

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting

March 7, 1995

Work Session on Transportation Planning Rule Grant Project:

Ms. Connell introduced Mr. Keith Linden, McKeever Morris, Inc., who had developed the report on implementation of the Transportation Planning Rule for Sherwood.

Mr. Linden introduced Jeff Mitchum, a member of the consulting team from McKeever Morris.

Mr. Linden and the Planning Commission members reviewed the Transportation Planning Rule implementation process and proposed the following issues be included in the project scope:

1. Bicycle parking for new development, except single-family residences.
2. Safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access within and between all types of development.
3. Design and for transit facilities.
4. Land use to support transit.
5. Preferential access to transit in commercial-institutional development.
6. Preferential parking for carpools and vanpools and maximum parking standards.
7. Opportunities for redevelopment of surface parking for transit-oriented use.
8. Road system that facilitate pedestrian and transit access.
9. Transit stops for major commercial, industrial and institutional developments.
10. Private streets.

The Commission also reviewed the purpose of the draft background summary and no amendments were made for the report; questions raised during the workshop will be resolved with the City Planning Staff prior to production of a final draft report; however, the Planning Commission is encouraged to submit any additional comments. During discussions, it was noted that the City has already adopted goals and policies which address many of the above TPR issues. The Commission discussed the importance of Highway 99W, and the need to resolve access issues to and across the highway with the ODOT.

Mr. Linden advised that one of the project goals will be to develop alternative approaches to implement the TPR requirements in Sherwood; alternatives will be developed to establish a range

of options that will be in keeping with the character of the City, after which the Planning Commission and City Council should have goals regarding implementation of the TPR.

During discussions, it was agreed that the City should begin reviewing existing goals and policies and supplement the goals in order to address each of the nine TPR issues. The Commission also made the following suggestions:

1. Use existing goals and policies.
2. Be careful about high-density development.
3. Minimum density standards should be considered.
4. Be proactive regarding transit routes and stops.
5. Coordination with other agencies is important (e.g., street standards study).
6. Consider rail transit potential.
7. Building orientation should be evaluated to benefit pedestrians and transit.
8. Exclusive pedestrian and bicycle routes/areas may be appropriate in Old Town.
9. City Council goals for 1995-96 should be considered.

After discussion, the Consulting team agreed to develop goals for the project, which are based on existing adopted language and with suggested supplemental goals for the Planning Commission's consideration. The policies and implementation strategies, which provide proper guidance for implementing the TPR are found in the City's Comprehensive Plan, the Sherwood Downtown Revitalization Plan, and the Sustainable Sherwood project. The related TPR issues from the previous list are noted with the policy reference. These are followed by several recommended policies to address remaining TPR issues.

The Commission, Staff and consultants discussed project timing, and the next meeting is to be held with the City Council, probably on April 18.

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call.** Chairman Gene Birchill called the meeting to order at approximately 7:55 p.m. Commission members present were: Gene Birchill, Chris Corrado, Susan Claus, Marge Stewart, Ken Shannon and Rick Hohnbaum. George Bechtold was absent on vacation and excused. Planning Director Carole Connell, Assistant Planner Lisa D. Nell, and Deputy City Recorder Kathy Cary were also present.

2. **Minutes of February 28, 1995 meetings:**

It was noted that the minutes of the February 28, 1995, meeting had not been mailed. Consideration of the minutes was tabled until the next meeting of the Commissioners.

3. Community Comments:

Chairman Birchill commented that he understood a majority of the audience wished to present comments to the Commissioners.

He noted that the section had been placed on the agenda in order to provide an opportunity for citizens to express ideas to the Planning Commission to help the members work better. Chairman Birchill requested that speakers provide their name and address for the record, and to limit comments because of the tight time constraints.

Dana Anderson, 620 SW St. Charles Way, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mr. Anderson read a letter into the record questioning the propriety of a Planning Commissioner participating in the land-use decision-making process while being involved in a lawsuit against the City as well as several residents. A copy of the letter is attached as part of these minutes.

