or five of the acres are building space.

Norm Dull confirmed.

Patrick Allen said that in a manner of speaking what is being considered is a recreational site with schools attached to it in terms of land use allocation.

Norm Dull said also added would be approximately 350-400 square feet per parking space. Norm said that other considerations are bus circulation areas, play areas, and park space. Norm reiterated that usable acreage is the key.

Chair Emery asked Kevin if he was ready to discuss Staff's recommended alternative.

Kevin Cronin stated that he made linear land use changes from Alternative E and moved them to the top of Alternative A/G, leaving the school location the same as originally placed in Alternative A/G.

Patrick Allen asked if this was the similarity with John Rankin's Modified Alternative A/G.

Kevin Cronin confirmed that essentially this was the case.

Patrick Allen asked if by moving the park to the north if the connection to Gillette Lane is lost.

Kevin Cronin said that Gillette Lane is difficult due to the delineation of wetlands. Kevin said that wetlands may be located north of Gillette Lane.

Dan Balza asked if it wasn't a requirement by fire and rescue to have a secondary entry to the school site.

Kevin Cronin said that Staff's recommended Alternative A/G there is access all the way around except on Gillette Lane. Kevin said there would not be an east/west access, but there would be a west/north access. Kevin said there would be two primary points of entry.

Patrick Allen said that there would be considerable traffic on Copper and Meadows streets.

Kevin Cronin stated that Copper Terrace would be a neighborhood route, which is a slightly higher designation than a local street.

Patrick Allen said that if he lived on Roelich Ave. he would travel on Meadow instead of Copper. Patrick said that Roelich runs north/south on the east side of the site and Meadow is the first right turn to take.

Chair Emery asked if Kevin could compare the alternatives and highlight the differences.

Kevin Cronin said that he would like to do that for the next meeting so that he would have time to evaluate the differences. Kevin also said that he would like direction from the Commission to obtain from the consultant a map of Staff's recommendation to bring back with Staff's evaluation.

Chair Emery confirmed this option. Chair Emery stated that he liked the option of having designated park space also due to the possibility that if more space was required it would be available using this space.

Kevin Cronin reiterated that the Parks Board wants to have a formal park with active uses. Kevin said that there is not a neighborhood park located west of Hwy. 99, and that residents on this side of Sherwood are using a pocket park or driving to Stella Olson, or now Sunset Park to enjoy use of an active park.

Patrick Allen asked Kevin if he could confirm that the proposed park would be about the size of Woodhaven Park.

Kevin Cronin said he could do the research, but that Woodhaven Park is a pretty good-sized park.

Dan Balza asked if someone could list the properties affected by the entire site.

John Rankin responded that the properties are shown with squares on his map, but John listed the Fillmore, Alexander, Rasmussen, Mandel, Labahn, & Rychlick properties. John said that the goal was to involve those properties that are most vacant for the school site.

Matt Nolan stated that both the Modified A/G Alternative and Staff's A/G Alternative include the Fillmore home location as part of the school site, which the School District has stated they will not consider displacing in the project. Matt asked Kevin how he would modify Staff's A/G Alternative to address this.

Kevin Cronin stated that he could not say at this time and would need time to evaluate this information before he could respond.

Matt Nolan asked Kevin if the School District and the City could re-evaluate the use & location of recreational fields on the school site and place some of these on a park site.

Kevin Cronin said that Matt's idea is a valid one. Kevin said that the desire in planning is to do everything in one stroke, but unfortunately the process does not work this way. Kevin said that the City is currently looking at the Parks Master Plan, which involves taking a system-wide look at how the City is providing parks and recreational services. Kevin said that at some point it will be time to do an individual master plan for a park in this site, and that a benefit of Staff's A/G Alternative in terms of long range planning is that the park space allows the flexibility for both an active & passive park in future.

Matt Nolan said that in the summer his children's favorite park to play in is located at Archer Glen Elementary school, and that it seems more practical to locate recreational facilities of the schools and park in such a way that resources are not duplicated.

Kevin Cronin confirmed that the Parks Board would not likely duplicate play structures or create the same resources as the school.

Patrick Allen stated that the alternatives share in common the school and park acreage requirements, which effectively leaves a 40-45 acre "public corner" that the City can determine who needs to own or operate remaining areas, as long as the Planning Commission can confirm that the general space requirements combined have been met.

Chair Emery asked if there were any further community comments.

John Rankin referred to the Modified A/G Alternative and stated that in terms of connectivity, there are multi-use paths through the active park, a footbridge and boardwalks. John reiterated that there is an 8" water line and a sanitary sewer connection located on Gillette Ln. that could possibly serve the schools.

Chair Emery asked if there were any other community comments.

Kurt Christensen, 22520 SW Fairoaks Dr., Sherwood OR 97140 – Mr. Christensen stated that he teaches middle school students in a school with about 900 students located in Hillsboro. Kurt asked if the School District had done any research into the possibility of having a K-8 model, and that there has been positive research in using this model that would also facilitate having just one school building instead of two.

Dan Jamison said that he has evaluated K-8 schools and they are remarkable. Dan said they would like to build a K-8 school, which was initially a key question for the long range facilities task force for the School District, but unfortunately the rate of growth in Sherwood is too rapid to allow this model. The School District would be forced to build again immediately due to the growth rate.

