
**City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission
Work Session Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2013**

Planning Commission Members Present: Staff Present:

Chair Jean Simson

Vice Chair James Copfer

Commissioner John Clifford

Commissioner Beth Cooke

Joseph Gall, City Manager

Tom Pessemier, Assistant City Manager

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager

Michelle Burchfield, Administrative Assist I

Planning Commission Members Absent:

Commissioner Michael Cary

Commissioner Russell Griffin

Commissioner Lisa Walker

Council Members Present:

Mayor Bill Middleton

Legal Counsel:

Chris Crean

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Simson called the meeting to order at 7:14 pm.

2. Agenda Review

The agenda consisted of a continued public hearing for SP 13-02/ VAR 13-01 and new business regarding appointment of a Planning Commission member to the Charter Committee.

3. Consent Agenda:

There was no Consent Agenda

4. Council Liaison Announcements

Mayor Middleton reminded of the Veteran's Day Event on Monday, November 11, 2013 and asked Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director to address the Tualatin Sherwood/ 99W Corridor project.

Julia commented that at a previous Planning Commission meeting there was a lot of citizen input about the Tualatin Sherwood Road widening project and that City Council had a Washington County representative at this meeting. Julia informed that Commission that staff was directed by City Council to work with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the County to get a right in access off of 99W north of the intersection for that project.

5. Staff Announcements

Brad commented that Planning Commission meetings for November and December would fall days before Thanksgiving and Christmas and suggested alternate dates for meetings because there were

five potential projects to come before the Commission. He suggested several alternative meeting dates and said he would utilize email to decide future meeting dates.

Brad reminded the Commission of the Annual Appreciation Dinner at City Hall December 3rd @ 6pm and said they would discuss the Planning Commission Report for that dinner at the Planning Commission Work Session on November 12th. Brad gave each of the Commissioners present a copy of the form (see record, Exhibit 1).

Brad reported that the first Citizen's Advisory Committee meeting for the Transportation System Plan Amendment was held on October 21, 2013 where they discussed what a Transportation System Plan is and what the committee's responsibilities will be regarding the Transportation System Plan (TSP) update. He said there were ten people appointed to the Committee with a good representation from various interests and Commissioner Russell Griffin as the Planning Commission liaison.

6. Community Comments

Neil Shannon, Sherwood resident, commented that he wanted to take the opportunity to speak regarding the Brookman Road Annexation as the meeting was recorded and broadcast. He said he was in opposition to the partial annexation of Brookman Road, but in favor of the entire Brookman Road Concept Plan being adopted by the City. Mr. Shannon said two years ago, the residents of that area voted against the annexation and now a portion of the property owners are seeking to bring in roughly 97 acres of that Plan and he felt that it was diluting the opportunities available in the Brookman Road area. He said he a jigsaw boundary line for the City of Sherwood would create differences between neighboring property owners within and outside the City and would bring complexity to the planning of it. Mr. Shannon urged a vote against the annexation.

7. Old Business

a. Continued Public Hearing – Community Center Major Site Plan Modification (SP 13-02/ VAR 13-01)

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement and asked for any ex parte contact, bias or conflicts of interest.

Commissioner John Clifford disclosed that he had contact with Landscape Architect, Kurt Lango in a professional capacity that was unrelated to the project and there were no comments or discussion regarding the agenda item.

Vice Chair James Copfer disclosed that he was the technical director for the Foundation for the Performing Arts and the Voices for Performing Arts, but it would not affect his ability to make a decision.

Chair Simson disclosed that all of her previous contacts were in public meetings. She asked that those giving testimony to include their mailing address on the blue comment card if they would like to be notified of any action by mail.

Chair Simson turned the time over to Brad Kilby for the Staff Report.

Brad reviewed the information given at the previous public hearing (see record, Exhibit 2) and said the public hearing record had been held open to allow for additional testimony. He explained that the applicant had submitted revised plans that were included in the Planning Commission packet and reminded the Commission that the project was approved to convert the old Machine Works building in 2012, but the building was not structurally sound and was demolished. Brad showed illustrations of the approved building and the proposed new building. Brad said the new building will be in the same location, but not placed in the public right of way the way that the old building was. He explained that it was a major modification to and approved site plan (SP 12-01) with a final development plan approved as PUD 09-01. Brad showed the approved site plan and the proposed modified site and said there were three trees that would be removed to the north of the building.

Brad explained that there is a variance request to reduce the required amount of glazing on the south side of the building per *Section 16.162.080H (Ground Floor Windows)* that requires that windows occupy at least 50% of the length of and 25% of the total ground level wall area.

Brad said the current proposal has 3,000 square feet of commercial space to 15, 285 square feet of building or 19.6% of the building. He said the original decision allowed a 40/60 split and this is within the confines of what was approved.

