

City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting

October 17, 1995

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Gene Birchill called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. Commission members present: Chairman Gene Birchill, Vice-Chairman Chris Corrado, George Bechtold, Susan Claus, Rick Hohnbaum, and Marge Stewart. Commissioner Kenneth Shannon was absent and excused. Planning Director Carole Connell, Assistant Planner Lisa Nell, and Secretary Roxanne Gibbons were also present.

2. Minutes of October 3, 1995 Commission Meeting

Chairman Birchill asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes of October 3, 1995. There being no comments, corrections or additions,

Rick Hohnbaum moved the Planning Commission accept the October 3, 1995 Commission meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

5. Director's Report

Carole Connell directed the Commission's attention to a brochure from the Oregon Department of Transportation regarding the Corridor Planning Project. Several open houses are scheduled in October and mid-November to discuss corridor-wide needs. Copies were distributed to the Commission Members (Mr. Shannon's copy will be mailed).

Ms. Connell referred the Commission to a request from Brian Keicher representing the Sherwood Business Park. The owner is requesting a minor revision to the design approval received for Phase III and Phase IV. Instead of installing the solid white steel roll-up doors on the 99W side of the building, the owner and the existing tenants would like to see full height glass roll-up doors. This change would give the tenants better visibility for their merchandise and generally upgrade the appearance of the project. It would also reduce the tenant's impulse to display their products in the parking lot. Ms. Connell said the doors would cost more, but may improve the appearance of the site. The site is zoned Light Industrial which allows general commercial which allows retail.

Rick Hohnbaum moved the Planning Commission accept the proposed change from Brian Keicher and approve the request for Sherwood Business Park to install glass roll-up doors on the 99W side of the building for Phase III and Phase IV. The motion was seconded by Chris Corrado and carried unanimously.

Ms. Connell clarified that the discussion at the last meeting regarding the lumber

yard was the lumber yard located on Tualatin-Sherwood Road, not the Garrigus Building. To-date, she has not heard anything from the owners regarding the store front improvements. Chairman Birchill suggested another letter be sent to the owner.

3. Community Comments

Chairman Birchill called for comments from the audience regarding any items not on the printed agenda. There being no comments, Chairman Birchill moved to the next agenda item.

4. Public Hearings

Chairman Birchill reviewed the public hearing process, read the hearings disclosure statement and requested that Commission members reveal any conflict of interest, ex-parte contact or bias regarding any issues on the agenda.

George Bechtold announced he would not be participating in Item 4C SUB 95-3 Woodhaven due to a possible conflict of interest. Chris Corrado announced he attended the open house invitation from Genstar for Woodhaven and did not believe this would impact his decision-making ability. Rick Hohnbaum announced his wife is an employee of the Sherwood School District and he would decide at the time of the hearing whether or not to participate in Items 4D and 4E regarding the School District Administration Office and High School Remodel respectively. Chris Corrado announced he saw Dr. Hill at the Onion Festival. Dr. Hill mentioned the upcoming applications for the District and a concern regarding setbacks. Mr. Corrado responded he had not yet read the packet and therefore did not have a response for Dr. Hill.

In response to Susan Claus's question, Ms. Connell said MLP 95-6 would not be heard tonight. Chairman Birchill announced he met with Norm Dull today to discuss building construction requirements for the High School, but did not discuss anything specific to the conditions. He did not feel this would affect his decisions regarding the School District agenda items. Mr. Bechtold announced his wife also works for the Sherwood School District, but did not feel this would affect his decision-making regarding the appropriate agenda items.

4A. MLP 95-6 Claus

Marge Stewart moved that MLP 95-6 Claus, a two-lot minor land partition request on South Sherwood Boulevard, be continued to the November 7, 1995 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Chris Corrado and carried with 5 ayes and Susan Claus abstaining.

4B. SP 95-11 Clopton

Ms. Connell stated that the applicant has run into an access problem to the site with Washington County. Staff is waiting for revised plans so a determination can be made on when to review this application pending more specific information.

Chairman Birchill tabled, to no date specific, SP 95-11 Clopton, Site Plan request for a contractor's business on Tualatin-Sherwood Road.

4C. SUB 95-3 Woodhaven Phase 2

Chairman Birchill called for the Staff Report. This application was not heard at the October 3, 1995 Commission meeting due to a lack of a quorum. Lisa Nell reported this is a request for preliminary plat approval of Woodhaven Phase 2 A-C Preliminary Subdivision Plat. Ms. Nell referred the Commission to the letter of explanation dated October 3, 1995 and Staff Report dated September 26, 1995, a complete copy of which are included in the Commission's minutes book.