Patrick Allen asked Dan if the current School District plan isn't effectively a two-wing, K-8 school.

Dan Jamison said that he does not believe the current plan is a two-wing, K-8 school, because the K-8 model loses its effectiveness when student population reaches over 1,000 students, and that there are 1,500 students.

Patrick Allen confirmed that it would not be effective, and that two K-8 schools would be currently required to accommodate the School District needs and plan.

Dan Jamison confirmed.

Richard Piacentini, 2001 6<sup>th</sup> Ave., #2300, Seattle WA 98121 – Richard said that his sister, Lori Brandes, is a property owner in Area 59. Richard said that he would like to know what the zoning process will be. Richard stated that the School District does not currently have the funds to build the schools and there is no guarantee that the bond measure will pass. Richard asked what happens if the school site is zoned for schools and then a bond measure does not pass.

Chair Emery said that the School District will try for a bond measure again.

Richard Piacentini asked what happens to the property owners in that scenario, and if there is an alternative for property owners so they are not stuck until a bond measure is resolved.

Chair Emery stated that if a bond measure fails it is the children that suffer due to schools that would be over capacity.

Richard Piacentini agreed, but stated that the property owners would suffer also. Richard said that for equity and fairness there should be some flexibility in place.

Patrick Allen said that the site has been specifically identified for a school site due to the need in the community, and that they would not be meeting now to discuss land development issues if it were not for this fact.



Richard Piacentini stated that although true, once the zoning has been determined, those property owners outside the school site will be able to develop their property while those within the school site would not be able to.

Patrick Allen asked what Mr. Piacentini would suggest.

Richard Piacentini suggested identifying the preference for the school location, but create a residential overlay to the area so that if the School District does not get the funds the property owners have flexibility.

Patrick Allen asked Mr. Piacentini how the school site would be preserved under his scenario.

Richard Piacentini said that he did not have the answer to that, but that once an area is zoned for the school it is locked in.

Chair Emery said that there are also County, Metro, and State zoning laws & regulations that must be complied with as directives to the process.

Patrick Allen asked Kevin to clarify the order of events in adopting a concept plan.

Kevin Cronin recapped; 1) Planning Commission recommends alternative to City Council, 2) City Council adopts a resolution upon approval – potentially March 2006, 3) Planning begins zoning implementation and policy framework – anywhere from 3-9 month process, but must be completed prior to public vote on annexation – hopefully by Nov. 2006 if possible. Kevin said that the Planning Commission will be included in the zoning implementation and policy framework process, but that it is too early to get into the details involved in that part of the process.

Patrick Allen asked Kevin if the Planning Commission will be obligated to adopt zoning for the site without knowing the status of the school's bond election.

Kevin Cronin said that there is no such obligation. Kevin stated that he applied for an extension on the process from Metro in June 2005, which Metro extended an additional year from the original March 2006 deadline.

Patrick Allen asked Kevin if in addressing Mr. Piacentini's concerns, the Planning Commission can pace the process of determining zoning to coincide with certainties about whether or not the bond measure for the schools pass.

Kevin Cronin confirmed. Kevin also stated that they can condition zoning on school bond measure approval. Kevin said there are several ways to structure the implementation.

Chair Emery asked if there were any further community comments.

Darwin Rasmussen, 20730 SW Elwert Rd., Sherwood OR 97140 – Mr. Rasmussen said that his contacts with Dan Jamison and Mark Christie have been very positive and that he believes the entire process will be a success due largely to the manner in which the School District has worked with everyone. Darwin said the property owners met with the architect and requested

that the water holding ponds in the community could be centralized, so that when one or two acre properties develop they are not required to create multiple water quality facilities.

Chair Emery asked Norm Dull if he was planning a water quality holding pond for the school site, or possibly configuring this under the parking lot.

Norm Dull said this process is quite a bit ahead, but that water quality cannot be done with retention or detention pipes underground.

Chair Emery stated that he has seen it done in Eugene and that it is possible to do it this way now.

Patrick Allen said that he has seen water quality constructed this way also.

Norm Dull stated that he has seen catch basins that filter water.

Chair Emery said that he thinks Storm Water Systems in Portland has developed theirs as well.

Norm Dull stated that whatever Clean Water Services allows them to do is the process they will pursue.

Kevin Cronin said that on Page 18 of the OTAK report addresses the water quality facilities and supports Mr. Rasmussen's concerns. Kevin said that it requires coordination, but that it is recommended.

Chair Emery asked if there were further community comments. There were none.

Russell Griffin asked Kevin to confirm that on February 14<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission would be presented with a final recommended Staff alternative.

Kevin Cronin confirmed and added that as long as he can coordinate with the consultant and receive the information required in time, that this is the plan. Kevin reiterated that he will be on paternity leave until approximately February 6<sup>th</sup>, but that he and additional Planning Staff will work together to have packets ready for Commissioners on Tuesday, February 7<sup>th</sup> one week prior to the meeting.

Russell Griffin asked Kevin to confirm that he is not ready to respond regarding the Fillmore property this evening.