Brad reviewed section 16.90.30.A.1.b.3 which limits the scope of the review for a modification request. He said it was suggested at the previous meeting that the Planning Commission could open up the discussion to review parking, landscaping, and other issues, but those items have no bearing on this request because the scope of this review is limited.

Brad showed an illustration of the southwest corner of the building as modified by the applicant and said the applicant would address the issue more fully. He said that staff recommended approval of the application with proposed conditions and reminded the Commission that there were some proposed revisions to those conditions.

Chair Simson asked for clarification on condition B.4 and suggested that the applicant had met the condition and could be removed. Staff concurred. The item was tabled until deliberations and Chair Simson turned the time over to the applicant.

Tom Pessemier, Assistant City Manager and Project Manager for the Community Center Project said they would go through some of the highlights of the project and any changes the Commission wanted to see. He introduced Keith Jones and Scott Wagner, the planner and architect for the project.

Keith Jones, Harper Houf Peterson Righellis Inc.(HHPR) explained that his firm had been working with the project since 2009 and said that he had requested that staff amend three of the conditions of approval: the landscaping requirement (B.1), the building base (B.4), and the parapet requirement (B3). He said that two of these conditions had already been satisfied and described the parapet requirement. Mr. Jones explained that the code requires the installation of a two-part parapet around the entire perimeter of the building and said that the applicant had suggested that the

two-part parapet does not work architecturally around all of the building. It can work on the retail portion, he said, but because of the mass of the building at the theater portion, it does not work with the architectural design. Mr. Jones said that this is justified by referencing the 2009 development approval that allowed some exceptions to the standards through the project PUD Architectural Pattern Book (which laid out the requirements that the phases of the PUD would follow). Mr. Jones stated that the Pattern Book identifies that the Machine Works phase of the PUD is not required to meet that Code provision in its entirety.

Mr. Jones commented on the changes made to the wall as requested by the Planning Commission and turned the time over to Scott Wagner.

Scott Wagner, Ankrom Moisan Architects gave a presentation (see record, Exhibit 3) that showed the site development. He said some sides of the building were more important such as Pine Street and the paseo facing Old Town. Mr. Wagner commented that Columbia Street was more subdued and Washington Street was the service side. He said the south side of the building benefits from the retail and becomes more service-oriented towards Washington Street. Mr. Wagner commented that the Planning Commission had asked what kind of neighbor the Community Center was architecturally on the lesser sides of the building. He said there was space available for landscaping on the Washington Street side and discussed the materials used, the elements used to break up the wall, and the lack of windows at the southwest corner. He said there were no windows because the space would be used for make-up and dressing rooms and they did not want light leaking onto the stage. Mr. Wagner said they considered comments and showed a revised elevation of the corner of the building. He said they were trying to respond to all of the issues and end up with a composition that makes sense for the building. Mr. Wagner described the use of stone, brick, and metal and the addition of glass windows on the south side. He talked about how the light from the window could be masked through curtains or blinds and pointed out that the windows were above the makeup light and mirrors. Mr. Wagner said that these changes addressed the visual concerns expressed by the Planning Commission.

Tom Pessemier asked to save the remainder of their time for rebuttal. The applicant used 10:41 minutes.

Commissioner John Clifford inquired about adding a metal awning to the new windows on the south in the future should there prove to be too much light coming through. Mr. Wagner confirmed and gave suggestions for blocking out light. Mr. Wagner explained that the intent now was to use a window treatment inside to black out the light. Discussion followed.

Chair Simson asked for public testimony.

Lori Randel, Sherwood resident said she did not care for the windows and asked if the idea of a mural was gone. Ms. Randel commented that she would like the City Council to hear that the smaller retail space in the center should be given to visual artists to do a cooperative gallery. She remarked that the original intent of the center was to have performing and visual arts in it. Ms. Randel encouraged others to tell the City Council that they would like to see the space offered up to visual artists for a cooperative gallery or classrooms for programing that is ready to go and funded through non- profits in town.

Eugene Stewart, Sherwood property owner said the building was not visually acceptable; not the color scheme, the design does not remind him of Old Town, and does not seem right. He commented that if this is the best we can have I guess we are stuck with it. Mr. Stewart commented on house the building height was measured and asked why there was not a requirement for a 6' planting strip as a visual break up from the residences behind it.

Mr. Stewart commented on the citizen involvement plan that Planning Director Brad Kilby had sent him and said he did not think we met Goal 1. He suggested that the Planning Commission and staff need to sit down and decide what the Citizen Involvement Plan is, start following it, and make it work.

With no public testimony, Chair Simson asked for rebuttal from the applicant.