Chairman Birchill pointed out that Planning Commissioners serve at the pleasure of the Mayor with support of the City Council. He suggested that Mr. Anderson submit his letter expressing his concern to the City Council.

Wendell Otto, 700 SW St. Barbara Way, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mr. Otto commented that it is incumbent upon the citizens to bring such matter to the attention of the Commissioners, and that is the reason for their attendance. He remarked that he is also concerned that someone on the Planning Commission could have a conflict of interest as far as the lawsuit is concerned. He recommended that an investigation be undertaken. Mr. Otto commented that it "seems rather mean-spirited for someone in the community to sue another citizen over water flow." He stated that he is bringing the issue to the attention of the Commission and stated that an investigation might be in order.

In response to Mr. Otto, Vice-Chairman Corrado remarked that service of a Commission member should not be addressed during this forum and suggested that the concerns be forwarded to the City Council, who will make a determination on whether and how to deal with a Commission member.

Cindra Gero, 670 SW St. Charles, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Ms. Gero inquired as to who is responsible for plumbing planning and future water run-off when a development comes into town. Chairman Birchill advised that the Commission reviews an established criteria, and the plans are

generally engineered and revised by staff for technical and detailed design requirements; staff recommends corrections to comply with ordinances or planning rules or will say the design is acceptable and will pass the project through.

Chairman Birchill advised that the service of any Commission member as well as the lawsuit will be addressed by the City Council. He advised that Ms. Connell will be directed to forward Mr. Anderson's letter to the City Council.

5. Public Hearings:

Chairman Birchill read the hearings disclosure statement and requested that Commissioners advise of any ex-parte contact, conflict of interest or personal bias regarding any item on the agenda.

Mr. Hohnbaum advised that his wife is employed by the School District as a bus driver; however, he did not see any conflict and expected to participate in discussions and consideration of SP 95-2, Intermediate School Addition.

Ms. Stewart advised that Regarding Item 5 B, she has no conflict, but does have a relative who lives next door to the project. Ms. Stewart advised that she will excuse herself from discussion and deliberations of the item.

With regard to SUB 94-9, Cedar Creek Park, Ms. Claus advised that she had provided property appraisals for the applicant and at some point in the future may again perform that service. She stated that she did not believe her work would affect her participation, and planned to be involved in the discussion and deliberations.

Vice-Chairman Corrado advised that he is involved in various activities with the School District, but does not believe it has any effect on the school addition before the Commission. He stated that he is pleased to participate in the activities of the School District as well as those of the City.

There being no further disclosures, Chairman Birchill called for a Staff Report.

A. SUB 94-9 Cedar Creek Park #2 Preliminary Plat: Request for a 22-lot subdivision on Scholls-Sherwood Road and Lynnly Way:

Assistant Planner Lisa D. Nell advised that the Commission is reviewing a preliminary Plat for Cedar Creek Park No. 2. She

noted that Page 2 of the Staff Report discusses the context and background of the project and that the Staff Report indicated that a letter had been received from Washington County requesting a traffic analysis. However, Ms. Nell explained that the letter from Washington County pertained to Cedar Creek Estates and was erroneously placed in the Cedar Creek file. She continued that the incorrect information had been deleted from the text of the report, but not from the conditions of approval and recommended that Condition No. 2 be deleted.

With regard to SW Scholls-Sherwood Road north of Cedar Creek Park 2, Ms. Nell advised that the applicant will need to continue street improvements that began in Cedar Creek Park No. 1, provide an additional 45 feet for future road improvements, and as requested by Washington County, comply with the County's traffic impact analysis requirements.

Ms. Nell advised that USA had not responded to the standard information letter; however, Mr. Lee Walker of USA, had telephoned and suggested that each dwelling unit have a connection to the sewer system.

Ms. Nell provided an in-depth review of the Staff Report dated February 28, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minute book. She pointed out that an all-weather surface easement to permit City access to Tract B, which is designated as a stormwater facility, is necessary and should be a condition of approval. Ms. Nell commented that a pedestrian path onto SW Scholls-Sherwood Road is desirable and the applicant is proposing to construct one-half the path, the other half to be constructed when the adjacent subdivision is constructed.