Kevin Cronin confirmed, and reiterated that tonight is the first time that he has also had the opportunity to review the materials presented by Mr. Rankin and heard the School District's stance on the Fillmore property. Kevin would like to have time to review and make a final recommendation on February 14<sup>th</sup> after making evaluations based on testimony received tonight.

Kevin further stated that he is asking the Commission to direct him to study the testimony provided this evening, compare for similarities and differences, and incorporate the information with Staff's recommended A/G Alternative for a final alternative recommendation at the February 14<sup>th</sup> session.

Dan Balza reiterated that they would also like to understand more clearly the differences between Staff's A/G Alternative and John Rankin's Modified A/G Alternative.

Kevin Cronin recapped his tasks; 1) study the two alternatives and present one final recommendation, and, 2) evaluate how the Fillmore property would be impacted or not impacted. Kevin asked if researching the size of Woodhaven Park was another task the Commission wanted to hear back on.

Patrick Allen said it was not, but that it was just speculation in the discussion.

Chair Emery said that he did have a question about alleyways, and would like to know more about lot size averages. Chair Emery said that he is concerned the alleyways will be too small.

Kevin Cronin said that he does not want prospective alleyway standards to be set in stone at this point and is concerned this may occur if it is something determined at this point of the process. Kevin also said that he will proceed with this however, if the Commission desires.

Chair Emery said that he would just like to see some averages.

Patrick Allen agreed, and stated that he would like to get a rough idea of what lot sizes need to be to achieve density.

Kevin Cronin confirmed.

Lowal Labahn, 18283 SW Edy Rd., Sherwood OR 97140, is a property and business owner in Area 59, as well as a member of the CAC study group for the project. Lowal said that he wanted to say that there are landowners that do not want to sell. Lowal stated that the process continues as if this is not the case.

Chair Emery confirmed that landowners certainly have the right to decide whether or not they want to sell their property, but that the process continues.

Patrick Allen moved that the Planning Commission directs Staff to implement the actions #1 through #4 on Page 9 of 10 of Kevin's January 3<sup>rd</sup> memo.

Dan Balza asked if the motion included the two tasks that Kevin recapped earlier.

Patrick Allen confirmed that this included; 1) study the two alternatives and present one final recommendation, and, 2) evaluate how the Fillmore property would be impacted or not impacted.

Russell Griffin seconded the motion.

Chair Emery asked if there was any discussion on the motion. There was none. A vote was taken:

Yes-6 No-0 Abstain-0

Motion carried.

**9. Comments from Commission** - Russell Griffin said that he receive permission from the seminar sponsors of the Planning Commissioner training he attended in Eugene, to copy the materials for the other Commissioners if desired. Russell asked Kevin if there was a budget for making copies.

Kevin Cronin confirmed that Planning Department staff will make the copies.

Dan Balza stated that at the last meeting it was discussed that the Planning Commission would like to send a letter to the City Council regarding the Planning Commission's decision process in the Sherwood Oaks project that was forwarded to the Council.

Kevin Cronin said that he was aware the Commission would like to do a letter for the City Council, to communicate an overview of the process that developed on the Sherwood Oaks project as it was presented to the Planning Commission. Kevin stated that the letter can be drafted by Julia Hajduk and circulated to Commissioners for input and approval. Julia stated that she would circulate the letter to the Commission.

Matt Nolan said that he would be out of town on February 14<sup>th</sup> and will not be able to attend the meeting.

Discussion ensued about the next meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup> and it was agreed by all that the Infill & Redevelopment Work Session scheduled for that meeting was not a pressing agenda item, and that since Kevin will also be out on paternity leave during this time, the January 24, 2006 session would be cancelled.

Chair Emery confirmed for the record that the January 24, 2006 Planning Commission meeting was cancelled.

Kevin Cronin confirmed that public notice of the cancellation would be posted.

**10. Next Meeting** – February 14, 2006 – Area 59 Recommendation; Chapter 9, Historic Resource Design Standards; American Legion Parking Lot CUP 05-04.

**11. Adjournment** – Chair Emery adjourned the meeting at 9:25 PM.

**End of Minutes**



Community Development Division  
Engineering Department  
22560 SW Pine Street  
Sherwood, OR 97140  
503-925-2309

Memo

Date: 7 February 2006  
Subject: Study Area 59  
To: Kevin Cronin, Planning Supervisor

I have reviewed the revised Alternative A/G and provide the following direction and comments.

Road and Street Comments:

1. Edy Road – The TSP designates Edy Road as a Collector.
  - a. The required street cross section for this section of road is a 3 Lane Section (without On-Street Parking). The center median is raised with a protected left turn lane.
  - b. Because Edy Road is approaching the characteristics of an Arterial Road, access will be limited to two locations. One access across from Trails End Drive and one to serve the main entrance to the school are recommended. The road shown to the far east of the site should be either closed or limited to a right in/right out if visibility permits.
2. Elwert Road – The TSP designates Elwert Road as an Arterial.
  - a. The required street cross section for this section of road is a 3 Lane Section without parking. The center median is raised with a protected left turn lane.
  - b. Because Elwert Road is an arterial road, access will be limited to two locations. The access shown close to the intersection of Elwert and Edy Roads will not be permitted.
3. Copper Terrace – The Copper Terrace is a Neighborhood Route and the TSP standards for this section will govern.
  - a. The required street cross section for this section of road is a 2 Lane Section with parking. No center median will be required.
  - b. There are no special access requirements for this road.
4. For the School, parent - student drop-off will be on the school site. Loading and unloading on and across Copper Terrace will be not be permitted to avoid the safety hazards similar to those occurring on Sherwood Boulevard during the school rush.
5. For local roads the TSP and TVF&R standards will govern.

