

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Special Planning Commission Meeting

July 5, 1995

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Birchill called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM. It was noted that this was a special meeting to review the Transportation Planning Rule and rules developed for that criteria. Commission members present: Chairman Gene Birchill, Vice-Chairman Chris Corrado (7:35 PM), George Bechtold, Susan Claus (7:20 PM), Rick Hohnbaum, Kenneth Shannon and Marge Stewart. Planning Director Carole Connell and Secretary Roxanne Gibbons were also present.

2. Minutes of June 20, 1995 Meeting

Chairman Birchill asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes of June 20, 1995. There being none,

Rick Hohnbaum moved the June 20, 1995 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes be accepted as submitted. The motion was seconded by Marge Stewart and carried unanimously.

3. Community Comments

Chairman Birchill called for comments from the audience regarding any items not on the printed agenda.

Clyde List, 21235 SW Pacific Highway, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Mr. List said in following the suggestion of the Commission from it's last meeting to help generate citizen interest and input in the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Plan and Code Amendments, he submitted information to the Sherwood Gazette. One article was not printed, but the Gazette did print a copy of the TPR Concept Map. Mr. List stated in many towns on the West Coast and in Europe there are constituencies for the type of changes the TPR advises. One example is the City of Seattle being very aggressive in giving the right-of-way back to the bicyclist. Another example is Copenhagen where they have prohibited automobiles in its historic district. He said there is a constituency out there and wanted the Commission to be aware of it.

There being no further comments, Chairman Birchill moved to the next Agenda item.

4. Public Hearing

Chairman Birchill announced this is a continued public hearing on the Transportation Planning Rule Plan and Code Amendments.

4.A. PA 95-2 Transportation Planning Rule Plan and Code (continued)

Carole Connell said the purpose of the meeting is to focus on the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Plan and Code amendments. The

final report has been submitted to the State by McKeever/Morris and the grant is complete. However, the Planning Commission and City Council will be able to modify this report.

Ms. Connell reported the City Council reviewed the TPR report at the June 27, 1995 regular meeting. Mayor Hitchcock made several comments. These included 1) Concern about the 80% density requirement, 2) Concern about the paved pathways recommendation, 3) Concern about eliminating cul-de-sacs, 4) Questioned the statement of equal funding for streets, pathways and bicycles and what this means, 5) Vision for Highway 99W really being a pedestrian environment, 6) Bicycle parking and garages wording "shall be required" should be "may be required", 7) Would like to know how far the City can go with the TPR to meet State requirements (mandatory).

In response to Rick Hohnbaum's question, Ms. Connell said in the report it is difficult to sort out state mandated rules from what is written in the TPR report.

Ms. Connell referred the Commission to the Concept Map. The undeveloped areas in the multi-modal corridors which would be affected by the new standards have been highlighted. Mr. Liden was concerned that some of these parcels would go beyond the 200 feet standard and be subject to conditions.

Marge Stewart asked what part of the information received by the Commission was included in the TPR report to the State. Ms. Connell responded the information received in the packets contained introduction and discussion material as well as specific Code and Plan amendments. Ms. Stewart stated the section that stressed Sherwood was within an urban area within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), not a rural community, was important and should be included in the amendments. Keith Liden, McKeever/Morris, Inc., said these comments could be incorporated into the TPR Plan, including the discussion relative to the background information on the recommended policies. The Commission agreed with this suggestion because it is important for people looking at the plan 20 years from now to understand why a certain rule was developed.

Ms. Connell said the report should also include the description of the multi-modal corridors, North Sherwood Boulevard, Oregon Street, Old Town, Tualatin-Sherwood Road, Enhanced Pedestrian Corridors, Bicycle Routes and Pedestrian and Bicycle Pathways.

Chairman Birchill asked Mr. Liden to review the specific areas contained in the report where the Commission still had questions. The Commission agreed the discussion would be interactive in trying to come to a consensus on specific issues.

Mr. Liden reported that following the June 20, 1995 Commission meeting, he incorporated all the recommendations into the revised Concept Map and TPR report. The TPR report included illustrations with the text. At the June 27, 1995, Council meeting, Mr. Liden reviewed the report and identified areas where he felt there were

still some questions. The multi-modal corridors apply to Highway 99W, North Sherwood Boulevard, Oregon Street, Old Town, and Tualatin-Sherwood Road. These routes are the most likely to have some type of transit system, e.g., Tri-Met. The routes should also include some suitable pedestrian environments to walk on and bicycle lanes. Building orientation should encourage pedestrian travel. The recommendation included some higher residential densities along these corridors. Mr. Liden said to support transit, corridor designation is proposed to require that the residential development occur at a minimum of 80% of the maximum density allowed by the underlying zone. To encourage more residential development in these corridors the amendments allow residential development as a secondary use to commercial or industrial use.