In conclusion, Ms. Nell recommended that SUB 94-9 Cedar Creek Park 2 Preliminary Plat be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report with the following revisions:

1. Revise Condition No. 1 to include Washington County's approval of engineered construction plans.
2. Delete Conditions Nos. 2 and 3, which are not relevant to the project.
3. Revise Condition No. 8 to require that the applicant comply with Washington County's dedication and other road requirements.

Chairman Birchill advised that the public hearing will be opened at this time, the applicant and/or proponents will be

allowed to speak after which the opponents will be allowed to present testimony; the applicant will be allowed a rebuttal period, then the public hearing will be closed. He pointed out that the public hearing can be re-opened at any time at the request of a Commission member.

Len Schelsky, Westlake Consultants, Inc., 15115 SW Sequoia Parkway, #150, Tigard, addressed the Commission. Mr. Schelsky provided a brief history on the dimensions and the characteristics of the site. He indicated that the width of the parcel limits what can be done, which explains the proposed dimensions and layout of some of the lots. Mr. Schelsky stated that Lots 55-80 could be a rounding factor and, if needed, can be revised to 5,000 square feet. He remarked that the main issue to address is the private street, and directed the Commissioners' attention to a proposed layout of the development. Mr. Schelsky advised that the applicant is proposing a duplex park where MDRH zoning allows multi-family units or higher. He pointed out that the applicant proposes eight units with a standard hammerhead, and an allowable 28-foot street. Mr. Schelsky commented that the applicant is providing private a street because public streets require more land and will further limit driveways and setback. He remarked that there will be no parking on the street since the automobiles will further obstruct driveways. Mr. Schelsky stated that it will be necessary to develop street maintenance agreements and he is open to suggestions as to how the issue should be addressed.

Mr. Schelsky questioned whether sidewalks should be required since people have a tendency to ride bikes or walk in the street, and not providing sidewalks would make better use of the land and keep the lots as deep as possible. Mr. Schelsky advised that a 15-foot pedestrian path to Scholls-Sherwood Road will result in the loss of a lot and the applicant proposes to dedicate a tract to be used by the City. He proposed a six-foot strip on Lot 54 with the adjoining project dedicating an additional six-foot strip to form an easement to provide City access. Mr. Schelsky advised that the applicant has no problem with extending the easement to Tax Lot 600, but would like to have verbiage included which eliminates providing utility easements to adjoining properties. With regard to storm drainage, Mr. Schelsky advised that a stormwater drain on Lynnly will be connected to the existing facility to accommodate the parcels to the west.

In response to Chairman Birchill's question, Mr. Schelsky replied that the applicant has been very successful in selling the homes, which are nice looking, two-story, two-car garage, two to three bedroom units offering affordable

housing in the \$95,000 to \$100,000 range.

In response to Ms. Claus' question, Mr. Schelsky indicated that there will be an easement at Lots 66 and 67 to run storm drainage to Lynnly Way. Ms. Connell inquired if a utility easement is needed from other two properties, or if the issue could be left open-ended. Mr. Schelsky pointed out that a review of the last plan showed the ridge line at the back of the property so that extending northward goes to Scholls-Sherwood Road. Mr. Schelsky stated that he thought the tax lot is large enough that the sewer can extend to Edy Road.

Mr. Shannon commented that duplexes indicate rental property and expressed concern as to how the private street is to be maintained and maintenance agreements enforced by the City if the owner of the property is an absentee owner.

There being no proponent or opponents testimony offered, Chairman Birchill closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for comments, questions and discussion among the Commission members.

Mr. Hohnbaum pointed out that the discussions indicate that there will be no parking on some of the streets; however, the conditions of approval do not mention installation of "No Parking" signs. He suggested that a condition to that effect be added.

Mr. Hohnbaum inquired as to whether improvements will be required on Scholls-Sherwood Road. Ms. Connell advised that Scholls-Sherwood is a county road and must be improved in accordance with County standards. She noted that Washington County will realign and improve the road with TIF funds.