6. The use of hammer heads in developed residential areas such as this one is highly questionable because of access issues as well as the safety of emergency vehicles. Sound conceptual planning and design would use cul-de-sacs to provide the mobility needed for this type of upscale development.

Sanitary System Comments:

1. Sanitary Sewer along Edy Road.
  - a. There have been several discussions of alternatives to provide sanitary service to the northern sections of Area 59. It has been suggested that a gravity sewer line could be constructed along Edy Road and this line would serve these sites. It is important to note that this sewer line will be in excess of 20 feet deep the majority of the distance along Edy Road. A sewer line at this depth this depth is difficult to maintain and repair.

A sewer line proposed at this depth is likely to be rejected.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this very important study.

*Eugene F Thomas*

Eugene Thomas, P.E.  
City Engineer

# Dean C. WERST

## ATTORNEY AT LAW

---

1785 Willamette Falls Drive  
West Linn, Oregon 97068  
Telephone: (503) 722-4546 • Facsimile: (503) 722-4549  
Email: atywerst@teleport.com

DEAN C. WERST  
Attorney at Law

JEANINE ERSKINE  
Legal Assistant

February 8, 2006

City of Sherwood  
Planning Commission  
Sherwood Civic Center  
22560 SW Pine Street  
Sherwood, Oregon 97140

RECEIVED  
FEB 09 2006  
BY *Kaz*  
PLANNING DEPT

**Re: Area 59 Zoning  
School Property**

Greetings:

I represent Dave Mandel and Nancy Kieling, who own an undivided twenty-five percent interest in the Mandel property at Elwert and Edy Roads, Sherwood, Oregon.

This letter is to request the zoning of the entire area 59 be designated for family residence and commercial uses and that no area be designated PI (public and/or institutional) zoning.

An allowed use or conditional use could and should be PI, within the footprint of the proposed school site, based on the charette of choice.

Specific areas in Area 59 should be designated for the various types of housing uses and commercial uses. The zoning for the proposed school site should be designated housing and/or neighborhood commercial.

Spot zoning a portion of the Area 59 property as PI would be in error. Doing so would violate the owners' constitutional rights, because when a local government exercises its power to regulate the use of land in the form of zoning, subdivision regulations, or official mapping, it has a discernible adverse economic impact on land ownership. If the zoning imposes "public institution" on specific land, the market value of that land diminishes drastically. The school, the only possible user, may never even purchase the property.

Such zoning regulation would deprive the land owner of the maximum developmental value of the land without just compensation. Both the Oregon and the Federal Constitutions contain provisions prohibiting the government from taking property without paying for it.

Oregon Constitution Article 1, Section 18: "private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation..." The federal provision is found in the Fifth Amendment, "...nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

I know of no undeveloped privately owned property in Oregon which is zoned for public institution. It would be appropriate for Sherwood to rezone the affected property as PI once the property does become a public use, but not before. Other jurisdictions deal with the PI zoning this way.

If the regulation identifies the land as a future site of a publicly owned use, the Oregon court has indicated that the plaintiff (land owner) would be entitled to the inverse condemnation remedy under the following circumstances: (1) if the designation results in such governmental intrusion as to inflict virtually irreversible damage; or (2) if the land owner is precluded from all economically feasible private uses pending eventual taking for public use. See Fifth Avenue Corp., supra, 282 Or at 614, Thornburg v. Port of Portland, 233 Or 178, 376 P2d 100 (1963), and Cereghino v. State Highway Com., 230 Or 439, 370 P2d 694 (1962).

At the January meeting, Mr. Paccentini (sp) addressed the Commission on the same issue. His questions and concerns were appropriate. His contentions paralleled the rules of law. The property owners cannot be saddled with a zoning regulation that causes the land to be useable only for a public use. The public use may never occur, thereby creating inverse condemnation.

I recommend you obtain the advice of your legal counsel. Should the specific property be zoned PI, my clients intend to formally appeal.

I hope this letter is helpful and I request it be read at your next hearing and that it be made a part of the record.

Very truly yours,



Dean C. Werst

DCW:jme

cc: Ms. Nancy Kieling  
Mr. David Mandel  
John A. Rankin, Esq.



## Kevin Cronin

---

**From:** David Mandel [dmandel@DavidMandel.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 27, 2005 4:31 PM  
**To:** Kevin Cronin  
**Cc:** dmandel@DavidMandel.com  
**Subject:** Area 59 Concept Plan (fwd)

Kevin,

I hope you get this before tonight's meeting. I have been trying to send this to you for a while, but I guess I had the wrong address. Everything I sent has been bouncing.

