



**City of Sherwood
PLANNING COMMISSION
Sherwood City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140
September 11, 2012 – 7PM**

Business Meeting – 7:00 PM

- 1. Call to Order/Roll Call**
- 2. Agenda Review**
- 3. Consent Agenda: None**
- 4. Council Liaison Announcements**
- 5. Staff Announcements**
- 6. Community Comments**
- 7. Old Business**
 - a. Public Hearing -TSP amendment for Cedar Brook Way (PA 12-03) (continued from 8/14)***

Amend the Transportation System Plan to change the functional classification of Cedar Brook Way from a local to a collector status road. The proposal will also update the TSP to clarify that the road connection is intended to go from Elwert road to Handley with one connection to Pacific Highway. The Pacific Highway connection location is not defined but would be somewhere 990 feet from both the Sunset and Meinecke Road intersections.

- 8. New Business**
 - a. Sherwood Town Center Plan update***

- 9. Adjourn**

Next Meeting: September 25, 2012



MEMORANDUM

City of Sherwood
22560 SW Pine St.
Sherwood, OR 97140
Tel 503-625-5522
Fax 503-625-5524
www.sherwoodoregon.gov

Mayor
Keith Mays

Council President
Dave Grant

Councilors
Linda Henderson
Robyn Folsom
Bill Butterfield
Matt Langer
Krisanna Clark

City Manager
Joseph Gall, ICMA-CM



2009 Top Ten Selection



2007 18th Best Place to Live

Sherwood

2006

All-America City Finalist

DATE: September 4, 2012
TO: Sherwood City Planning Commission
FROM: Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Cedar Brook Way TSP amendment (PA 12-03)

At the Planning Commission meeting on August 14, 2012, the Commission held a public hearing on PA 12-03 to consider amending the TSP relating to Cedar Brook Way. After hearing staff testimony and public testimony, the Commission continued the hearing until the September 11, 2012 meeting to allow staff time to provide more information on several items. The Commission has closed the public record portion of this meeting, but agreed that they could decide to re-open it if deemed appropriate. If the Commission determines not to re-open the public testimony portion of the hearing, the public would continue to have an opportunity to provide input at the City Council hearing. The Commission should refer to the packet materials previously provided for the August 14, 2012 meeting in addition to this memorandum.

Response to issues raised/questions asked:

The Commission asked for more information on the process/ability to obtain a variance from the County to connect a local road to Elwert (and arterial road)

Per the County standards (referenced in the DKS memo at footnote 5), "Direct access to arterial roads shall be from collector or other arterial streets. Exceptions for local streets and private accesses may be allowed through a Type II process when collector access is found to be unavailable and impracticable by the Director." It is possible that the County would approve an exception to connect a local street to Elwert; however there is no guarantee and there would be more review documentation required. Because there is already a local street stub to the Elks property, Bushong Terrace, it is possible the County would determine that an alternative access is available and practical and not permit the exception.

How important is this amendment to connectivity?

The DKS analysis Memo looked at the intersection impacts, assuming existing and 2035 traffic volumes with and without Cedar Brook Way connecting from Elwert to Handley and with and without an access to Pacific Highway. Taking the information from the 4 options studied, it is clear that more connectivity between Elwert and Handley is better for the study intersections, especially the Highway 99W/Sunset intersection (the higher the number, the worse the congestion at the intersection.) All of the options, with improvements meet the service standards, but Options 3 and 4 provide more capacity for development of these properties before major off-site improvements are necessary.

| Comparison of Volume to Capacity (V/C) for study intersection operations (2035 PM Peak with no additional off-site improvements ¹) | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| | Hwy 99/ Elwert Rd- Sunset | Hwy 99/ Meinecke | Handley St/ Cedar Brook Way | Elwert Rd./ Kruger Rd | Elwert Rd/ Handley | Hwy 99/ New access |
| Option 1 - no connection from Elwert to Handley (DKS memo table 6) | >2 | .91 | .50 | .64 | .59 | .89 |
| Option 2 - connection from Elwert to Handley, no hwy access (DKS memo table 8) | 1.76 | .90 | .58 | .64 | .52 | n/a |
| Option 3 - connection from Elwert to Handley, right-in/right out hwy access (DKS memo table 10) | 1.78 | .92 | .50 | .61 | .50 | .89 |
| Option 4 - connection from Elwert to Handley, full signalized hwy access (DKS memo table) | 1.49 | .87 | .46 | .60 | .50 | .85 |

Finally, it should be noted that while not having a connection from Elwert to Handley would keep the residential traffic separate from the commercial traffic, it would likely have greater impacts to the residential neighborhood directly north of the Elks property. This is especially true if the County did not allow a local street connection to Elwert in which case the residential development would have only one access out; along Bushong Terrace to the north of the Elks property. In addition, having the residential areas able to access the commercial areas without having to travel over the arterial road network (Elwert to Pacific Highway) is consistent with the intent of connectivity.