Ms. Nell also directed the Commission's attention to the decision notice from the City Council for PUD 93-3 Phase 2 of the Woodhaven Final PUD Master Plan dated September 27, 1995 and **revised** decision notice dated October 16, 1995.

Ms. Nell reported there are a total of 5 phases in the Woodhaven PUD development with numerous neighborhood areas. Phase 2A-C of Woodhaven is a 34.82 acre site and the preliminary plat proposes 116 lots and 6 tracts. The project is zoned LDR with a PUD overlay and the preliminary plat meets all of the zoning requirements as approved with the Woodhaven PUD Final Master Plan. Staff recommends that Conditions 10 and 11 (pg. 19) be deleted because they are repeated as Conditions 2 and 16. Ms. Nell reviewed the other recommended changes to the stated conditions.

In conclusion, Ms. Nell stated based on the findings of fact, agency comments and Council modifications, Staff recommends approval of SUB 95-3 Woodhaven Phase 2 A-C Preliminary Plat subject to the conditions as listed in the Staff Report and revision recommended by Staff.

Chairman Birchill asked if the applicant wished to provide any comments.

David Bantz, Genstar Land Company Northwest, 11515 SW Durham Road, Suite E-9, Tigard, Oregon 97224, representing the applicant, addressed the Commission. Mr. Bantz stated that the additional density approved by the City Council (19 units which allows a total of 1287 dwelling units from the 1268) was not at the request of the applicant. The motion to increase the density was made after the public hearing was closed. Mr. Bantz said Commissioner Hohnbaum had made a similar motion at a previous Commission meeting, but the motion died due to a lack of a second. Regarding the conditions for this application, all of the questions the applicant had were discussed with Staff and affirmed for presentation. Mr. Bantz said he would be happy to answer any questions from the Commission.

Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application. There being no further proponent testimony, Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the proposal. There being no opponent testimony, Chairman Birchill dispensed with the rebuttal portion of the hearing and closed the public hearing,

unless a Commission member asked that it be reopened for additional testimony, for discussion and comments by the Commission.

Susan Claus asked for clarification of the Revised Decision Notice dated October 16, 1995, Condition #5 regarding Woodhaven maintaining the Sunset Boulevard landscaping adjacent to Woodhaven for one year after the City's acceptance of the public improvements for the final phase of Woodhaven or whenever an alternative means of maintenance is established, whichever occurs first. Ms. Claus asked what alternative means of maintenance was being contemplated at this time. Ms. Connell responded there were no alternatives being considered at this time and what the Council discussed was generic in nature, such as a possible tax assessment. This kind of assessment would apply to all landscaping strips within the City, not just Woodhaven. This type of decision would be made by the City Council.

Marge Stewart asked for clarification regarding Council approval for corner lot dimensions in future phases. Ms. Connell responded that the Council's concern was that the corner lots could be too small and site distance requirements for fences or sheds would not meet the Code. Ms. Connell said the City Code is not adequate in this regard. She agreed that this process could be somewhat cumbersome for the Council. The condition would apply to future phases of Woodhaven. Mr. Bantz said it was his interpretation that the Council would review the corner lot dimensions with all subsequent phases. The concern was fences being constructed that did not meet Woodhaven or City restrictions and these restrictions not being enforced. Chairman Birchill suggested Mr. Bantz may want to get further clarification from the Council regarding this condition. Ms. Nell advised that Condition #13 referencing parking on Vine Drive should be on one side of the street with bike lanes on the other side of the street, five foot sidewalks on both sides of the street and "No Parking Signs" located on one side of the street. There being no further questions or comments by the Commission,

Chris Corrado moved based upon findings of fact, Staff recommendations and conditions as revised, that SUB 95-3 Woodhaven Phase 2A-C Preliminary Plat for a 116 single-family lot subdivision, be approved by the Commission subject to the conditions as stated in the Decision Notice dated October 19, 1995, which are attached to and made a part of these minutes. The motion was seconded by Marge Stewart and carried unanimously. Commissioner Bechtold did not participate in the discussion or decision.

4D. CUP 95-3 & SP 95-8 School District Administration Office

Chairman Birchill called for the Staff Report. Rick Hohnbaum stated his wife is a part-time employee of the School District, however he did not see a direct financial conflict for this particular application. Her hours may increase as the District grows and Mr. Hohnbaum asked that this be made a part of the record.

Carole Connell reported this is a site plan and conditional use permit request by the Sherwood School District to construct an administration building on South Sherwood Boulevard. This dual application will require two motions. Ms. Connell referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated October 10, 1995, a complete copy of which is included in the Commission's minutes book.