Mr. Hohnbaum pointed out that there is nothing in the City's guidelines for allowing hammerheads and inquired if the hammerhead could be public rather than private? Ms. Connell advised that the City uses Washington County's standards for hammerheads and they have been allowed in other locations.

Chairman Birchill inquired whether the setbacks shown on SW Scholls-Sherwood Road aligned with the same setbacks on the west side of the cemetery, and if so is there a way to negotiate a setback agreement to provide access to Scholls-Sherwood Road? Ms. Connell advised that there are graves in that area which would preclude such alignment.

Ms. Claus also pointed out that street maintenance agreements are difficult to enforce and manage in view of the number of persons involved, and noted that the City will only be

involved with path repair and maintenance. Ms. Connell suggested that the applicant provide a sample maintenance agreement. She noted that an "absent-owner" agreement could cover maintenance of the private street.

Chairman Birchill suggested that the applicant consider blocking off SW Lynnly Way at the east extension between Lots 59 and 60, making the road turn southerly into Tract A and making a turn to the street similar to that at the north end of the project, providing an access at the adjoining site east of the subdivision. Mr. Schelsky stated that it might make the connection to Borchers Road more difficult. He stated that the road could barrier-off the area separately since it is a multi-family area, and the applicant could put in a 50-foot right-of-way for the hammerhead, and the applicant will work out the details with City Engineer.

Mr. Corrado inquired as to how to deal with the access to the north, and whether a 20-foot all-weather access is acceptable as an emergency access. Chairman Birchill suggested that the applicant contact the Fire Department to resolve the question and to determine if an emergency access is required.

There being no further questions or discussion, Mr. Corrado moved that, based on the findings of facts outlined in the Staff report dated February 28, 1995, including recommended additions, deletions and amendments, SUB 94-9 be approved subject to the following conditions:

Prior to submittal of final plat:

1. Submit for approval by the City, USA, Washington County and TVFRD engineered construction plans for all public and private utility improvements including sanitary and storm water, sewer, water, street alignments and construction plans, erosion control, street lighting, landscaping, signage and lane striping, utility easements, access easements, and fire hydrants. In addition to standard requirements:
 - a. Review the plat so that the private street south of SW Lynnly Way is designated a public street with a fifty (50) foot right-of-way, complying with the City street design and construction standards for public streets.
 - b. Construct a twenty (20') foot all-weather hard surface extending from the west end of the hammer head turn-around to Tract "B". The easement and approved construction drawings must be approved by

USA and the City.

- c. The property may be subject to water, storm water and sanitary sewer payback agreements.
 - d. Provide a 7-1/2-foot tract on the eastern border of Lot 54 and provide a temporarily improved pedestrian path as well as a cash deposit equal to half the cost to construct a future pathway to Scholls-Sherwood Road.
 - e. Extend the sewer and water easement to connect to Tax Lot 600 (Tax Map 2S1 30AC), the lot adjoining the southwest corner of the subdivision. Provide utility easements to other adjoining properties if determined necessary by the City.
 - f. Provide a water quality facility.
 - g. Provide street names in accordance with City requirements.
 - h. Install "No Parking" signs on the east side of the north/south street.
2. Provide one (1) fire hydrant at or near the intersection of SW Lynnly Way and the proposed "Private Drive Way Tract A" (lots 67 and 60). All proposed hydrants must be located in accordance with district requirements.
 3. Provide a plot plan with each building permit request so that the City can determine which trees are to be preserved. Comply with all applicable requirements of Section 8.304.07, Trees Along Public Streets or on Other Public Property.
 4. All lots must comply with the dimensional requirements and minimum square footage of the MDRH zoning district.
 5. Submit a landscape plan and map for City Staff approval. Comply with all applicable requirements of Section 8.304.06, Trees on Property Subject to Certain Land Use Application. Submit a landscape corridor plan along the SW Scholls-Sherwood Road frontage which describes the plant materials and ground cover to be used. Define the landscape corridor as a 15-foot easement on the Plat.
 6. Comply with Washington County road dedication and

Traffic Impact Analysis requirements for Scholls-Sherwood Road. On the south side of SW Scholls-Sherwood Road the width of the parcel, continue the street improvements that were made in Cedar Creek Park No. 1 and construct a sidewalk.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Claus and carried unanimously.