Keith Jones commented that the maximum allowed height is 40feet and the proposed building height is 26 feet. Scott Wagner commented that the site falls about 30 inches on Pine Street and another three to four feet to the southwest corner [on Washington]. So the building proper from finished floor to top does not exceed the height. Keith Jones said his understanding was that the height was measured from the average grade. Brad Kilby added that it was measured from a reference datum that he could explain further, but the City would verify that the building did not exceed the height. Chair Simson said it was necessary.

Mr. Jones commented that because the property is within and PUD the streets were laid out as part of the approval. He said the streets are unique with the downtown streetscapes, curbed streets and green street planters. Mr. Jones noted that Columbia Street acts as a one-way connector with angled parking. Mr. Jones said he did not hear any other comments that were directed at the approval.

Chair Simson asked regarding the color palette.

Mr. Wagner said the Cannery Square Planned Unit Development (PUD) has its own set of color criteria with warm and natural tones that criteria were followed.

Commissioner Cooke asked regarding an empty planter along Columbia Street. Mr. Wagner answered that there were more trees and light poles not shown in the illustration.

Tom Pessemier added that having a mural was looked into but not being proposed. He said the wall is rough, but people do murals on brick walls from time to time, where they have to put a coating on the wall. He said it would be more difficult with the metal. Tom commented that it would not be very difficult to add a mural if the community wants to do it at a later time.

With no other questions for the applicant, Chair Simson closed the public hearing and asked for final comments from staff. None were received.

Chair Simson asked if the Commission was in favor of the changes recommended by staff to amend condition A.9 and to strike conditions B.1 and B.4. The Commission was.

Chair Simson asked for comments regarding the variance request regarding glazing. She explained that the variance can be approved if the standards are maintained to the greatest extent reasonably possible while permitting reasonable economic use of the land and asked if they had met the criteria. Vice Chair Copfer and Commissioner Clifford conveyed that they had.

Chair Simson concurred, saying that the Code encourages interesting and active ground floors where the activities are happening in the building. She commented that the activities are not happening on the southwest corner, but the applicant has brought pedestrian scale interest to the side of the building that is architecturally appealing. Commissioner Cooke agreed.

Brad Kilby asked if the Commission wished to discuss the parapets. Chair Simson answered that per the PUD, parapets were to be on all sides of the building and the applicant's testimony was that the former Machine Works Building, and the use of the building as a Community Center, would not work well with parapets on the theater side.

Vice Chair Copfer commented that there was discussion regarding the parapets two weeks ago and as shown on the final, it looked acceptable. Commissioner Clifford agreed.

Chair Simson added that the intent of the Code was to have a top, middle and base and the metal creates a top, middle and base consistent with the PUD.

Motion: From Vice Chair Copfer for the Sherwood Planning Commission to approve the application for SP 13-02 Major Modification to the Site Plan for the Community Center accepting the changes proposed by staff and the revised elevation received with the windows and changes to architectural features and based on the applicant testimony, public testimony received, analysis, findings and conditions. Seconded by Commissioner John Clifford. All present Planning Commissioners in favor (Commissioners Cary, Griffin, and Walker were absent).

8. New Business

a. Discussion regarding the Planning Commission appointment to the "Charter Committee".

Brad Kilby explained that a committee was being formed and every board and commission was asked to provide a liaison to assist in reviewing the City Charter. He said the charter was written in 2005 and this would be the first citizen review.

Julia added that it was recommended to review the charter for housekeeping about every five years and it was a good time to review. She said the Council has decided to utilize the knowledge and citizen connections from the different board and commission members along with three citizens at large. Julia said it would meet approximately twice a month until March in order to put it on the May 2014 ballot.

Mayor Middleton commented that the charter was like the City's constitution and was available on the City website (<http://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/citycouncil/page/city-charter>). He said in the past, the review has been done by a small group of Council members and once completed each item will be on the ballot separately. Mayor Middleton gave two examples of possible changes such as

changing the mayoral term from two years to four years and doing away with [Council] positions, having the top candidates with the majority of votes elected. Linda Henderson is in charge of the committee.

City Manager Joseph Gall added that the Charter Committee will be a very public process and anybody interested in serving can still be involved through that process.

Vice Chair Copfer and Commissioner Cooke were interested in serving with Commissioner Cooke being chosen because of past experience with charter review process in Lafayette, Oregon.

9. Planning Commissioner Announcements

Chair Simson made known that she had attended a Washington County Transportation System Plan open house where she found out that Council had directed staff to work with the County. She said she was excited to see so many in attendance. Commissioner Cooke said she was also in attendance.

Brad Kilby said there was a training opportunity through the League of Oregon Cities on Saturday November 2, 2013 regarding land use and the City was hosting. He asked if there were any commissioners interested.

10. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 8:10 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Kirsten Allen
Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: December 10, 2013