Ms. Connell reviewed the findings of facts contained in the Staff Report. The request is for a 3200 square foot office administration building for the School District. The site is located on a 2.92 acre vacant parcel on South Sherwood Boulevard. The District proposes to construct an office building toward the front of the site. There is a pathway that crosses the south side of the property to Archer Glen School. The parcel is 609 feet deep, 235 feet wide in the rear, narrowing to 136 feet of frontage on Sherwood Boulevard. There are no known significant natural resources, floodplains or wetland on the site. Some of the trees on the site will be removed and some will be incorporated into the landscape plan. The site exceeds the minimum lot size in the MDRH zone of 5000 square feet.

Ms. Connell reported there are four criteria for approval of a conditional use permit. The first criteria, availability of services; sewer, water, storm water, have been met. However, Commissioner Corrado brought Staff's attention the Sherwood Boulevard ultimate right-of-way. The right-of-way would be reviewed during the discussion of the site plan. The second criteria which deals with zone standards has been met. The proposal complies with the provisions of the MDRH zone. The third criteria asks if there is a need and whether the applicant provided an adequate response to this condition in a letter dated October 9, 1995. The fourth criteria is if the public is best served by allowing the conditional use for the particular piece of property in question as compared to other available property. Ms. Connell said this location is appropriate due to District ownership, proximity to the elementary school, the low impact on adjoining residential uses since it will only be open during normal business hours, the existence and planned buffers, there will be little traffic or noise impacts and because of the residential-like character of the proposed building. This proposal is not new and was discussed during the planning phase for the Archer Glen School. The surrounding property will not be adversely affected by the use.

In conclusion, Ms. Connell reported based on the findings of fact and recommended conditions of approval for the simultaneous site plan application, Staff recommends approval of the conditional use with no conditions. Staff recommends conditions be applied to the proposed site plan approval.

Chairman Birchill asked if the applicant wished to provide any comments on CUP 95-3.

Dr. Bill Hill, Superintendent, Sherwood School District, 400 N. Sherwood Boulevard, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Dr. Hill urged the Commission's support of the proposed conditional use permit. Bids have been received for the project and the District is waiting to proceed pending the outcome of

the Commission's decision tonight. Dr. Hill explained the District office is currently split by being located at the Intermediate School and Archer Glen School. These conditions are not uncommon in a growth situation, but are not the best long term working conditions. Dr. Hill stated the District is comfortable with the recommendations and he would be glad to answer any questions.

Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application. There being no further proponent testimony, Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the proposal. There being no opponent testimony, Chairman Birchill dispensed with the rebuttal portion of the hearing and closed the public hearing, unless a Commission member asked that it be reopened for additional testimony, for discussion and comments by the Commission.

Susan Claus asked if any provisions were being made to replace this MDRH zoning inventory in any other part of the City and an explanation of the City's policy. Ms. Connell responded no provision is being made, however, these types of institutional uses are allowed in all residential zones as a conditional use. This question would be more pertinent if the zone was being changed. Ms. Claus said if this was not the School District, but some type of commercial or office building, they would have a tremendous burden to prove why this conditional use would be appropriate. It was her concern that the Commission be consistent. Ms. Connell said this zone does not allow commercial buildings, only institutional-type uses. There is a difference between the two types and they are not comparable.

Dr. Hill said it is important to recognize this conditional use does not apply to the total 2.92 acres. This use would only be applied on the 0.92 acres on the front portion of the property. When Archer Glen School was developed, the 2 acres were added to the back of the campus for more playground area and the required fire lane. There being no further questions or comments,

Chris Corrado moved the Commission approve CUP 95-3 Sherwood School District Administration Building conditional use permit, based on the Staff Report and public testimony, without any conditions. The motion was seconded by Susan Claus and carried unanimously.

Chairman Birchill called for the Staff Report for SP 95-8 Sherwood School District Administration Building Site Plan request. Ms. Connell referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated October 10, 1995, a complete copy of which is included in the Commission's minutes book.

Ms. Connell reviewed the concerns regarding the right-of-way. The main access to the site is from South Sherwood Boulevard. In going through the analysis, at the Staff level, it appears the right-of-way should be 80 feet. Sherwood Boulevard is a minor arterial with a planned bike lane which requires an 80 foot wide ROW.