¹ Data from Exhibit B of the 8/14/12 packet – Memo from DKS dated June 28, 2012
PA 12-03 Cedar Brook Way TSP Amendment
9-4-12 PC memo

Who does have access to 99W and will all other accesses be closed when development of the road occurs?

The City does not control access to 99W. When a development is proposed, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) will apply their access control standards and consideration is given to existing deeded accesses as well as properties with no deeded access or those that have previously given up their access rights. Regardless, according to the DKS memo and confirmed by ODOT, there are no locations along this stretch of 99W that has a "reservation access" (a location where access rights have been retained) which means that when a street location is proposed the City would need to apply for a grant of access.

ODOT has the ultimate say in the creation of new, and the retention or closure of existing access points to the highway. Temporary or permanent access to Pacific Highway will be dependent on the traffic generated by the proposed use and the existing alternate access options available.

Clarification on funding options for the road

While the funding of the road is not a part of the TSP amendment decision process, staff has met with a number of the property owners directly affected by this road alignment and believe that these owners now understand the difference between the proposed TSP amendment and ultimate construction of the road. It is our understanding that a number of people originally testified against the amendment because they did not understand the SDC credits. Attached to this memo is more detail on how the current SDC credits work. This memo is for information only as how the roads are ultimately constructed and paid for are not decided through a TSP and is not part of this project.

That said, it is also our understanding that this amendment, in and of itself, does not remove all uncertainty for these properties and it will not be until a road is actually designed that more certainty regarding location and costs will be provided. The Commission can certainly include in their recommendation to the Council a recommendation that the City take the lead on providing more clarity on the road alignment and design.

Attachments:

- 1 – Clarification of SDC and TDT Credits from Bob Galati



MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Sherwood Planning Commission

FROM: Bob Galati, P.E.
City Engineer, Engineering Department

SUBJECT: Cedar Brook Way TSP Amendment

ISSUE: Clarification of City SDC and County TDT Credits

In recent discussions about the Cedar Brook Way TSP Amendment, two main questions were asked concerning credits;

1. At what point is the construction cost of a public road improvement eligible for credits against transportation SDC/TDT charges?
2. What are the criteria for calculating SDC/TDT credits for right-of-way dedication and road construction costs?

The following information provides specific information on the applicable components for both the City Transportation System Development Charge (SDC) and Washington County Transportation Development Tax (TDT).

General Definitions

Municipal Code Section 15.16.020 – Purpose, provides the following:

“The purpose of the system development charge is to impose an equitable share of the cost of capital improvements for water, sanitary sewer, streets, storm drainage, and parks and open space upon those new or expanded developments that create the need for increased demand on capital improvements.”

Section 15.16.040 – Definitions, define SDC’s as follows:

“System development charge” means a reimbursement fee, an improvement fee, or a combination thereof, assessed or collected at the time of issuance of a building permit, or at the time of connection to a capital improvement. “System development charge” includes that portion of a sanitary sewer, storm water, or water system connection charge that is greater than the amount necessary to reimburse the city for its average cost of inspecting and installing connections to water, storm water, and sanitary sewer facilities. “System development charge” does not include charges assessed or collected as part of a local improvement district or a charge in lieu of a local improvement district assessment, or the cost of complying with requirements or conditions imposed by a land use decision.

Section 1 of the Countywide Transportation Development Tax Procedures Manual provides the following information for the TDT:

“The Countywide TDT program will collect charges from new development based on the development’s projected impact on the transportation system. Proceeds from the TDT program will be used to fund road and transit capital improvements as identified in the capital improvements list. These improvements provide additional capacity to the major transportation system.”

“The Countywide TDT is based on a uniform rate structure that will be assessed by all jurisdictions. The tax charged to a developing property for a particular use is the same whether the developing property is located within any city or within the unincorporated urban area or within the rural area.”

City Transportation SDC Credit Criteria

- 1) The following criteria are standard for a development project to be eligible for City Transportation SDC Credits:
 - a) The proposed transportation improvement must be identified in the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).
 - b) The proposed transportation improvement must be for a road designation of collector or higher classification.
 - c) The City accepts the full actual road construction cost towards the valuation of the SDC Credit.
 - d) Rights-of-way and easement costs are eligible for SDC Credits.
 - i) Land valuation may be based on either a City reviewed and approved appraisal valuation, or the County assessors land valuation, whichever is higher. (Section 15.16.100.J)
- 2) Engineering, surveying, and plan review and inspection fees are not eligible for SDC Credits.
- 3) Construction costs are based on City review and acceptance of final construction progress payments and related tracking spreadsheets in verifying actual construction costs. (Section 15.16.100.J)
 - a) Items identified as not eligible for credits are excluded from SDC Credit analysis.
 - b) Eligible credits may not exceed prevailing market rates for similar projects as determined by the City.