Sincerely,  
David Mandel  
Chief Activist  
Portland Linux/Unix Group  
560 SE Alexander  
Corvallis, Oregon 97333  
(541) 752-3769 land  
(541) 730-5285 cell

```
=====
David Mandel, Programmer      http://www.ocs.orst.edu/prism/
                               Other Affiliations
David Mandel                  http://www.DavidMandel.com
Portland Linux/Unix Group     http://pdxLinux.org
LinuxFund                     http://LinuxFund.org
=====
```

27 October 2005 Kevin Cronin Planning

Manager  
22566 SW Washington Street  
Sherwood, Oregon 97140  
USA  
<kcronin@ci.sherwood.or.us>  
(503) 625-4242

Kevin,

As I understand there is a meeting tonight regarding the Area 59 Concept Plan. Unfortunately, I can not attend. However, I do want to give input where and when appropriate. If this meeting is an appropriate forum could you please read this letter or enter it as written testimony depending on the situation.

I have attended and participated in a number of meetings regarding Area 59 starting with Metro's consideration of UGB inclusion for the area; and I have been very impressed with the process so far. It is been very democratic. I feel like I have a real voice in the decisions being made with my family's land.

I was especially impressed by the Charrette and the planning commission hearing following the Charrette. All three plans put forward at the Charrette were practical, reasonable plans that had the support of the overwhelming majority of affected persons. I would prefer Plan A, but I could live with any of the three alternatives. I was also glad to see that commission wasn't willing to support minority plans that had very little support from affected people. Thank you.

Of course, concept plans are just concept plans. They always minor changes and fine tuning. I'm sure you are in the process of doing this now.

Along these lines, the commissioners made a couple comments and asked questions at the hearing following the Charrette that I would like to comment on:

- (1) Someone mentioned that the Elwert's were a prominent family in the area.

This is true.

The Elwerts were prominent members of the community for many years, and the Steins and the Elwerts and the Mandels all own or owned land on both sides of Elwert road. The Elwerts were also quite wealthy for a couple generations.

Francis Mandel, my father, and Leo Elwert were good friends. I have fond memories of times in the 1950s when Leo Elwert would visit my father and the two of them would sit in our basement sharing a bottle of bourbon.

However, I would like to mention the Stein family as one of the area's prominent families. They predate the Elwerts and Mandels, and maybe have been largely forgotten but that would be a shame. As I understand, they once owned all the land on both sides of Elwert road and developed the land into individual farms.

They were good businessmen, but they were also very kind and helpful. For various reasons, the Mandels really wanted to leave Germany; but didn't have the money required. So they moved to Austria as a first step and were planning on moving to Russia as soon as they could. Fortunately, Stein family members in the old country loaned the Mandels funds to come to America with the promise of more help once they got to Middleton, Oregon. The Mandels came to Middleton and purchased their property from the Steins and have been forever grateful for their assistance. I assume the Steins helped many others in the area as well.

- (2) One of the commissioners asked why people placed the parks the way they did at the Charrette. Another ask why we didn't set more land aside for commercial use.

The Charrette was great and I'm pleased with the results. However, there were certain limitations inherent in the process. First, we didn't have much instruction on how the park space could be used. Some people wanted to put it where the creeks are. Others thought this was set aside and couldn't be used in any way. Thus, we had to deal with some confusion on this issue. Still, the result was satisfactory.

As for the commercial use land, all three plans used all the red paper (commercial land) we were given. We had scissors, so we could shape and reduce areas, but we had no way to increase the amount of area assigned to a usage. (Notice, all three plans reduced the size of the schools.)

Personally, I've been thinking about this area a lot lately and I would like to see everything on the west side of the Mandel creek made commercial. I'm still thinking about this. We don't want a strip mall there. But it might be kind of neat to have some light commercial/residual mix with an old European favor - something like old Middleton.

- (3) Lastly, I want to say something about the shadow or IP zoning. The school district and the city seem to oppose this. On the other hand, they say it won't make any difference to the value of the land. If this is true, then why oppose it?

Having the shadow zoning would really help the current owners evaluate their situation, and this would enable them to make a deal much sooner; so we can get the schools built and populated with students. Sherwood needs these schools now and shadow zoning could help speed the process along.

Sincerely,  
David Mandel  
Area 59 Property Owner  
560 SE Alexander  
Corvallis, Oregon 97333  
(541) 730-5285 mobile

---

David Mandel, Programmer	<a href="http://www.ocs.orst.edu/prism/">http://www.ocs.orst.edu/prism/</a>
Other Affiliations	
David Mandel	<a href="http://www.DavidMandel.com">http://www.DavidMandel.com</a>
Portland Linux/Unix Group	<a href="http://pdxLinux.org">http://pdxLinux.org</a>
LinuxFund	<a href="http://LinuxFund.org">http://LinuxFund.org</a>

---

140 NE First Street, LLC  
17400 SW Upper Boones Ferry Rd.  
Suite 230  
Durham, OR 97140

November 28, 2005

6.303

Heather Austin  
Associate Planner  
City of Sherwood  
20 Washington  
Sherwood, OR 97140

**RECEIVED**  
NOV 28 2005  
BY ha  
PLANNING DEPT

Oak and First

Re: SP 05-16

Dear Heather,

I am in receipt of the site review for the parking lot on First and Oak Streets (SP 05-16). I do not believe that a parking lot is a permitted use in the MDRL zone and such it does not qualify for a type II (fast track) site plan review. The property is located within the boundary of the Old Town Overlay District and should be reviewed under a Type IV process per section 3.201.01

Since site plan review is required I anticipate that the City will be required to do half street improvements as is required by code section 6.303.