Currently there is a 60 foot ROW. Additional ROW is needed to provide 40 feet from centerline to the subject site. As a part of the Archer Glen Elementary School approval, a half-street improvement on South Sherwood Boulevard, adjoining the subject site, was required and has been provided, except for the sidewalk. The City installed sidewalks on a portion of Sherwood Boulevard to improve pedestrian access to the school. The decision required a 10 foot dedication for Sherwood Boulevard in front of the site. Ms. Connell said this should have been a 15 foot dedication. Further research showed the City used a 7 foot ROW, not the 8 foot ROW. The sidewalk and curb construction were based on 10 foot dedication, not 15 feet. In reviewing the site plan, a 15 foot dedication would cause a problem because of the existing design. The question to the Commission is whether or not to require the ultimate 15 foot dedication, knowing everything else on the road is 70 feet. Ms. Connell said her concern is adequate ROW for a bikelane. The Staff Report states, require a ROW 40 feet from centerline to the site's front property line. The applicant has requested that 35 feet from centerline be required as originally required in the Archer Glen decision and as built with the City's street project. Ms. Connell said she will try to review the construction plans for the sidewalk to verify what was built. All of Sherwood Boulevard should be 40 feet from centerline, but 35 feet from centerline would align with the current sidewalk project.

Ms. Connell stated the applicant has provided a landscaping plan and tree survey. The District has indicated there is a small landscaping budget for this proposal. The Code requires that all areas not developed are to be landscaped. The plan generally complies with this requirement. Ms. Connell referred to this area on the map. Staff recommends verification of the landscape corridor of 15 feet after roadway dedication. Staff thought the applicant could improve on the type of evergreen groundcover on the front of the site. The landscaping, in particular the grass, should be able to be maintained with limited irrigation.

Ms. Connell reported the plan illustrates a paved parking lot adjoining the building. It includes 11 adequately sized stalls and an alternate parking plan adding 7 more stalls in anticipation of future building expansion. The District would like to put the additional parking stalls in now and are waiting for cost bids to determine financial feasibility. No additional improvements are needed with regard to loading. There is one vehicle access into the site from South Sherwood Boulevard. It meets the 24 foot width requirement and has adequate turning radius. A bicycle rack is provided at the building entry. Adequate site distance onto South Sherwood Boulevard has been verified by DKS Traffic Engineers in a letter dated August 17, 1995. The letter recommended completion of the half-street improvements on South Sherwood Boulevard, removal of existing vegetation in the clear vision area and restricting new plantings in that area.

Ms. Connell said there is no outdoor storage, sales or display proposed or permitted. Sheet A3.1 illustrates a wall mounted sign near the front door and no additional signs are permitted. An outdoor lighting plan should be provided. The building looks like a residence with wood beveled siding and composition gable roof. Ms. Connell pointed

out the stormwater plan on the map.

In conclusion, Ms. Connell reviewed the recommended conditions of approval.

Chairman Birchill asked if the applicant wished to provide any comments on SP 95-8 Sherwood School District Administration Building Site Plan.

Dr. Bill Hill, Superintendent, Sherwood School District, 400 N. Sherwood Boulevard, Sherwood, Oregon 97140, addressed the Commission. Dr. Hill said when the initial proposal was made they relied on the research and advice they were given to put in the half-street improvements. These conditions would certainly impact the location of the proposed administration building which could cause it to be moved back further which does impact the bid the District has received. It does get more complicated. Dr. Hill said the District Staff did acquire a copy of David Evans & Associates description which clearly states 35 feet from centerline. When the District commissioned the project they were relying upon the information in the report. City Staff has been very helpful and supportive to the District and he was not there to be critical of anyone. Dr. Hill said his advice is it should be 35 feet from the centerline versus 40 feet at this time. He appreciated the fact that maybe on the other side of the street there is a difference, but perhaps as the road gets redesigned in the future maybe some type of compromise could be reached at that time, in terms of alignment. The apartments are also very close to the street with parking. The District moved the building forward to address the City Staff concerns regarding accessibility for walkers or bicyclists. Dr. Hill said the issue of location and distance has been on the table and the District was caught a little bit short after putting together the bid specifications only to find recently that the planning could be a little awry. This puts the District in a little bit of a bind, however they do understand the long term issue.

George Bechtold asked if it was David Evans that was misinformed. Ms. Connell said she thought this was where the 70 foot right-of-way started, but she did not want to point to anyone in particular. However, as a condition she said City widths may be decreased with future transportation updates.

Mr. Bechtold asked Dr. Hill why it would increase the costs to move the building back. Dr. Hill responded costs would be impacted because the terrain starts to drop off dramatically as you go west on the property. The District is trying to keep the costs down because they are using interest earnings from the bond to pay for the building. The District moved forward and accommodated what they thought was understood in terms of accessibility. At that point, had the District been aware that perhaps there would be a different line drawn out then this would have impacted what their architect developed for specifications and accepted bids on. Again, there has been a lot of dialogue regarding the half-street improvements. Dr. Hill said this concluded his testimony.

Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application. There being no further proponent testimony, Chairman

Birchill asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the proposal. There being no opponent testimony, Chairman Birchill dispensed with the rebuttal portion of the hearing and closed the public hearing, unless a Commission member asked that it be reopened for additional testimony, for discussion and comments by the Commission.

