



**City of Sherwood  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Sherwood Police Facility  
20495 SW Borchers Drive**

**January 20, 2004**

**Regular Meeting -7:00 PM**

**Note: Agenda Item 5B PUD 03-01 Woodhaven Crossing will be heard at the February 3, 2004 Planning Commission mtg**

**A G E N D A**

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. Consent Agenda – December 16, 2003 PC Minutes**
- 3. Agenda Review**
- 4. Community Comments** *are limited to items NOT on the printed Agenda.*
- 5. Public Hearings:** (Commissioners declare conflict of interest, ex-parte contact, or personal bias) **Public Hearings** before the City Council and other Boards and Commissions shall follow the procedure identified in Resolution 98-743, adopted June 9, 1998 (copies available on table):
  - A. (cont'd from 12-02-03) PA 03-03 PUD Lot Sizes Plan Text Amendments.** A request by West Hills Development to amend Section 2.202.05C Residential PUD (Part 3, Sherwood Zoning & Development Code), in particular Item 3 Minimum Lot Size, so the City Council may approve lots with less than 5,000 square feet for single-family detached dwellings if certain criteria are satisfied. *(Dave Wechner, Planning Director)*
  - B. (Re-scheduled for 2-3-04 PC Mtg) PUD 03-01 Woodhaven Crossing Planned Unit Development:** a request by Peter Livingston for Milford/Marian Hosler (owners), for 168 residential condominium units and 3 ground floor commercial units (4,800 square feet) on an 8.97 acre site with open space tracts. The site is located at 22822 SW Pacific Hwy, further described as Tax Lot 500, Map 2S 1 31B. *(Dave Wechner, Planning Director)*
  - C. SP 03-07 Sunset Park Site Plan:** a request by the City of Sherwood for site plan approval to develop the remaining phases of the park master plan for public open space, recreational facilities, park buildings, and roadway improvements, further described at Tax Lots 600, 700, 800, Map 2S 1 32DB. *(Anne Elvers, Associate Planner)*
- 6. New Business**
- 7. Adjourn**

**ITEMS NOT COMPLETED BY 11:00 PM WILL BE CONTINUED  
TO THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING**

# **APPROVED MINUTES**

---

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**January 20, 2004**

---

---

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

Chair Adrian Emery called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Commission Members present:

Patrick Allen  
Dan Balza  
Adrian Emery  
Kevin Henry  
Jean Lafayette  
Ken Shannon  
1-Vacant position

Staff:

Dave Wechner, Planning Director  
Anne Elvers, Associate Planner  
Terry Keyes, City Engineer  
Roxanne Gibbons, Recording Secretary

**2. Consent Agenda**

**Patrick Allen moved the Planning Commission accept the December 16, 2003 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented. Seconded by Jean Lafayette.**

**Vote for Passage of Motion: 5-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain (Emery)**

**3. Agenda Review**

There were no changes to the Agenda.

**4. Community Comments**

There were no community comments.

**5. Public Hearings**

Vice-Chair Patrick Allen read the hearings disclosure statement and asked that Commission members reveal any conflicts of interest, ex-parte contact or bias.

Mr. Henry said that he would not be participating in the public hearing scheduled for PUD 03-01 Woodhaven Crossing because he has a potential customer that may be involved with this project.

**5A. PA 03-03 PUD Lot Sizes Plan Text Amendments**

**Chair Emery opened the public hearing on PA 03-03 PUD Lot Sizes Plan Text Amendments and asked if the applicant wished to make any comments.**

**Michael Robinson, representing the applicant, 1120 NW Couch, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, Portland, Oregon 97209, addressed the Commission.** Mr. Robinson referred the Commission to the letter dated January 13, 2004, requesting a continuance to the February 3, 2004 Regular Commission meeting. This application was continued from January 6, 2004 to this date due to the inclement weather during the week of January 6<sup>th</sup>. He did not know that the applicant would be attending the National Homebuilders Association Conference this week. He assured the

Commission that the applicant would be available on February 3<sup>rd</sup> and that no further continuances would be requested.