Marge Stewart said at one time the bus line extended to Sunset Boulevard and down through Sherwood Old Town and this could be included as a part of the report.

Mr. Liden said the most speculative part of the report was the Highway 99W corridor. The Commission reviewed the Concept Map identifying the corridors and specific undeveloped parcels. The corridor designation within 200 feet of a street requirement really only affects residential zoned properties. The Concept Map does not show all of the collector and arterial streets. The Transportation Update includes most collector and arterial streets. There are streets not shown on the map that would have bike lanes. The difference is there would not be an enhanced pedestrian environment. However, these streets would contain the Transportation Plan requirements relative to sidewalks and bicycle lanes.

The Commission continued to review the Concept Map and made several recommendations. Ms. Connell suggested the Future Employment & Residential Concentrations and Downtown Core identifiers be removed from the Concept Map. The Commission agreed with this recommendation. In response to Ms. Stewart's question, Ms. Connell will determine if Brookman Road is within the City's jurisdiction and whether it is designated as an arterial or collector street. Chris Corrado said at some point the Commission would need to agree with what is shown on the Concept Map and recognize this map is not all inclusive. Ms. Connell said the information should at least be consistent.

The Commission discussed how to incorporate the Concept Map into the City Transportation Plan and Map. Mr. Hohnbaum recommended the City Council should be encouraged to update the Transportation Plan when they reviewed this report. Mr. Liden said the land use issues could be shown on the City Zoning Map and include the corresponding provisions in the City Zoning Code.

Chairman Birchill asked Mr. Liden how the 80% density would be measured. Mr. Liden responded you would look at the maximum number of allowable units on a particular piece of property, given

the existing zoning and development, and calculate 80% based on this number. The TPR report recommends a minimum residential density standard for residential zones that is 80% of the maximum permitted by the base zoning district. Ms. Connell said a good example would be Sherwood Village. Chairman Birchill stated his concern is if the City does not have a density requirement, when it comes time to move the Urban Growth Boundary lines the Boundary Commission will review the City's densities and conclude the City has only a portion of what it is supposed to have. From a growth standpoint, this could potentially hurt the City. Mr. Shannon reviewed how difficult it was to establish the City's UGB and become a part of the Portland UGB. He felt when the time comes to move the UGB, the City would need to have a lot of development already in place in order to identify City needs to the Boundary Commission. Considerable discussion followed regarding the 80% density requirement.

Susan Claus said density was only part of the question. In addition, there is the question of services, extension of the UGB and system development charges. The TPR report only references residentially zoned properties in the multi-modal corridors. Only a few parcels would be subject to this density requirement, including some small lots in Old Town. The report also encourages development of mixed use, residential and commercial or industrial. The Planning Commission discussed whether the 80% density would have much impact.

Rick Hohnbaum asked if the plan was to have Highway 99W developed at 80% density with future bus stops along the highway. Ms. Connell said at this time Tri-Met does not go down Highway 99W and that Tri-Met schedules its routes in response to the demands of the public.

George Bechtold said the 80% maximum density allowance seemed to leave a gap in the current Code requirements. Ms. Connell said the recommendation in the report would help close this gap. Again, the 80% requirement would only affect the multi-modal corridors.

Chairman Birchill asked the Commission for a consensus on the 80% density requirement. At this point Commissioners Hohnbaum, Shannon, and Corrado felt the 80% density, as applied in the report, was acceptable. Commissioners Stewart, Bechtold and Claus questioned the need for the 80% density requirement.

Ms. Claus said the 80% density, as referenced in the TPR, is irrelevant because if the document is going to stand the test of time, there may be a reason to include something in the report referencing redevelopment. The 80% density requirement only affects a couple of properties. Ms. Claus suggested the 80% density requirement should be dealt with in a different form. She said if the Commission is seriously going to consider an 80% density requirement, it should be applied to more than just two properties and economics should be considered. Mr. Hohnbaum said

the Planning Commission should be dealing with planning issues and not economics. Mr. Bechtold said he would like to see more definition toward the mixed use requirement. He felt the 80% density requirement in the report is not what the Commission really would want and he did not support it in this form. Chairman Birchill said he supported the 80% density requirement, but was not sure the TPR report was the proper place or way to deal with it at this point because it does not impact that many properties. Mr. Liden agreed that the 80% density did not impact many properties and the Commission may want to discuss how to use system development charges as a way to encourage people, possibly through financial incentives, to have more density where the City is in the best position to serve the residents. Mr. Liden suggested the Commission review the City of Gresham's transportation impact fees in developing SDC or TIF incentives.