In response to Mr. Hohnbaum's question, Ms. Connell stated the pedestrian pathway is already located on the proposed site between the parking lot and the building. This design coincides with the Transportation Planning Rule. Mr. Hohnbaum asked for clarification on the required number of parking stalls. Ms. Connell said parking for the number of employees is an industrial standard, not an office category. Since the zoning code specifications do not cover every specific use, you use the one that is most similar. In this case, Ms. Connell used the office standard. Mr. Hohnbaum asked if it was good planning not to have the number of parking stalls for the number of employees. Ms. Connell said another interesting planning issue is to reduce parking requirements so that people use other means of transportation such as bicycle or walking. Dr. Hill said they have a quote on the bid for the additional parking stalls and additional parking was anticipated.

George Bechtold asked if the stormwater detention facility that the School District put in was adequate to handle this office addition. Ms. Connell said she had not heard otherwise and the stormwater facility will require approval of USA, as stated in Condition #1. Marge Stewart said she was not in favor of using Photinia because it requires constant trimming. She favored the Abelia Grandiflora. Ms. Connell said they need evergreen plantings.

In response to Ms. Claus's question, Dr. Hill said the District now has 12 employees and projects 15-16 employees in the future. This is why the District bid the alternate for the additional parking spaces. They anticipate having only a few visitors at any one time. Ms. Claus said she would support the 35 foot from centerline right-of-way and at least 18 parking stalls. Mr. Bechtold said he supported the 40 foot from centerline right-of-way, not 35 feet and that the City should be consistent under the guidelines which are in place. Chairman Birchill asked if the 35 feet versus 40 feet was a result of the City's change in standards. Ms. Connell said she believed when David Evans & Associates reviewed the sidewalk project and looked at the standards, where it states minor arterials, 70 feet, and minor arterials with a bikelane, 80 feet, they did not go back and look at the plans which called for a bikelane. Ms. Connell said the 35 feet from centerline would adequately get everything into this space, still have a safe street with the only question being the bikelane. Chairman Birchill said the bottom line is safety. Considerable discussion followed regarding the street width and right-of-way.

Ms. Connell confirmed that the speed limit in this area is 25 MPH. Dr. Hill stated people are becoming very accustomed to using the other connectors and staying off of the major arterials in reaching the Archer Glen School. Ms. Stewart asked if there was any other property on South Sherwood Boulevard which has a 40 foot setback

from the centerline. Ms. Connell responded there are no such properties at this time and the 35 foot right-of-way would still meet the minor arterial standard. Ms. Connell said another option would be decreasing the landscape border. There being no further discussion,

Susan Claus moved based upon findings of fact, Staff recommendations, public testimony, and Commission discussion, that SP 95-8 School District Administration Office be approved, subject to the following conditions:

Prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Submit engineered construction plans for City, USA, and TVFRD approval illustrating public and private utility improvements for water, sanitary and storm sewer, erosion control, grading and fire hydrant locations.
2. Dedicate the necessary Sherwood Boulevard road right-of-way to ensure there is 35 feet from centerline to the site's front property line. The City will install a sidewalk along the Sherwood Boulevard frontage.
3. Revise the site plan to ensure a 15 foot wide landscape corridor along the front property line. Replace the bark mulch groundcover with a low-maintenance green groundcover.
4. Provide a street light at the driveway intersection with Sherwood Boulevard.
5. Remove existing vegetation in the clear vision area adjoining the driveway in accordance with City standards. Restrict new vegetation in the clear vision area.
6. A sign permit is not necessary if signage is installed as shown on the approved site plan.
7. Provide for access to a fire hydrant 250 feet from all sides of the building.
8. Provide an outdoor lighting plan for City approval.
9. There shall be a minimum of 18 parking stalls.

This approval is valid for one (1) year.

The motion was seconded by Marge Stewart and carried with 5 ayes and Commissioner Bechtold voting nay.

Chairman Birchill recessed the meeting for a 5-minute break and reconvened the meeting at 8:55 PM.

4E. SP 95-9 High School Addition

Chairman Birchill called for the Staff Report. Lisa Nell reported this is a site plan review for the Sherwood High School Addition and Remodel. Ms. Nell referred the Commission to the Staff Report dated September 26, 1995, a complete copy of which is included in the Commission's minutes book.