Mr. Allen asked Staff to go over the conditions for requesting continuances. He was concerned that an established policy was not being enforced.

Mr. Wechner said it has been the policy for the Commission to grant the first request for a continuance. Additional requests for continuances are subject to more stringent review by the Commission and may not be granted.

Mr. Lafayette said the argument could be made that the hearing scheduled for January 6, 2004 was continued due to circumstances beyond anyone's control (inclement weather). It was rescheduled by Staff to January 20, 2004. Neither Staff nor Mr. Robinson were aware this would conflict with the National Homebuilders Conference.

**Jean Lafayette moved the Planning Commission continue PA 03-03 PUD Lot Sizes Plan Text Amendments to the February 3, 2004 Regular Planning Commission meeting, as requested by the applicant, with the understanding that this will be the final continuance. Seconded by Kevin Henry.**

**Vote for Passage of Motion: 5-Yes, 1-No (Allen), 0-Abstain**

**5B. PUD 03-01 Woodhaven Crossing Planned Unit Development**

Chair Emery announced that, as noted on the Agenda, this item will be heard at the February 3, 2004 Regular Commission meeting.

Mr. Wechner explained that the public notice was not published in The Times newspapers as required by the Development Code. The application has been re-noticed for publication and is now scheduled for the February 3, 2004 Regular Commission meeting. This will not conflict with other Agenda items scheduled on this date.

**5C. SP 03-07 Sunset Park Site Plan**

**Chair Emery opened the public hearing on SP 03-07 Sunset Park Site Plan and called for the Staff Report.**

Anne Elvers, Associate Planner, referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated December 31, 2003, a complete copy of which is contained in the City Planning File SP 03-07. She noted:

- The applicant is requesting site plan approval for improvements to Sunset Park.
- The park is 22.79 acres and is located at 390 SE Sunset Boulevard. The site is zoned Low Density Residential (LDR) and Institutional Public (IP). Recreational facilities are permitted outright in the LDR zone and as a conditional use in the IP zone.
- There is a municipal water tower on the site as well as some additional associated structures.
- An artificial-turf soccer field is located on the south section of the site adjacent to Sunset Boulevard.

- The site plan includes developing the remaining unused portions of the park with public open space, additional recreational facilities, park buildings, roadway improvements and an additional parking lot in the northeast section of the site.
- The Staff Report does not include a finding for Section 5.302.03B, Miscellaneous Standards for Off-Street Parking that states groups of more than four (4) parking spaces shall be served by a driveway so that no backing movements or maneuvering within a street will be required. The plans show back-in parking off of Division Street. A finding should be included with the Planning Commission decision.
- In conclusion, Staff recommends approval with conditions.

**Chair Emery asked if the applicant wished to provide testimony.**

**Jonathan Beaver, Murase Associates, (landscape architect) 926 NW 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 240, Portland, Oregon 97214 and Sandra Burtzos, Senior Project Manager, City Staff, addressed the Commission.**

Ms. Burtzos reviewed the process used to notify the public of the proposed Sunset Park Master Plan. It included holding three public open houses, sending notices to surrounding property owners within 300 feet of the site, placing the three park design alternatives on the City web page, and review by the Parks Board, who recommended approval to the City Council. The Council adopted the Sunset Park Master Plan in September 2003.

Mr. Beaver referred the Commission to the colored site plan board and identified the following:

- There is an existing 49-car parking lot off of Sunset Boulevard and an artificial turf soccer field just north of the parking lot.
- A gravel driveway runs down the center of the site and the water tank is located along the north side of the site.
- There is a grove of deciduous trees along the north side of the site.
- The master plan was developed after determining how individual uses on the site would best be located based on topography, adjacency to the surrounding neighborhood and ADA access throughout the park. The site was previously graded.
- The majority of the park amenities will be centrally located. These amenities include a pathway that will provide universal access from one side of the park to the other. There will be a restroom facility, concession stand, large picnic shelter, smaller picnic shelter, basketball court and seating area, a picnic area that marks the old home-site, and an interactive water feature and playground.
- The north part of the site will have a 29-car parking lot with a traffic circle and some additional parking along the access drive.
- They also looked at parking off of Division Street and improvements along Sunset Boulevard that would include a number of traffic calming techniques.

