

---

**City of Sherwood, Oregon  
Planning Commission  
October 13, 2015**

---

**Planning Commissioners Present:**

Chair Jean Simson  
Vice Chair Russell Griffin  
Commissioner Chris Flores  
Commissioner Michael Meyer  
Commissioner Alan Pearson  
Commissioner Rob Rettig

**Staff Present:**

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager  
Michelle Miller, Senior Planner  
Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

**Planning Commission Members Absent:**

Commissioner Lisa Walker

**Council Members Present:**

Councilor Sally Robinson

**Legal Counsel:**

None

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

Chair Jean Simson called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

**2. Consent Agenda**

- a. June 23, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes
- b. July 14, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes
- c. July 28, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes
- d. September 8, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

**Motion: From Commissioner Alan Pearson to approve the Consent Agenda, Seconded by Vice Chair Russell Griffin. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Commissioner Lisa Walker was absent).**

**3. Council Liaison Announcements**

Council President Sally Robinson informed the Commission that City Council had asked the City Attorney to make revisions to the chicken ordinance and a second public hearing would be held on October 20, 2015.

**4. Staff Announcements**

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, announced that Commissioners Pearson and Flores attended Planning Commissioner training in Bend. He said that the Draft Hybrid Alternative for the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan project, a culmination of the previous three alternative plans, had been released. He encouraged the commission members to share and collect surveys regarding the draft plan and said

there was a drop box for completed surveys in the library. The survey will be open until October 30<sup>th</sup> and can also be taken online at [sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwoodwest](http://sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwoodwest). Mr. Kilby announced an Open House for the Sherwood West Pre-Concept Plan project at 6:00 pm on October 22, 2015 at the Sherwood Center for the Arts.

Mr. Kilby informed the Commission that there would be a Public Open House for the Cedar Creek Trail on October 29, 2015. Michelle Miller, is the Project Manager, for the \$5.6m federal grant that the City received for a regional trail. The Open House would be about the design and construction for the trail within the Cedar Creek corridor and the City needed feedback for the trail and developing a preferred alignment for the area northwest of 99W. She said Chris Flores was the Planning Commission liaison for the Local Trail Advisory Committee (LTAC)

Mr. Kilby reminded the Planning Commission about the Annual Boards & Commissions Appreciation Dinner on Tuesday, December 15<sup>th</sup> and asked members to consider strengths, weaknesses and opportunities that may exist in the City regarding a land use or general planning prospective.

In answer to Chair Simson's questions, Mr. Kilby reported that there was no news regarding the tannery site and confirmed that the fencing for the site had been identified as a safety concern. He informed that recreational marijuana could not be purchased legally in the City as the City Council decided not to allow early sales. Ms. Miller added that the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) was accepting public comment about regulation processes and the City was tracking the issue at this time.

## **5. Community Comments**

None were received

## **6. New business**

### **a. Public Hearing – LA 15-01 Bowman House 3**

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

Vice Chair Russell Griffin indicated that he lived a block away from the site, but did not expect it to influence his ability to make a decision.

Michelle Miller, Senior Planner gave a staff report with a presentation (see record, Exhibit 1). She said the proposal was to construct a single family home in Old Town on the vacant lot located at 15824 SW 1<sup>st</sup> Street where the Sherwood School District had purchased two adjacent properties from the City. The City purchased the property as part of the Downtown Street project. She said permission to demolish the house was received in 2008 and some of the trees had been removed in order to site the house. Ms. Miller explained that a Temporary Use Permit had been granted on the site for an accessory structure, pending final approval from the Planning Commission. Because the site is located within the Old Town Overlay a review is required for all structures on the site (see planning record, TUP 15-05)

Ms. Miller explained that the Sherwood School District purchased the property for the high school construction class and the plan was to design, construct and do the interior work on the house as part of an educational component. The project would end with the sale of the house to a private party. Ms. Miller said it would take about two years to complete the house; this was the Bowman House 3 so they have

already completed a couple similar projects. Ms. Miller explained that the school district also purchased the property to the northeast, but it was not part of the proposal.

Ms. Miller indicated that the site was zoned Medium Density Residential Low and required 14' front yard setback, with 20' setback for the garage. She said something unique in the Old Town Overlay was that off street parking and street trees were not required, but a Planning Commission review was required because it was in Old Town and had special design standards.