Ms. Nell reviewed the findings of fact contained in the Staff Report. The Sherwood High School is located south of Meinecke Road and north of West Villa Road on 31.59 acres in an Institutional/Public (IP) zone. The proposed addition is a conditional use in the IP zone. Since the use is existing and the value of the addition is less than 50% of the total value, a new conditional use permit is not required. The site plan complies with IP setback, height and lot size requirements. The applicant will need to provide the City with a landscaping plan. There is no interior landscaping proposed for the parking areas. The applicant will need to provide a landscaping plan for the proposed parking lot on the east side of the site and the additional parking lot which has been recommended by the DKS Transportation Impact Study. The plan will need to comply with the Chapter 5 landscaping requirements. The applicant will need to provide the City with a landscape plan for the 15 foot wide visual corridor on the Meinecke Road frontage.

Ms. Nell reported the high school has 58 paved parking stalls. The code requires two parking spaces per classroom and one space for every ten students. With the addition of 5 more classrooms, the Code requires a total of 129 parking stalls. The applicant proposes to provide a total of 139 spaces. However, in the DKS Traffic Report, they recommend a total of 218 on-site parking stalls be required. Staff believes that this is a much more accurate recommendation when using a comparable study of other area high schools. Staff recommends that the applicant provide an additional 79 parking spaces or 160 new spaces for a total of 218 parking spaces on the site. According to the Code the loading or maneuvering areas shall be clearly marked and painted with appropriate signage.

Ms. Nell stated there are two access points along Meinecke Road. The applicant will need to ensure that the existing solid waste service is adequate to meet the increased demand when the additional 250 students are enrolled at the high school. The applicant will need to locate the same type of bollard lighting along the south side of the west walkway that connects the west parking lot to the Building "A" addition and ensure that there is adequate lighting on all pedestrian walkways throughout the site. Adequate lighting will need to be provided in all of the parking lots. A sidewalk to Building "C" addition from the west driveway is needed.

Ms. Nell reported Meinecke Road is planned as a minor arterial street with an 80 foot right-of-way, bikelane, curbs and sidewalks. Additional ROW for a total of 40 feet from the centerline and half-street improvements should be made a condition of approval. According to the Code, the school should have 4 bicycle parking spaces per classroom, which would require 108 bicycle spaces at the site. Staff recommends the

space be provided on the site within 50 feet of the school entranceway.

Ms. Nell reviewed the DKS Associates transportation impact study dated September 27, 1995 as discussed in the Staff Report. In a conversation on October 3, 1995 with DKS, Staff questioned the decision to not require a signal at the 99W/Meinecke Road intersection. Mr. Coffey of DKS recommended Staff send a copy of the application to ODOT for additional review. Laurie Nicholson called October 11, 1995, and informed Staff that the high school remodel/addition did not warrant a traffic signal at the Meinecke Road/Highway 99W intersection. Ms. Nell discussed the transportation study recommendations contained in the report.

In conclusion, Ms. Nell reviewed the recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

Chairman Birchill opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant wished to provide any comments.

Norman R. Dull, Dull, Olson, Weekes, Architects, 319 SW Washington Street, #200, Portland, Oregon 97204, addressed the Commission. Mr. Dull addressed each of the recommendations. The applicant had no problem with Conditions #1, #2, #3, #4, #5. With regard to Condition #6, Mr. Dull clarified that the applicant is not proposing any "additional" outdoor storage. If there is existing outdoor storage, Mr. Dull did not want to agree for the District to remove such storage. The applicant had no problems with Conditions #7, #8. With regard to Condition #9, Mr. Dull said he would like to work with the City in deciding the type of lighting to provide for the sidewalks. He was not sure that "bollard" type lighting was the most effective. The applicant had no concerns with Condition #10. Mr. Dull said he was not sure what was to be accomplished with Condition #11 and asked for clarification.

With regard to Condition #12 and the 40 foot right-of-way, Mr. Dull said this is the same type of issue which was discussed on the previous application. The applicant was under the impression that 35 feet was going to be the required right-of-way. This would provide a 27 foot travel area for a total of 54 feet. These are the figures the applicant has used up to this point and the civil engineered half-street drawings are based on the 35 feet right-of-way.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked if Mr. Dull had this assumption in writing from a City representative or City Engineer. Mr. Dull said he did not know for sure, but Tad Milburn was the person that their civil engineer had discussed this with. In response to Ms. Connell's question, Mr. Dull said the total right-of-way was 37 feet.

Mr. Dull continued that the applicant had no concerns with Conditions #13, and asked for clarification on Condition #14. With regard to Condition #15, 108 bicycle spaces, Mr. Dull said the most bicycles he had seen at the high school are maybe 10 bikes at any one time which left 30-40 spaces available. He referred to the small covered area on the map which could provide some covered spaces for bicycles.

However, it seems like 108 spaces would not be used. If this became an issue at a later time, the School District would want to manage that in some manner and would be willing to put in the necessary bicycle parking.