Mr. Henry asked for clarification regarding the proposed baseball field and who would be playing on this field. He was concerned about the size of the baseball field and the type of fencing needed. The site shows that a second soccer field will be part of the baseball field, so fencing may not be feasible.

Ms. Burtzos responded that the baseball field was designed for the 13-15 year old age group.

Mr. Henry asked how older children or adults would be prevented from using the field. He was concerned about safety due to the size of the field because it does not seem to be far enough away from the existing residential area. The corner of one of the back yards was only about 370-380 feet from home plate. This could easily be reached by a high school player using an aluminum bat. There are also walking paths within this range. He asked how the potential dangers from flying baseballs would be mitigated. A baseball field for high school players would have to be at least 400 feet from home plate to center field.

Mr. Beaver responded that a higher fence could be used. He did not know how the baseball field was going to be managed.

Ms. Burtzos said the YMCA is going to manage the fields, but a formal agreement has not yet been finalized. The City will continue to make reservations for the picnic sites and shelters. There is an existing row of trees along the back side of the adjoining residential area. The trees are not very large, but they could be enhanced with additional plantings. Staff met with the baseball organization and all the fields in Sherwood are looked at as being multi-purpose fields. A temporary fence could be placed outside of the soccer field area. They talked to the residential neighbors adjacent to the site and they did not have any specific concerns at this time.

Mr. Henry was also concerned about the "back-in" parking proposed off of Division Street and how this would be regulated.

In response to Mr. Allen's question, Ms. Evers said the off-street parking proposed along Division Street does not meet Code requirements without having some type of drive area where cars can maneuver without being in the street.

Ms. Burtzos said they looked at this, but the retaining wall that would be necessary would be cost prohibitive for the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Keyes did not agree with the Planning Staff interpretation of the Code. Division Street is a public street and diagonal parking always backs onto a public street. He said the Code standard was designed for parking lots and not diagonal parking. Parking along Division Street may not be needed at this time. The Transportation System Plan (TSP) is probably going to reclassify Division Street. There are right-of-way issues to be resolved. If the parking was eliminated, they may be able to put the diagonal parking on the entry-way next to the water tank and eventually use parallel parking on Division Street. He said Mr. Henry made a good point about someone arriving late and going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Wechner said he disagreed with the City Engineer's interpretation. The Commission should focus on the details of what benefits the back-in parking has and whether the Code prohibits this type of parking configuration. He read Section 5.302.03.B of the Code, "Parking space configuration, stall and access isle size shall be of sufficient width for all vehicle turning and maneuvering. Groups of more than four (4) parking spaces shall be served by a driveway so that

no backing movements or other maneuvering within a street, other than an alley would be required.” Mr. Keyes has cited in his memo some of the reasons why the back-in parking would work. The Commission should evaluate this against the provisions of the Code.

Ms. Lafayette asked how the right-of-way dedication was going to be addressed on Division Street.

Mr. Keyes said Division Street would be widened past the site at least to 22 feet. He would like to minimize any other public improvements because of changes that will occur through the TSP process.

Mr. Allen asked if the Division Street parking could be done when the demand for it is determined to be necessary and a design for Division Street is completed.

Mr. Keyes said this could be done. Ms. Burtzos said the Parks Board recommended that this parking not be built until it is necessary and the design of Division Street is determined.

Mr. Balza asked if the intersection of Sunset and Aldridge Terrace was going to remain a 4-way stop. He supported the 4-way stop because of the amount of pedestrians and vehicle traffic.

Mr. Keyes responded that it should not be a 4-way stop. Sunset Boulevard is an arterial. Sunset Boulevard has been designed to have traffic calming, so the stop sign could be removed at some time in the future.