There are nine criteria to review for residential design standards.

1. Volume and Mass
2. Roof Forms
3. Siding and Exterior Cladding
4. Trim and Architectural Detailing
5. Opening and Windows
6. Porches and Entrances
7. Landscape, Fencing and Perimeter Definition
8. Additions
9. Front Facing Presentations

Ms. Miller directed the Commission to the front elevation facing 1st Street, and said the first of the criteria were to enhance the vertical character. She pointed out the vertical siding and the verticality of the three roof forms relating that the proposed height was 28.2 feet. She said the applicant met the minimum roof pitch and there were a variety of materials with the different types of siding.

Ms. Miller recounted that a porch, as shown in the front, was a component of the Old Town standards. Other important details to an Old Town review were the inclusion of corner boards, barge boards, shake trim and gable ends. She said the bellyband between floors added interest to the design of the house. Ms. Miller specified that the windows were required to be vertical at a 2:1 ratio (shown on the proposed), and all except the one above the porch in the corner complied. This window will not be able to open and was for letting light in to the stairwell. Ms. Miller indicated that the front door was required to have glazing and the proposed front entryway door had 29% glazing. She said she did not include the amount of glazing in the staff report and asked that it be corrected on page 28.11 of the packet.

Ms. Miller showed examples of the left, right and rear elevations. She said the rear elevation would face Oregon Street, also known as the pedestrian walkway. She said on the rear elevation the thing to note was the skylights that faced the walkway. She asked the Commission to consider whether they met the standard that says they are to be placed on the side of the structure, not to be visible from the public right of way, and of a low profile design. Ms. Miller pointed out that the applicant had right of way on the front with 1st Street, at the parabour and the pedestrian walkway. She said it was up to the Commission to decide if they were low profile and met the standard.

Ms. Miller showed an illustrated picture (see record, Exhibit 1) of the house and directed the Commission to the color scheme. Note: The illustration had the garage on the right. Ms. Miller explained that the garage would be on left in order to share the driveway with the second house on the property to the northeast because the proximity to the parabour.

Ms. Miller requested adding Exhibit C to the Planning Record; a plot plan showing the location of the house and the shed on the site. She said the applicant proposed the same color palette and for the shed to match the design of the house.

Ms. Miller recommended approval with the conditions to design and construct a curb-tight sidewalk along the frontage and to provide a shared driveway with property to northeast.

Commissioner Rettig asked about the label on the site plan regarding the storm. Ms. Miller responded that it was the plot plan review that was submitted to the Building Department for review. Mr. Kilby added that because it was a building permit on private property that location could shift. Ms. Miller suggested that the applicant could offer an explanation.

Chair Simson asked if the Planning Commission was reviewing the shed as part of the application and if it was required as part of the Old Town Overlay review. Ms. Miller responded that the level of review was up to the Commission's discretion. The Development Code says that any structure in Old Town requires a Planning Commission review and there was precedence with the demolition of a shed in Old Town. Chair Simson asked for elevations for the shed. Ms. Miller reported that the requirements for an accessory structure had been met and the description indicated it would follow the same color scheme.

Commissioner Pearson asked if sheds were common in this area and stated they would be keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Not having a shed could be a liability for the sale of the house, because a shed would be used for storage and the potential owner would want a shed. Michelle affirmed.

Chair Simson stated that the review of the accessory structure had two criteria to be considered: if a building permit was required and setback rules. Ms. Miller stated the shed did not need a building permit. Chair Simson stated that when a building permit is not required and the structure is not less than 100 square feet and less than six feet tall, no rear or side yard setbacks are required and the structure may abut the property line.

Ms. Miller clarified that the structure was over six feet tall and needed to be three feet from the property line. Chair Simson said part of the Old Town design criteria required that the shed match the main house and the setbacks were based on the size of the shed. Ms. Miller confirmed.

Chair Simson asked for testimony from the applicant.

**Jon Dickover**, Construction teacher at Sherwood High School, 16956 SW Meinecke Road addressed the question of the storm water line by responding that the city engineer did not want weep holes in the curb so the storm line would connect in the middle of 1<sup>st</sup> Street. He said he wanted to put the storm line in that location near the property line in order to trench for two lines at one time.