Washington County TDT Credit Criteria

- 1) Information on the Washington County TDT Credit process is identified in the County Wide Transportation Development Tax Procedures Manual (June 2009).
- 2) The TDT Procedures Manual provides the following criteria to be eligible to receive TDT Credits:
 - a) The proposed transportation improvement must be identified on the County's TDT CIP list. (Section 3.17.030.2)
 - b) The proposed transportation improvement is built larger or with greater capacity than the local government's minimum standard facility size. (Section 3.17.070.2)
 - c) Eligible construction costs for TDT Credits are based solely on the portion of the improvement that: (Section 3.17.030.2)
 - i) Exceeds the local government's minimum standard facility size (local road);
 - ii) Exceeds the capacity needed to serve the particular development project or property.
- 3) Valuation of rights-of-way and easement land market value are based on county tax records. (Section 3.17.070.3.b)
- 4) Total eligible TDT Credit for engineering and survey services shall not exceed 13.5% of total construction costs. (Section 3.17.070.A.11) The City excludes plan and inspection fees from TDT Credit analysis.
- 5) If developer has taken CWS SDC Credits towards storm water quantity and/or storm water quality infrastructure, then the construction cost of these facilities are not eligible for TDT Credits. (Section 3.17.070.A.12)



MEMORANDUM

City of Sherwood
22560 SW Pine St.
Sherwood, OR 97140
Tel 503-625-5522
Fax 503-625-5524
www.sherwoodoregon.gov

Mayor
Keith Mays

Council President
Dave Grant

Councilors
Linda Henderson
Robyn Folsom
Bill Butterfield
Matt Langer
Krisanna Clark

City Manager
Joseph Gall, ICMA-CM



2009 Top Ten Selection



2007 18th Best Place to Live

Sherwood

2006

All-America City Finalist

DATE: September 4, 2012
TO: Sherwood City Planning Commission
FROM: Julia Hajduk, Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Sherwood Town Center Plan

The Planning Commission is designated as the Steering Committee for the Town Center Plan. While there are 3 Steering Committee meetings officially scoped for the Town Center project, it was recognized that the Planning Commission would want to be updated throughout the process and be given the opportunity to ask questions, provide input and direction.

The Steering Committee met in June and provided feedback on the goals and objectives of the project as well as the public involvement plan. Since that time, the consultant team has been working on the background data, existing conditions report, identifying opportunities and constraints and drafting a vision statement for consideration. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting is scheduled for September 12th to review the reports and provide feedback. The documents will then be shared at an open house on October 3rd for public input. After the TAC and SAC meeting and Open House, the comments received will be compiled and brought to the Steering Committee for final input and guidance.

The purpose of this topic on the September 11th meeting agenda is to give you the opportunity to review the documents that are going to the SAC and TAC and share any overarching comments or concerns that you might want us to pose to the SAC, TAC and at the Open House.

Attachments:

- 1 - Draft Vision Statement
- 2 - Draft Existing Conditions Report

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 4, 2012

TO: Sherwood Town Center Plan Technical Advisory Committee and Stakeholder Advisory Committee

FROM: Darci Rudzinski, Shayna Rehberg, Carolyn Reid
Angelo Planning Group

**SUBJECT: Sherwood Town Center Plan
Draft Vision Statement**

The *Project Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria* memorandum (July 16, 2012) identifies several goals and objectives to help guide the development of a Town Center Plan. Developing an overarching vision for the Town Center, as instructed by Goal 2 in that memorandum, will help identify the desired attributes for Sherwood's Town Center and begin to put in context the opportunities and constraints to achieving these attributes, as explored in the Existing Conditions Report. The vision task and objectives are described as follows:

Goal 2 – Town Center Vision. Develop an overarching vision that guides the development and redevelopment in the Town Center; evaluation of land use, transportation, and design alternatives; and agency coordination and plan implementation.

Objectives

- Establish a vision statement that specifically describes the uses, activities, look, and feel of the future Sherwood Town Center.
- Determine boundaries for the Town Center, whether existing boundaries, expanded boundaries to include Old Town, or modified boundaries to encompass just Old Town.
- Consider the vision statements from the 2007 Economic Opportunities Analysis and other City planning documents in developing the Sherwood Town Center Vision.
- Create opportunities for public/private partnerships within the Sherwood Town Center to achieve the vision.

The following proposed vision statement is guided by these objectives. (Note that determining the boundary will follow a discussion of possible alternatives for the location of the Town Center and creating opportunities for public/private partnerships will be part of implementation.)

Town Center Vision Statement

Sherwood Town Center is a lively, safe, and beautiful place that embodies the best of Sherwood, a family friendly community with historic roots that enthusiastically plans for a bright future. The Town Center is the focal point of community life and commerce: neighbors and visitors come together here to eat, shop, work, and play. The mix of housing, restaurants, shops, parks, natural areas and public gathering spaces that front vibrant, tree-lined streets supports existing businesses and attracts new businesses and visitors. Getting to and getting around the Town Center is easy, whether you are traveling on foot, by bike, by skateboard, on a bus, or in a car.

Sherwood Town Center Existing Conditions Report

For a complete copy of the report, please refer to
<http://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwood-town-center-plan>