Mr. Dull reported they are working with USA on the stormwater calculations (Condition #16) and they have no problem working with an arborist (Condition #17) for trimming the trees along Meinecke Road or enforcing the drop-off zone (Condition #19) for bus loading.

Mr. Dull said this was all that he had and would be available for any questions.

In response to Ms. Claus's question regarding the bicycle spaces, Mr. Dull said the high school already has a rack which could hold 30 bicycles. It is used very little. The most bicycles he has seen is maybe 10 bicycles. Mr. Dull said they would be willing to put 10 additional spaces under the covered area in front of the school. This would help to promote some bicycle usage.

Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application. There being no further proponent testimony, Chairman Birchill asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the proposal. There being no opponent testimony, Chairman Birchill dispensed with the rebuttal portion of the hearing and closed the public hearing, unless a Commission member asked that it be reopened for additional testimony. The floor was opened for discussion and comments by the Commission.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked if the vehicle drop-off in the bus zone is enforced, where would the private vehicle drop-off be located. Ms. Nell said this was not known. Mr. Hohnbaum said identifying a private vehicle and bus loading zones had been dealt with at the Intermediate School and Archer Glen School. Chairman Birchill said Condition #19 states the applicant and architect will generate additional plans for submittal to Staff for review and approval. Mr. Hohnbaum said a statement should be added to this condition relative to passenger loading and unloading plan be submitted for Staff approval, bus and private vehicles dropping off students in a safe manner. Ms. Nell said the intent of Condition #19 was a recommendation by DKS Associates transportation study. Ms. Claus said the recommendation was probably due to getting the buses off of the turn lanes into the queuing area. The Commission discussed the drop-off zone, its enforcement and safety concerns.

In response to Mr. Corrado's question, Mr. Dull said the 139 parking spaces are marked on the plan and identified the area for the graveled parking area. This will provide the total 218 parking spaces. Mr. Corrado asked if some type of separate pedestrian, vehicle-drop off point could be included in this area. Mr. Dull responded he had not looked at this area, but it was his feeling it would be difficult. Ms. Stewart asked if any thought had been given to having the buses come in the back way. Mr. Lloyd Wilson said they looked at both lots and there would be more problems in

getting buses turned around from the back way. Mr. Dull said the applicant would be willing to work out an acceptable plan with the City Staff.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked for further explanation of the 8-inch waterline and water looping. Mr. Dull responded there is an existing 8-inch line that runs from Meinecke Road to the fire hydrants. In discussions with the City and Fire District, the applicant is proposing an additional 8-inch line and the provision of additional fire hydrants. He identified the waterline and hydrant locations on the map. The waterline does not loop. There are two separate lines off of the main line.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked that the public hearing be reopened for additional testimony.
Chairman Birchill reopened the public hearing on SP 95-9 Sherwood High School Addition.

Mr. Hohnbaum directed his question to Bonnie Maplethorpe, Deputy Clerk of the Sherwood School District. It was his understanding, and please correct him if he is wrong, that when the citizens were asked to approve this new development that they were going to see a gymnasium. Ms. Maplethorpe responded that this was not in the title of the bond measure. The bond language was very general. The gym was one thing that was mentioned from a very long list of items.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked how many classrooms were being added. Ms. Nell responded five classrooms were being added. Mr. Hohnbaum asked how this would change the current capacity of the high school. Ms. Nell said the current capacity is 500 and the addition will allow for an additional 250 students, for a total of 750 students. Mr. asked if 5 classrooms would add 250 students. Ms. Nell reviewed the types of classrooms being added. In response to Mr. Hohnbaum's question, Chairman Birchill said the building capacity is determined by the Building Code. Ms. Connell said the Building Official has the plans and will determine if 750 students will be the new figure.

There being no further public testimony,

Chairman Birchill closed the public hearing on SP 95-9 Sherwood High School Addition.

Mr. Hohnbaum asked what the proposed width of Meinecke Road was at the front driveway. He identified the area on the map. Ms. Connell said it is 55 feet at this location. Mr. Hohnbaum said in driving from downtown, past Stella Olsen Park and turning left into the high school, the turn lane for buses and large vehicles -- the problem is in order to make this corner, all vehicles, including buses, have to go out into the oncoming traffic lane to make the turn. This blocks traffic coming from the other direction. Mr. Hohnbaum said either the driveway needs to be made wider and/or the Meinecke Road right-of-way needs to be wider. Buses are going over the centerline in order to make the turn. Ms. Connell said the two developments in the area, Robin's Run dedicated 35 feet from center and Home Town Estates on the other

side, which was built later, dedicated 40 feet from center. The Commission agreed it was even more important to get 40 feet dedication from centerline so that a safe turn can be made into the school without blocking traffic.