Sincerely,

J. Patrick Lucas

**Attachment A**

# **APPROVED MINUTES**

final

---

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**February 28, 2006**

---

---

**Commission Members Present:**

Patrick Allen – Vice Chair  
Dan Balza  
Jean Lafayette  
Russell Griffin  
Matt Nolan  
Todd Skelton

**Staff:**

Kevin Cronin – Planning Supervisor  
Julia Hajduk – Senior Planner  
Rob Dixon – Community Development Director  
Cynthia Butler – Administrative Assistant

**Commission Members Absent:**

Chair – Adrian Emery

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** – Vice Chair Allen called the meeting to order at 7 PM.
2. **Agenda Review**
3. **Brief Announcements** – Julia Hajduk responded to a question from Commissioner Balza about the outcome of the Sherwood Oaks application (PA 05-03) that was heard by City Council on February 7, 2006. Julia reported the application was denied and gave a brief overview. Kevin reiterated that the volunteer Tree for All tree planting event co-sponsored by the City of Sherwood and organized by SOLV, will be March 4<sup>th</sup> at Stella Olson Park from 9AM - 1PM. Posters are displayed around town. A Parks Master Plan public workshop was held Monday, February 27<sup>th</sup> and was well attended.
4. **Community Comments** (the public may provide comments on any non-agenda item) – None.
5. **Chapter 9 – Historic Resources – Plan Text Amendment (PA 05-04) Public Hearing:** Public hearing continued from December 13, 2005 to consider a plan text amendment to the Code regarding historic preservation standards and the role of the LAB (Landmarks Advisory Board).

Kevin recapped the process to date. Edits were drafted from last meeting's recommendations and the two primary action items carried forward to tonight's meeting were to determine the role of the LAB and standards for townhouses in the Cannery site that is zoned RC (retail commercial).

Patrick Allen initiated the discussion on the current role of the LAB and the options being considered; 1) Supergroup, consisting of 3-4 voting members appointed by City Council in addition to members of the Planning Commission that meet on the same night as Planning Commission, or 2) Technical Advisory Subcommittee, consisting of 3-4 non-voting members appointed by City Council that meet apart from Planning Commission and provide advisory recommendations to the Planning Commission. Page 31 of the draft revisions Chapter 9 document reflecting these options with examples was reviewed. Kevin recommended the

Supergroup and said the process would be more streamlined with members of one body meeting on the same night for consultation, discussion and the decision making process. Once the Commission makes their determination the draft revisions of Chapter 9 would be updated accordingly to reflect the appropriate language throughout the document.

Matt Nolan questioned the challenge of recruiting 4 qualified members committed and available for either of the options. Kevin stated that he already had 3 possible candidates in mind to apply for the positions.

Vice Chair Allen asked Commissioners if there were any further questions or discussion for Staff before moving on to the townhouse issues for the Cannery site. There were none.

Kevin referred to Page 4, Section 9.202.04 of the draft revisions Chapter 9 documents regarding permitted conditional use for townhomes in the RC zone. Kevin stated that the zero lot-line rule exists presently in Old Town and would like that standard applied to the Smockville Design Standards, so that building could be done right up to the lot line as in Old Town and not have to meet setback requirements.

Height limits were discussed. Kevin stated that draft edits from the last meeting reflect consistent height standards. Commissioners discussed whether the height standards may be too high or too low, then recommended the public hearing portion of the session be initiated prior to further discussion.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was any public testimony.

Eugene Stewart, PO Box 534, Sherwood, OR 97140 – Eugene said that he feels the height standard should be lower to conform to the look and feel of Old Town. Eugene was concerned about public notice being sufficient for interested parties to attend hearings on these issues. Eugene also said that his primary concern remains the parking issue. A parking study should be done to confirm needs and location for parking.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was any further public testimony. There was none. The public hearing was closed. Kevin Cronin responded to testimony and stated that ample public notice is always provided for Commission sessions and public hearings, including posting in 5 consistent public places, notification through the Gazette and Chamber of Commerce, emails to interested parties who have provided their email address for notification, and printing in the Tigard Times.

Dan Balza referenced Page 17 of the draft revision Chapter 9 document and stated that it was his recollection the Commission recommended a maximum height of 3 stories instead of 4 as shown. Commissioner Nolan agreed. Discussion ensued regarding recommendations for height standards in Old Town versus the Cannery site in the Smockville Design Standards. Commissioners recommended the removal of “stories” in the language of both standards and that height be defined strictly by actual height standards. Recommendations were arrived by consensus for: 36 feet in Old Town, and 50 feet in the Smockville portion at the Cannery site.

Jean Lafayette stated that although the Old Town Standards and the Smockville Design Standards have been merged into one document as the Commission had requested, the information is not clearly labeled in places and contains information that is duplicated in areas.

Jean said that the follow-up comments she planned previously to provide Staff before the draft revision was completed did not occur, and that she would do so before the final revision to assist Staff in clarification of some portions of the document in this regard. Matt Nolan agreed the two sets of standards are confusing in places.