B. MLP 95-1 Meissinger Minor Land Partition: a two-lot partition on Division Street:

(Note for the Record: Ms. Stewart excused herself from deliberation and participation in discussion and voting on this issue.)

Chairman Birchill called for a Staff Report.

Ms. Nell reported that the Commission is reviewing a minor land partition on Division Street, which will create two lots. Ms. Nell reviewed the Staff Report dated February 28, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's Minute Book. She pointed out that, due to lot size, shape and drainfields for both lots, future development is not possible unless both parcels hook into the City sewer system.

Ms. Nell reviewed the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report and recommended that MLP 95-1, Meissinger, be approved subject to those conditions.

Chairman Birchill opened the public hearing for comments from the applicant and/or proponents.

Bob Loquist, 233 SE Washington Street, Hillsboro, addressed the Commission. Mr. Loquist advised that he is representing the applicant and has read the conditions of approval. He indicated that all parties are in agreement with the conditions. With regard to Condition No. 4, Mr. Loquist pointed out that a fire hydrant already exists at 75 NW Court Street, and inquired whether an additional fire hydrant is necessary. He commented that the applicants are agreeable with the recommendation and urged the Commissioners to approve the request.

Marge Stewart, 575 N. Sherwood Boulevard, No. 59, Sherwood, addressed the Commissioners. Ms. Stewart commented that the partition of the parcel is a reasonable request, and one which she favors. Ms. Stewart stated that she has some problem with not requiring that the applicant hook up to the City sewer at this time. She commented that she is not

comfortable with septic systems adjacent to the City's water supply, and pointed out that about 20 years ago, the property adjacent to the site could not handle the septic system, and was required to connect to the City sewer. Ms. Stewart remarked that in order to connect to the City sewer at the manhole on Lincoln Street, the property adjoining that manhole belongs to the Snyder family and a section belonging to the City, and the property with the septic sewer problem is adjacent to the Meissinger's parcel. Ms. Stewart indicated that many properties in the area had sewer connection problems. She commented that she is concerned about all of the septic systems around the City's water supply. Ms. Stewart stated that, at the time the property owners adjacent to the Meissingers had their problems with the sewer connection, they offered to bring the sewer line up Lincoln Street to their property. However, the City would not allow the extension; a City Councilmember felt it would be a hardship for the property owners to pay the connection fee, approximately \$9,000, to Washington County. She stated that the property owners then had to obtain an easement from a private owner for a private sewer line in order to hook-up via a lower sewer line. Ms. Stewart remarked that the private property owner planted trees over the sewer line, which has created several problems during the past 20 years. Ms. Stewart commented that the City should be responsible for the cost of the sewer line and connection into the City sewer system be made available to the long-time residents in the area.

David Hess, 400 East Division Street, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mr. Hess requested that, if the partition is approved, the sewer line be extended to the south side of Division Street. He remarked that the previous owner of his property had planted the trees and he had dealt with the problems with the private sewer line as stated by Ms. Stewart. Mr. Hess stated that it is time for the City to take care of those problems and urged the Commission to consider extension of the sewer line to the south side of Division Street.

Joan Tasker, 475 East Division Street, Sherwood, addressed the Commission. Mrs. Tasker advised that she is the person with the private sewer line, and there has always been problems with the line, and since trees had been planted over the line, the problems will continue. Mrs. Tasker stated that she will either have to install a new line, or hook up to the City's sewer, and is concerned with what will happen when her property has to hook into the City's sewer. She pointed out that for 25 years she has maintained the private line, down a hill into the City's system.

Ms. Stewart again addressed the Commission. She pointed out that the house on the north side of Division Street could hook into Division Street; however, the houses below have to go down the hill via a private line to hook into the City's sewer line.