Following a second informal vote of the Commission, Chairman Birchill announced the general consensus was the 80% density requirement is not as important as it first appeared and the report may not be the proper place to deal with it.

The Planning Commission agreed to remove all references to the 80% density requirement from the TPR Report All other Multi-Modal Transportation Corridor (MTC) code amendments would remain the same.

Chairman Birchill asked Ms. Connell to include as a future agenda item further discussion on density requirements which would be included in planning documents. This discussion would include zoning, commercial and industrial mix.

The Commission reviewed cul-de-sacs and their reference to Section 6.305.06 in the Code. Mr. Hohnbaum said he agreed with the language as written. Chairman Birchill concurred with the language in the report limiting the use of cul-de-sacs. He referenced his neighborhood as an example. When the dead-end streets were finally opened as "through" streets the traffic and speeding problems subsided considerably. This occurred even with the substantial increase of houses in the area. Ms. Claus said she was not in favor of the language as written because it seemed to be too restrictive. She asked who determined if a developer meets the criteria and whether or not this is an arbitrary decision. Mr. Liden responded that generally speaking, the view in current planning is to move away from cul-de-sacs. Streets that go through and connect allow for easier movement in neighborhoods, both by automobiles and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Corrado said he did not feel this language would preclude cul-de-sacs in future development. Ms. Connell said the language would permit the Commission to decide where cul-de-sacs should be allowed and the parameters that needed to be met. Following further discussion,

The Planning Commission recommended leaving the language relative to cul-de-sacs referencing Section

6.305.06 of the Code as written.

In response to Ms. Stewart's question, Mr. Liden said page 9 of the TPR report paraphrased current City policies.

Ms. Connell asked for clarification regarding the illustration of Highway 99W on page 10 of the TPR report. Mr. Liden responded the illustration shows what the City is trying to achieve. The main point is the City would have some landscape or physical separation between sidewalks and the highway traffic lanes. The illustration is a concept for what the Highway 99W crossings may look like. Ms. Claus questioned the size of the trees shown on the illustration, particularly in reference to exposure and being able to see businesses along the highway. Chairman Birchill stated studies have shown that when streets are lined with trees it tends to slow traffic down. Slower traffic will be more aware of the surrounding environment. Mr. Liden said street tree requirements are common and the trees shown on the illustration would probably be placed at the crossings of Highway 99W. Much of the enhanced pedestrian environment along Highway 99W will have to be coordinated with ODOT. The Commission agreed that Highway 99W would not be a place where pedestrians would want to take a walk, but the highway did need to be more pedestrian friendly. The Commission agreed with the concepts on the illustration and that it would be titled appropriately.

Mr. Liden discussed Item E, page 15, Plan Implementation, Policy 9, "The City shall consider alternative modes of transportation to the automobile to be of equal importance when transportation facilities are funded, constructed, improved or maintained." Mr. Liden said the concern is if people take this statement to mean that the City will provide equal amounts of money for alternative modes of transportation to the automobile. The intent of this goal was not to spend an equal amount of funds, but that walking, bicycling and transit would be treated as legitimate forms of transportation. After discussing alternative wording, it was the consensus of the Commission to leave the wording as originally written.

Mr. Liden referred the Commission to Item C, page 21, Transportation Plan, Policy 9, "The City shall establish a 'Multi-modal Transportation Corridor' overlay zone which provides for the following within 200 feet of the street within the corridor...." referencing the word "standards". In response to Ms. Connell's question, Mr. Liden said the report was written as a standard. The Commission agreed with the "standard" concept.

Ms. Connell referred the Commission to Item 0.4, page 23, Community Design, Policies and Strategies, "Require new commercial and multi-family buildings to be located and oriented in a manner which provides a pleasant walking environment." Ms. Connell asked if this is or should be applied to Highway 99W. Mr. Liden responded this is a policy and should apply to Highway 99W.