Mr. Dickover said the shed was a ten feet tall structure with horizontal lap siding that would match the proposed house with shingles on the gable ends.

Chair Simson asked about the pitch of the roof that cannot exceed 6/12.

Mr. Dickover responded that the pitch of the shed roof was at 4/12; the walls are eight foot tall and it was twelve feet wide making the shed ten feet tall.

Chair Simson commented that staff had provided a copy of the elevations of the shed provided in TUP 15-05 (see record, Exhibit D).

Mr. Dickover explained that the Sherwood School District purchased the property with a difficult timeline because of the start of the school year in September. He said the class was designed to teach students how to frame and do residential construction and he thought it was a win, win, win to teach the students how to build the shed first would benefit the house. Mr. Dickover explained that it was a great opportunity to

be able to teach the kids how to pour concrete, to practice framing, and to hand-cut the roof. The house roofs are usually truss built and the students do not work on the roof for safety reasons.

Chair Simson commented that the Civics class should be present to help Mr. Dickover present the application. She asked if the applicant was in agreement with the conditions of approval as written by staff. Mr. Dickover confirmed.

Chair Simson asked for questions from commission members.

Commissioner Pearson commented that the contractor for this house would not disappear once the house was built.

With no other questions for the applicant and no public comment, Chair Simson closed the public hearing for deliberation and asked for final comments from staff.

Ms. Miller added that the pitch of the roof on the shed was in compliance because the maximum pitch was 6/12.

Chair Simson commented that the applicant had done a good job matching materials between the house and the shed and it may be the best-looking shed with the materials proposed. She asked for comments or concerns from the Commission

Vice Chair Griffin asked where students would park during construction and commented that there had been a near miss on the parabour in September. He said he hoped there would be no parking on the roundabout. Mr. Griffin also asked about deliveries to the site as there was a night delivery earlier in the week also blocked the roundabout.

Chair Simson commented on the proposed skylights and said the house had two frontages. She said the 1<sup>st</sup> Street frontage was the primary frontage and she believed the skylights at the rear side had been minimized, of a low profile, and meeting the intent of the Code.

Vice Chair Griffin asked if the roof overhang for the shed would drip on the property and not outside the property on to the planting beds that skirt the walkway. Mr. Kilby indicated that the water must drip onto the property and the gables did not hang over the property line.

Vice Chair Griffin pointed out that landscaping was not required so the illustrated picture of the house did not represent what the house would look like. He asked if there was landscaping planned or if it was up to the prospective homeowner. Chair Simson said it was not required and therefore not under the purview of the Planning Commission to direct one way or the other. Ms. Miller noted that the applicant had proposed garden beds and grass.

Chair Simson asked about the proposed fence. Ms. Miller stated that the applicant proposed a wood fence at forty-two inches in the front and a six foot fence along the side and rear. If the fence in the rear was less than three feet from the walkway it would need to be forty-two inches, but because of the existing landscape buffer the code allows for a fence to be six feet high. She said the applicant indicated verbally that he planned to plant arborvitae as well to give more privacy to the property owner. Chair Simson thanked Ms. Miller for the clarification and commented that the property had double frontage, because a public space was on both sides and needed clarification on how they would address the rear fence.

With no other questions or comments, the following motion was received.

**Motion: From Commissioner Chris Flores to approve the application for the Bowman House 3, LA 15-01, based on applicant testimony, public testimony received and the analysis, findings, and**

conditions in the staff report. Seconded by Vice Chair Russell Griffin. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Commissioner Lisa Walker was absent).

### 7. Planning Commissioner Announcements

Vice Chair Griffin announced the *Peter Pan* play to be held at the Sherwood Center for the Arts, October 15 through October 17, 2015. He said they had two casts and 95 participants, an amazing pirate ship and beautiful backdrops.

Commissioner Pearson commented that the Planning Commissioner Training Conference he attended was excellent and he appreciated the opportunity to interact with other commissioners from other jurisdictions of all sizes who shared the same goals to improve the community they live in. We don't get paid for it, but we do it because we want to make our towns and cities the best they can be. He recommended that other commissioners take advantage of future opportunities as it was worth the time.

### 8. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 7:46 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Kirsten Allen, Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: November 24, 2015