Mr. Bechtold said this raises a question. The Commission has had two different applications before them and they both have come in with 35 feet from centerline when the City's standard is 40 feet from centerline. Somewhere there is a communications breakdown and he hoped the Commission would not have to address this issue too many more times.

Chairman Birchill said Mr. Hohnbaum has pointed out a problem and if the 40 foot dedication does not solve it, maybe the School District will need to widen the entrance to the intersection to accommodate buses without obstructing traffic. There could be a need for both improvements. The Commission agreed to reword Condition #19 for this purpose.

There being no further comments,

Chris Corrado moved based upon findings of fact, Staff recommendations, public testimony, Commission discussion and conditions as revised, that SP 95-9 Sherwood High School Addition be approved, subject to the following conditions:

Prior to issuance of a building permit:

1. Provide engineered construction plans for public and private improvements including costs, maintenance and bonding provisions in compliance with City, USA and TVFRD standards. The plans shall include provisions for streets, pathways, sanitary sewer, water, fire protection, storm water runoff, erosion control, grading, street lighting, landscaping, and signage.
2. Provide a landscaping plan for the proposed parking lot on the east side of the site and the additional parking spaces which have been recommended by the DKS Transportation Impact Study. The plan will need to illustrate compliance with the landscaping requirements contained in Chapter 5 of the Code and be approved by the City.
3. Provide the City with a landscape plan for the 15 foot wide visual corridor on the Meinecke Road frontage.
4. Provide a total of 218 parking spaces on the site as follows:
 - 58 existing paved spaces
 - 14 proposed spaces along the west driveway to be paved
 - 67 proposed spaces in the east parking lot to be paved
 - 79 additional spaces which are to be an all-weather surface

Provide wheel stops, curbs or stripes whichever is appropriate for particular parking areas. Provide a parking lot plan, illustrating how the site plan complies with the Code.

5. Clearly mark and paint loading or maneuvering areas. Clearly mark and sign all interior drives and access aisles to show the direction of flow and maintain vehicular and pedestrian safety.
6. No new outdoor storage is proposed and is therefore not permitted.
7. Ensure that the existing solid waste service is adequate to meet the increased demand when the additional 250 students are enrolled at the high school.
8. Provide on-site and right-of-way signage as recommended in the applicant's transportation report and as required by the City.
9. Provide lighting along pedestrian pathways as approved by the City. Install pole lighting in the small proposed parking lot on the west side of the site as approved by the City.
10. Provide a landscaping plan for areas adjoining the proposed additions.
11. Provide a sidewalk connecting to the south side of the school.
12. Dedicate to the City additional Meinecke Road right-of-way for a total of 40 feet from the center line and provide half-street improvements, including a street surface width of 33 feet (66 feet width for the entire ROW), a five (5) foot bike lane, a curb and a five (5) foot sidewalk. Redesign the left turn lane and/or entrance drive at the east access to adequately accommodate bus turning movements.
13. Provide painted crosswalks and install pedestrian crossing signs as part of the half-street improvements. Provide a marked school crossing on NW Meinecke Road on the wet leg of the east side driveway access. Provide handicap ramps at both ends of school crossing. Provide school area and school crossing signing which meets the City's and ODOT's requirements.
14. Provide sidewalks from the buildings to the proposed sidewalk along the Meinecke Road frontage to improve pedestrian connectivity in the school vicinity. Extend existing on-site sidewalk, located adjacent to east side driveway, to Meinecke Road.
15. Provide 10 new covered bicycle spaces at the site.
16. Recalculate storm water volume calculations, including all additional

impervious surfaces. If required by the City, provide an on-site storm water detention facility to be incorporated with the proposed storm water treatment facility.

17. Provide a report from a certified arborist and obtain approval from the City to remove trees that are not within the building footprint.
18. Trim trees on the south side of NW Meinecke Road east of the east project access to provide a clear path for pedestrians along the sidewalk.
19. Enforce the drop-off, school bus loading operation currently in place to minimize the potential of vehicle loading occurring in the bus zone. Provide a separate vehicle student drop-off plan for City Staff approval.

This approval is valid for one (1) year. Building expansion will require an additional site plan approval.

The motion was seconded by George Bechtold and carried unanimously.

Other Business

Ms. Connell said the City has hired a pro-tem land use judge to hear the Allied Systems zoning violations. After this hearing, the Allied Systems appeal of the Planning Commission's decision will be heard by the City Council. The land use hearing should be heard within 2-3 weeks.

Ms. Connell said the new City Manager, Jon Bormet, will begin employment on November 13, 1995. She is traveling to Montgomery, Ohio to review their planning developments.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne Gibbons
Planning Commission Secretary