Vice Chair Allen recapped the 5 issues under consideration this evening; 1) Landmarks Advisory Board role, 2) Height limits, 3) townhouse standards in the Cannery site, 4) Commissioner Lafayette's comments on clarification for Smockville and Old Town standards, 5) Parking standards. Patrick reiterated the need for a parking study on supply and demand in order to respond to parking issues that come before the Commission. Patrick suggested that Staff arranged a work session on parking and invited Assistant City Manager, Jim Patterson to attend. Kevin confirmed.

Jean Lafayette referred back to height standards using the recently constructed McCormick building as an example. Discussion ensued regarding roof-mounted equipment and the visual barrier options listed in the Code. Julia Hajduk indicated that the parapet on top of the McCormick building was not completed and that additional screening would be placed.

Vice Chair Allen asked Commissioners and Staff if it was necessary for the Commission to review another draft after tonight's session, or if recommendations could be completed by Staff without this requirement. Consensus was that the Commission would not be required to view the final draft, and that Staff would make changes as noted for the March 21<sup>st</sup> City Council session.

Jean Lafayette moved to approve Plan Text Amendment PA 05-04 as amended, based on staff report findings of fact, public testimony, and Staff recommendations, with revisions to the Chapter 9 of the Code, Historic Resources, as follows; 1) recommendation of a Supergroup to serve as the LAB, 2) Height limits revised to 36 feet in the Old Town Design Standards, and 50 feet in the Smockville Design Standards and removal of "stories" in text, 3) townhouse recommendations by Staff approved for zero lot line standards in the Cannery site, 4) incorporation of Commissioner Lafayette's recommendations for more clear language separating the Old Town Design Standards from the Smockville Design Standards, and 5) parking issues to be discussed at a work session with ACM Jim Patterson, date to be determined.

Matt Nolan seconded.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was further discussion of the motion. There was none.

Vote: Yes – 6 No – 0 Abstain – 0  
Motion carried at 7:50 PM. A 10 minute break was taken.

<10 minute break>

**6. SE Sherwood Master Plan – Study Session -** Vice Chair Allen confirmed that although this was not a public hearing, that public comments would be received. Walk-on written comments were received from: Raindrops to Refuge, Jeffrey Kleinman, Attorney, AKS Engineering, and Sherwood resident Paula Yuzon.



Kevin Cronin recapped the process to date and stated that over 120 citizens have participated in workshops on the SE Sherwood Master Plan. Kevin reiterated that the master plan is designed to have a plan in place rather than react to development on an ad hoc basis. Kevin briefly reviewed each of the resulting alternatives reflecting options from lowest to highest density. Staff recommended a hybrid of the B & C alternatives, B/C which reflects 4 units per acre. Kevin stated that this keeps the density lower than the next zone, LDR (low density residential) which is 7 units per acre.

Vice Chair Allen asked for an overview of the primary differences between each alternative and a brief synopsis of key factors that led to each. Kevin provided descriptions of each alternative and stated that each is driven by differing opinions of property owners on how the land should be developed.

Rob Dixon stated the long process has required good communication skills and has called on cooperation with property owners to develop a concept plan. Rob confirmed Kevin's assertion that ad hoc development does not produce sound planning and that infrastructure also is not possible with this kind of development. Rob stated that other than some site distance issues for engineering, the recommended alternative for a concept plan looks good

Kevin stated that the next step in the process once a recommendation is given, would be to draft a technical memo for implementation of the concept plan. Discussion ensued about green streets and the possibility of using green streets in this plan. Kevin reiterated that they are currently in the TSP (Transportation System Plan), but that they require technical follow-up with Engineering. Rob stated the cost for green streets is high, but that they can be done.

Vice Chair Allen asked Staff if the Code currently protects any of the area. Julia Hajduk said that density transfer in Chapter 8, Environmental Resources, could protect some of the wooded area, but that it cannot force density transfer and that there are no regulations currently in place to fully protect these areas. Patrick asked if there were further questions of Staff. There were none. A public comment period was initiated.

Robert Davidson, area resident at 23792 SW Robson Terrace, Sherwood, OR 97140 – Robert stated that he lives in the Sherwood View Estates and that he is in favor of larger lot sizes and supports protection of natural areas on the site. Robert endorsed alternative A, and stated that Denali Lane should not become a through street.

Carl Axelson, Raindrops to Refuge, 22461 SW Pine St., Sherwood, OR 97140 – Carl emphasized a need and concern for as low an impact as possible on the natural environment in development. Carl stated that he would like to see the overriding theme for the development be viewed through wildlife and wetlands.

Patrick Huske, developer of Ironwood Acres and area resident at 23352 SW Murdock Rd., Sherwood, OR 97140 – Patrick said that each property should be considered separately. Patrick also said that early on in the process there was agreement by 6 out of 10 property owners on 7 units per acre.

Alex Hurley, AKS Engineering, 13910 SW Galbreath Drive, Ste. 100, Sherwood, OR 97140 -

Alex stated that alternative B/C appears to meet all of the goals and that ownership boundaries are honored. Alex said that surveys are needed and that although green streets are an option, they are expensive to maintain. Alex said the most difficult challenge is determining how to appropriate costs.