Mr. Wechner said the Commission should evaluate the potential impacts of the baseball field and try to mitigate those impacts.

The Commission discussed at length the use of the baseball field and ways to mitigate any safety concerns. The discussion included:

- Limit the use of the baseball field to a specific age group.
- Placing some type of fence on the site, either temporary or permanent.
- Re-orienting the placement of the baseball field.
- Placing signage on the pathway regarding flying baseballs.

Ms. Lafayette said she did not support limiting the use of a “public property” to certain individuals. The City should work with adjoining property owners to enhance the physical barrier by fence or some type of mesh net and signage on the pathway “beware of flying baseballs”.

Ms. Burtzos said the vegetated screening was one option that seemed feasible.

**Chair Emery asked if there was any proponent or opponent testimony. There being none, Chair Emery dispensed with the rebuttal portion of the hearing and closed the public hearing on SP 03-07 Sunset Park Site Plan for Commission deliberations.**

The Commission discussed the use of a temporary fence because of the soccer field overlay on the baseball field.

Matt Nolan, member of the Parks Board, said the baseball field was laid out to accommodate a 70-foot base path as requested by the baseball organization. They identified the need of a field for the 13-15 year old age group because there are no other existing fields for this age group in Sherwood.

Ms. Lafayette suggested the Commission deal with the Division Street parking and then continue their discussion regarding safety issues surrounding the proposed baseball field. The Commission concurred.

Mr. Allen suggested a finding that the proposed parking off of Division Street does not meet the standard of Section 5.302.03B of the Code. He recommended that the parking be considered when the need is justified and Division Street has been redesigned.

Mr. Keyes agreed with Mr. Allen. He would recommend including a provision that the Division Street parking be eliminated under this site plan.

The Commission agreed to add a condition that the final site plan shall not include parking along Division Street with this site plan. The condition and findings will be included with the Notice of Decision.

Mr. Allen said because there was no opponent or proponent testimony regarding the master plan for Sunset Park, and given that when specifically approached, the neighbors did not have any specific concerns, the baseball field could be left as shown in the site plan. The Commission agreed with this assessment.

Mr. Shannon and Ms. Lafayette were concerned about limiting the use of a portion of public property for a specific age group.

Mr. Henry noted that from May through August, the baseball field would be in use. From September through May, it would be used as a soccer field for all age groups.

Mr. Allen said he could accept the Parks Advisory Board recommendation that the Sunset Park Master Plan meets the needs of the community.

Mr. Wechner said little league fields are usually set up with different dimensions to meet the needs of specific age groups.

**Patrick Allen moved that the Planning Commission approve with conditions SP 03-07 Sunset Park Site Plan based on the staff report, application testimony, public testimony, agency comments, with the added finding that the proposed parking Division Street does not meet Section 5.302.03B of the Code and adding a condition that no parking is allowed on Division Street under this site plan application. Seconded by Adrian Emery.**



**Ms. Lafayette moved to amend the motion to add a condition that the applicant shall assure that adequate screening is in place to prevent significant adverse impacts of baseball use of the field to the adjoining neighbors. Seconded by Kevin Henry**

**Vote of Passage of amendment to motion: 5-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain (Emery)**

**Vote of Passage of amended motion: 6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

**6. New Business**

Patrick Allen asked if Staff could confirm whether public bodies are required to have recorded roll call votes in the minutes. Mr. Wechner will review the *public meetings laws*.

Mr. Wechner announced he would be participating as a panel member in a one-day symposium discussion, "*Balancing Agriculture & Urban Land Needs in Washington County*" on January 30, 2004 at Pacific University in Forest Grove. Any Commission members who are interested in attending should contact him regarding transportation.

The Commission will have a work session to review the proposed sign code amendments and additional amendments to the deck criteria following their February 3, 2004 Regular Commission meeting.

**7. Adjourn**

**There being no further business to discuss, Chair Emery adjourned the regular Commission meeting at 8:20 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Planning Department