Mr. Loquist, representing the applicants, addressed the Commission. He pointed out that the City has two options to assure availability of sewer hook-up, a non-remonstrance agreement or formation of an LID, and urged that the Commission not delay approval of the project.

Chairman Birchill next opened the public hearing for comments from opponents. There being no further testimony, Chairman Birchill closed the public hearing. He pointed out that the public hearing may be re-opened at the request of a Commissioner.

In response to Mr. Hohnbaum's questions regarding the City's sewer line, access for the lower lots on Division Street, and the private sewer lines, Ms. Connell pointed out that the sewer line is at the end of and parallels Division Street. She pointed out that the depth of the lots would require easements through some property in order to access the City's line, which is below the parcels. Ms. Connell commented that the private line has an easement across Tax Lot 300, the line crosses Division Street and was done 25 years ago when the property owner negotiated an easement with the home owner and the private line connects to a sewer line below Division Street.

Mr. Corrado suggested that Staff deal with the sewer issue separately and requested that a letter be sent to the City Council explaining the situation and requesting that the City rectify, and participate in the design and installation of the sewer to the properties being discussed.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Hohnbaum moved, seconded by Mr. Shannon, that MLP 95-1 be approved based on the findings of facts outlined in the Staff report dated February 28, 1995, and subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall enter into a non-remonstrance agreement with the City for future public road and utility improvements adjoining the site.
2. Obtain a permit from the Washington County Department of Health and Human Services for the installation of the on-site sewage disposal system (septic system).
3. The applicant shall enter into an access easement and maintenance agreement with the owner of Lot 2 and record with the partition at Washington County.
4. Locate a fire hydrant within 500 feet of the new dwelling unit if not already provided.

Ms. Claus requested that Ms. Connell contact Washington County and if there is a problem with the perk test or sewerage, that the Commission make a commitment through the City Council and that Ms. Connell bring the sewer/septic problems to the attention of the City Engineer for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Upon call of the question, the motion carried unanimously.

C. SP 95-2 Intermediate School Addition: a 19,600 square foot addition to the existing School on North Sherwood Boulevard:

Chairman Birchill called for a staff report.

Ms. Connell pointed out the reference in the Staff Report to Elementary School should be "Intermediate School". Ms. Connell provided an in-depth review of the Staff report dated February 28, 1995, a complete copy of which is contained in the Commission's minute book. She pointed out that the addition will accommodate 175 additional students, and the number of classrooms will increase to 27. Ms. Connell commented that the laurel hedge between the School and the PGE building will have to be removed to accommodate additional parking.

Ms. Connell reviewed the landscaping plan and noted that the details of the plant materials is missing and will be required for review and approval by Staff.

Ms. Connell discussed the pedestrian facilities and traffic report and noted that the School District should avoid using the new access as a "drop-off" for students. She remarked that there is a walking access between the school and the residential area to the south. Ms. Connell requested that the applicant recommend location of cross walks from the south corner of the project to the nearby streets. Ms. Connell pointed out that the circulation pattern for several streets are down-graded in the Traffic Report to a service level of D. She recommended that the City review the service levels and consider improvements rather than watching levels deteriorate further. Ms. Connell also recommended that the City Council be urged to consider installing stop signs at Pine and Oregon and at Pine and Third in order to better control traffic.

With regard to open spaces, Ms. Connell noted that the City, in concert with the School District, plans to build two new tennis courts and a full basketball court at the school site

and recommended that the sight plan be revised to include those facilities.

In conclusion, Ms. Connell reviewed the conditions of approval and recommended the following revisions:

1. Revise Condition No. 4 to require detailed design for traffic and pedestrian movements.
2. Require wheel stops at new full-time parking stalls.
3. Condition No. 9 is considered a directive for staff.

Chairman Birchill opened the public hearing for testimony from the applicant and proponents.

Norm Dull, Dull-Olson-Weekes, 319 SW Washington, Portland, addressed the Commission. Mr. Dull advised that he had additional information on the site and access to the site at the Intermediate School and he would address those issues. He pointed out that Mr. Peter Coffee of DKS is also in attendance and will address questions related to the traffic report.