Carolyn Peterson, resident at 14340 SW Fair Oaks Drive, Sherwood, OR 97140 – Carolyn endorsed alternative A that has lower impact on the natural environment. Carolyn stated that wider green space is more appealing and agrees that Denali Lane should not become a through street.

Debra Ng-Wong, area resident at 23524 SW Denali Ln., Sherwood, OR 97140 – Debra lives near a pond on the site that she is concerned may not be protected with development. Debra said she attended the Parks Master Plan workshop where the need for more park space in the City was discussed and she feels this area could accommodate that need. Debra also discussed height standards should be lower in any development to protect views.

Bart Bartholomew, opponent, 1573 View Lake Court, Lake Oswego, OR 97034 – Bart stated he was in attendance on behalf of the Moser's, area property owners, and that they do not support any of the alternatives. Bart said that the Moser's are in favor of higher density and plan to pursue legal options available to them.

Kurt Kristensen, resident at 22520 SW Fair Oaks Court, Sherwood, OR 97140 – Kurt stated that although he will not personally be impacted by the development of the site, he is in favor of preserving green space and encourages long range planning of the area for the benefit of future generations. Kurt stated that alternative A is the best suited for the area, and that he believes higher density is proposed by the City to pay for the infrastructure.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there were further public comments. There were none. A 10 minute break was taken at 9:25 PM.

<10 minute break>

Vice Chair Allen asked Staff if public comment could continue at the March 28<sup>th</sup> session.

Kevin Cronin confirmed and stated there is no rush on the process. Kevin said that he would like to draft a technical memo for an implementation strategy by the March 28<sup>th</sup> session, but that public comment could continue.

Dan Balza asked Kevin what protections, if any, exist for the wetlands after the construction is over and property owners move in.

Kevin said that public outreach and education for protection will be required, and that the EPA (Environment Protection Agency) plays a role in supporting continued protection. Continued discussion on green streets ensued.

Russell Griffin asked Kevin about Denali Lane and the expressed need for this to become a through street.

Kevin Cronin said that Denali Lane is already in the TSP and that for connectivity, Denali Lane needs to connect to a larger street. Kevin said that cul-de-sacs are not an option.

Additional public comments were requested and accepted.

Jeff Roberts, proponent, 21705 SW Wheat Place, Sherwood, OR 97140 – Jeff asked what was planned for the area north of the SE Sherwood Master Plan site.

Kevin Cronin stated that it is currently part of the Parks Master Plan.

Gerrie Leslie, area resident, 23558 SW Denali Lane, Sherwood, OR 97140 – Gerrie stated that Denali Lane was never meant to be a through street and that he is strongly against it.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there were further public comments. There were none. Patrick stated that the discussion had two distinct components; 1) technical items such as streets, alleys, and access issues, and 2) landowners, property lines, and alternative selection. Patrick stated that the entire project includes 6 property owners. Matt Nolan confirmed.

Jean Lafayette said that she had concerns about the Moser property and asked Kevin if there was any updated information about the legal direction expected by this property owner. Kevin stated that he did not presently have more information, but would bring any new developments to the March 28<sup>th</sup> session.

Vice Chair Allen confirmed that the Commission would like Staff to report back on any impacts to the proposed concept plan that may exist depending on legal routes sought by the Moser family regarding their property. Patrick also asked Staff to clarify what some of the recommendations made by Raindrops to Refuge might mean in terms of green street support. Commissioners agreed that taking no action would not be in the best interest of the City in terms of ad hoc development.

Vice Chair Allen asked Kevin in addition to the above requests, the Commission would like feedback on each of the public comments made this evening. Kevin confirmed. Russell Griffin asked Kevin if there were any existing standards that protect someone's view. Kevin Cronin stated he would look into it and add it to the responses Staff will provide.

Kurt Kristensen, 22520 SW Fair Oaks Court, Sherwood, OR 97140 – asked if it was possible to get a breakdown of the infrastructure costs associated with Murdock Rd. Kevin said it would be very difficult. Kurt asked if there is an option for splitting the costs with the property owners.

Rob Dixon stated that it is the standard for development to cover full frontage improvements, which would apply on Murdock Rd. Rob said that some of the cost for through traffic could be taken into consideration. Rob confirmed that this information would be very difficult to determine at this stage. Vice Chair Allen asked Staff what timeline was needed for follow-up. Kevin confirmed March 28<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Allen recommended that on March 28<sup>th</sup> another work session on the SE Sherwood Master Plan would be on the agenda, including more public comment. Patrick also

recommended that another session for public comment be set 2-4 weeks following the March 28<sup>th</sup> session. Commissioners agreed. Staff confirmed.

**7. Comments by Commission** - Todd Skelton attended the Parks Master Plan workshop held on February 27<sup>th</sup> and said that it was a positive process. Russell Griffin said that the stop signs for street construction in Old Town were moved from the intersection of Main & Railroad streets and that this was a safety hazard particularly for pedestrians. Staff confirmed this would be investigated.

**8. Next Meeting – March 14, 2006:** Infill & Redevelopment Standards work session 6-7PM; Regular session items: American Legion Parking Lot (CUP 05-04); Goal 5 Standards.

**9. Adjournment** – Vice Chair Allen adjourned the session at 10 PM.