The Commission reviewed the recommended code amendments referencing the Multi-modal Transportation Corridor Overlay Zone (MTC), beginning on page 24 of the report. Under Section 2.204.02, Applicability, Ms. Connell said the 200 feet requirement would take in the whole parcel. Mr. Liden said a practical problem that may arise is in trying to apply a standard to only a portion of the property. Mr. Liden suggested using a percentage of the area as a calculation. If the minimum density requirement is removed then these requirements would pertain to special requirements such as building orientation, setbacks and windows. Chairman Birchill asked where the 200 feet would be measured from. Ms. Connell responded it should be measured from the property line. The Commission agreed it should be specified where the line is measured from and that it should be measured from the property line.

Mr. Liden explained two options referencing page 26, 2.204.04, Special Requirements for Highway 99W, A. Building Setbacks, "Development in commercial zones shall have a maximum setback of 100 feet from the street frontage on 99W." One option is to have a maximum setback of 100 feet. An important consideration here is from which point(s) of buildings to measure the setback. As an alternative to Subsections A and B, pedestrian plazas shall be permitted when all of the following standards are satisfied...". Ms. Connell stated she was having a hard time trying to picture the pedestrian plazas on Highway 99W.

Ms. Claus said an overlay placed on certain Highway 99W properties which would require that buildings be within 100 feet of the road would be an additional constraint. One of the constraints would be access. Ms. Claus said it is hard to make a blanket statement when there are different pieces and uses for properties. The Commission discussed how this requirement would be applied. Mr. Hohnbaum said the ideal way to deal with this requirement is not to deal with access from Highway 99W, but to deal with it by access from the backside of the property. Ms. Claus said the ODOT corridor study that includes travel to Lincoln City is not going to specify where accesses will be located until a definite development is identified. Ms. Claus continued that it is very difficult to apply standards to Highway 99W when the Commission does not know how ODOT is going to react.

Chairman Birchill said he agreed with much of what Ms. Claus was saying. However, if the Commission wants to have the Sherwood area of Highway 99W look like Tigard, then they would proceed with no plan. A City plan will provide more consistency as well as information to show ODOT. Ms. Claus said the point she was making was following a meeting with ODOT it became very apparent to her that ODOT wanted Sherwood to do the homework. ODOT did not want to commit any time or funds to Highway 99W planning. It was Ms. Claus' opinion that ODOT will try to limit whatever the City tries to do on Highway 99W, but will consider what the City wants to do on Highway 99W.

Chairman Birchill asked for clarification on the 100 feet setback requirement. Mr. Liden responded many of the setbacks and orientation in the report are directed towards major transit stops. However, the City does not have these type of stops on Highway 99W at this time.

Ms. Connell said she was not sure what the Commission would be achieving with the 100 feet setback requirement. Mr. Liden suggested focusing attention not so much on Highway 99W, but focus the attention more on the basic issue of how people will get from Building A to Building B, on foot or bicycle and connections between commercial developments. Considerable discussion followed regarding connections between commercial developments and accessibility for pedestrians. Mr. Corrado agreed that Highway 99W should be made as pedestrian friendly as possible, but pedestrian traffic is not what drives businesses on the highway. Mr. Liden said what he was hearing from the Commission is to forget the setback requirements and focus more on accommodating the connectivity on a case by case basis. Chairman Birchill said the State of Oregon Building Code will require sidewalks from Highway 99W to businesses.

Mr. Hohnbaum said he would advocate that the Commission use the commercial connection to join residential neighborhoods by providing access between the access points which they are requiring exist between commercial and residential properties. Mr. Liden said the Commission could remove a few of the sections relative to setbacks and determine if there are requirements for pedestrian connections between properties that would be different from the general requirements. Mr. Liden said pages 17 and 18 of the report, Recommended Code Amendments, 6.805 and 7.403 would apply to anywhere in the City and addressed the issue the Commission was discussing. Ms. Connell said the public facilities section of the Code would apply. It was the consensus of the Commission to leave in the setback requirements.

The Commission agreed to remove Section 2.204.04, Special Requirements for Highway 99W, beginning on page 26, from the report. Section 2.204.05, Special Requirements for North Sherwood Boulevard, Oregon Street and Downtown would remain a part of the report.

With the consent of the Commission, Chairman Birchill announced the Transportation Planning Rule Plan and Code amendments public hearing would be continued to the July 18, 1995 Planning Commission meeting. The Commission will set aside 45 minutes to continue their review and discussion. The meeting will begin at 7:00 PM. Ms. Claus suggested Commission members come prepared with a list of questions. A revised copy of the report will be mailed to the Commission with the regular packet for the July 18 meeting.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne Gibbons
Planning Commission Secretary