Mr. Dull commented that two options for separating pedestrian, bus and vehicle movements had been presented to the School Board; he distributed the report to the Commissioners, a copy of which has been placed in the Commission's minute book. He pointed out that Option A is the preferred option, and the idea behind the options is that one converts the driveway in front of the school to a student drop-off area via a tighter arch that currently exists and creates improved circulation for buses. Mr. Dull reviewed the diagrams and contents of the circulations plans. In response to Ms. Stewart's questions regarding parking during special events at the school, Mr. Dull pointed out that additional parking is available at the gravel area south of the School and access to that area is available.

Peter Coffee, DKS, 921 SW Washington, Portland, addressed the Commission. Mr. Coffee advised that the District plan, which is not indicated on any of the options, is that 15 additional parking spaces will become available when the District office moves to the new school. With regard to stop signs at Third and Oregon, Mr. Coffee noted that the traffic analysis was based on a lot of new development, approximately 2600 new homes. He commented that the stop sign should be discussed in terms of when the new development is completed, there will be a need for a stop sign.

Dan Hess, Project Engineer, Dull-Olson-Weeks, 319 SW Washington, Portland, addressed the Commission. Mr. Hess advised that he is the project engineer for the school addition and offered to answer any questions the Commissioners may have with regard to the design of the building.

There being no further proponent testimony, Chairman Birchill opened the public hearing for testimony or comments from opponents.

Richard Grooman, 3134 NW Neptune Avenue, Lincoln City, addressed the Commission. Mr. Grooman advised that he owns the property south of the proposed school addition and felt that he had not received adequate information. He commented that he is reserving the option to speak in favor or in opposition of the project until it is determined how the addition will affect his property, which is the closest neighboring property. Mr. Grooman stated that he had seen nothing of the plans or details, he was only told there will be a fence between the property to preserve or try to maintain access to keep his property inaccessible and to keep the children from running across and littering his property.

Mr. Grooman requested that he be provided more information from the City as to how his property is affected; i.e., sidewalks, drainage or any additional sewers or any thing else that would become his personal problem. Chairman Birchill advised Mr. Grooman that he had been notified of the hearing and it is his responsibility to obtain information from the City Staff. Mr. Grooman stated that he was just involved with a project of Tualatin-Sherwood Road, and is very leery of new construction and the greater benefit to the City of Sherwood. He commented that he lost property because of the sewer project on Tualatin-Sherwood Road. Mr. Grooman remarked that he felt there had been a great misrepresentation with the project on Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

In response to Commissioner Shannon's questions, Mr. Grooman remarked that he would support any fencing to forego any trespassing. He stated that he had talked to school administration several months ago and was advised that he would be informed of that. Mr. Grooman inquired as to what is the purpose of the loading zone at the east end of the school, and the access at the area will create a lot of activity, which he would like to see curtailed, or that the school district consider purchasing his property. With regard to the alley from Second Street, Mr. Grooman questioned if the alley will be enlarged for use by the school. Mr. Dull responded that the school district is planning to install a 6-foot chain link fence along the alley

and will close off the alley. Mr. Grooman then inquired as to whom will be responsible for removal of the laurel hedge. He stated that he is not opposed to removal, only curious as to who will be using the sidewalks. Ms. Connell responded that no drop-off traffic will enter in the new driveway, and the plan is that the area will be for pedestrians and service personnel only. She pointed out that the City is recommending vehicle use only by administration.

There being no further testimony, Chairman Birchill closed the public hearing. He commented that the public hearing may be re-opened at any time at the request of the Commissioners.

In response to Ms. Claus' questions, Mr. Grooman indicated that he had no objections to the school's addition, he had only questions and would like to know how much his property will be affected by LIDs for improvements. Ms. Connell responded that there will be no LIDs involved, and there is no financial obligation to be placed on Mr. Grooman's property.

In response to Mr. Hohnbaum's question regarding the letter from the Fire Department, Ms. Connell advised that the School District must meet hydrant and access requirements, both of which must be approved by the Fire Department. Mr. Coffee advised that a second letter had been received from Mr. Tobias which indicates that TVFR requirements have been met. Mr. Hohnbaum pointed out that the issue of crosswalks and maintenance of crosswalks must be approved by the City Council and suggested that Staff direct the issue to Council. He commented that he is not comfortable with the Planning Commission making crosswalk decision. Ms. Connell commented that the conditions of approval contained in the Staff report had been reviewed with the City Manager, who is comfortable with the condition.

Mr. Hohnbaum questioned the off-street parking requirement of two stalls per teacher and requested that the standard be clarified as to whether the standard applies to other employees; and, are the planned improvements for the parking lot the same for employees such as bus drivers and shop maintenance workers? Ms. Connell responded that the standard reads two parking stalls per teacher for junior high school. School Superintendent Dr. Hill directed the Commissioners' attention to the drawings which were distributed earlier and advised that additional parking is provided for bus drivers and shop maintenance workers as illustrated on the drawings. He pointed out that a significant drop in students enrollment at Hopkins School is anticipated, which will free-up some parking space, and the goal is to separate buses from

personal vehicle traffic.

In response to Ms. Claus' questions, Mr. Dull suggested that the words "full-time" be added to Condition No. 7 between the words "new" and "parking".

Mr. Hohnbaum moved that SP 95-2 be approved based on the findings of fact outlined in the Staff Report dated February 28, 1995, with the following amendments: 1) add TVFRD and Washington County to the list of required approvals in Condition No. 1; 2) add the words "full-time" to Condition No. 7. The motion was seconded by Mr. Corrado.

Ms. Claus questioned Condition No. 8 and whether posting of signs would resolve the access restrictions. After a brief discussion, Staff was directed to contact other school districts to determine if and what procedure had been successful, then work with the school district to resolve limiting access problems.

Ms. Claus suggested that the motion to approve SP 95-2 be amended to include a revision to Condition No. 4 to require the applicant to provide a detailed design for Option A to separate traffic and pedestrian movement at the north driveway onto Sherwood Boulevard and designate parking for buses as well as bus driver's personal vehicles on the site.

Mr. Hohnbaum accepted the above amendment to the motion; Mr. Corrado also accepted the amendment.

There being no further discussion, upon call of the question, the motion to approve SP 95-2 subject to the following conditions, carried unanimously:

Prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Submit for City and TVFRD approval detailed construction plans for all public improvements including but not limited to, sanitary sewer, storm water, water service, street improvements, erosion control, fire protection, outdoor lighting, and private utilities.
2. Dedicate to the City ten (10') feet of N. Sherwood Blvd. frontage the width of the parcel for street right-of-way purposes.
3. Provide a recommendation for City Staff approval identifying the preferred location of pedestrian crosswalks from the adjacent neighborhood to the SE

corner access area. The City will mark and maintain the crosswalks.

4. Provide for Staff approval a detailed design for Option A separating traffic and pedestrian movements at the northern driveway onto North Sherwood Boulevard, and delineating bus drivers' personal vehicle parking on the site.
5. Provide a plant materials list that corresponds to the landscape plan, for City Staff approval.
6. For storm water assessment purposes, provide the City with revised square footages reflecting the additional impermeable surface of the remodel.
7. Provide wheel stops or curbing in front of all new permanent parking stalls.
8. The new access drive onto Second and Ash Streets is restricted to service vehicles and school personnel only. Student drop-offs at the service entry are prohibited, as determined by the District and Staff.
9. Staff will prepare a memorandum to City Council requesting action on the applicant's Traffic Report recommendations for the intersection of Pine at Oregon Street.

7. **Director's Report**

Ms. Connell advised that the State Legislature passed a bill on historic designation requiring home owner consent. She commented that it will now be necessary to amend the City's recently adopted ordinance to comply with the new legislation.

8. **Adjournment:**

There being no further items before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Cary
Deputy City Recorder