
**City of Sherwood, Oregon
Sherwood Town Center
Steering Committee Minutes
May 28, 2013**

Steering Committee Members Present:

Chair Patrick Allen
John Clifford
James Copfer
Russell Griffin
Jean Simson
Lisa Walker

Staff Present:

Tom Pessemier, Assistant City Manager
Brad Kilby, Planning Manager
Michelle Miller, Associate Planner
Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Michael Cary

Council Members Present:

Mayor Bill Middleton

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Patrick Allen called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. February 12, 2013 Town Center Plan Steering committee Minutes

Motion: From Lisa Walker to approve the Consent Agenda from February 12, 2013, Seconded by John Clifford. Committee Members Allen, Clifford, Copfer, Griffin and Walker Voted in Favor; Jean Simson abstained (Michael Cary was absent).

3. New Business

- a. Presentation and discussion of Sherwood Town Center Plan and Action Plan

Senior Planner, Michelle Miller gave an overview of the project with a presentation (see record, Exhibit 1) and said the planning for the Sherwood Town Center Plan has taken place for about a year. She reviewed the topics to be covered and said the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) consisted of members of the community, neighbors, and business owners within the study area and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was comprised of staff from other jurisdictions, Metro and government planning agencies. Each advisory committee helped advise towards the plan.

Michelle described that in the 1990's Metro Council adopted the 2040 Growth Concept that would guide regional growth and development and local communities within the region work to determine where to focus growth and development for the next 50 years. She said that in 2012 the City received a grant to evaluate where Sherwood would want to designate its Town Center and a plan for development over time. Michelle stressed that it was a long range plan with policy directions that the community wants to achieve; how it should grow and what it should look like. There are about thirty town centers throughout the region.

Michelle explained the study area and stated that the previous town center boundary was exclusively the retail area along 99W and Tualatin Sherwood Road (known as Six Corners). She

described the process that developed the proposed new Town Center Plan and said input came from the Town Center Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), public open houses, and narrowing down alternatives based on that feedback.

Michelle described the plan structure as having a Town Center Plan Document, which gives an overview of the plan with the accompanying action plan document, and showed a map of the proposed Town Center Boundary. The boundary includes three districts; the Langer Drive Commercial District to the north, bordered by 99W and Tualatin Sherwood Road; a Central Neighborhoods district; and the Old Town district on the south, bordered by the Cannery Square Plaza. The western boundary is the proposed boundary for the cedar creek trail and Langer Farms Parkway is the eastern boundary. Michelle gave characteristics of each of the districts. The presentation showed depictions of what each could look like.

Langer Drive District

- More pedestrian-friendly
- Encourage Reorienting buildings to street rather than interior parking lots
- New buildings “line” the street

Central Neighborhoods

- Existing character preserved
- Pedestrian improvements to improve connections from retail areas and to Old Town
- Vacant land could develop into multi-family uses

Old Town

- Higher, intensity mixed use development where zoned retail
- Infill & redevelopment at higher density (townhomes & multi-family)
- Already contains classic town center concepts
 - Walkable with a sidewalk grid
 - Easy movement from storefront to storefront
 - Unique character

Overall Concepts

- Enhanced streetscapes on Langer & Sherwood Blvd.
 - Wider sidewalks
 - Improved Landscaping
 - Multimodal transportation
- Add north/south bike and pedestrian connections
 - Bike-friendly streets on 10th Street & Gleneagle Drive
- Gateways where key roadways cross the “edges” mark the transition to the Town Center area
- Unifying streetscape elements on Main Corridors

Chris Maciejewski, with DKS Associates the City’s On-Call Traffic Engineer firm discussed the traffic analysis associated with the Town Center Plan. He said the series of roadways, sidewalks, and bicycle improvements within the plan are intended to facilitate movement in the Town Center. Mr. Maciejewski explained the impacts in a twenty year horizon to the surrounding network, if there is an increase in land use density, and said this is above the assumed growth in the Transportation System Plan (TSP). He said that making the changes would bring 125 additional dwelling units, 400

additional employees, and a little over 1000 additional PM peak hour vehicle trips. He said it was evaluated to see if the additions would cause any traffic facilities to not meet standards. Mr. Maciejewski showed a map that showed where the traffic increases would be and said that most of the increase will be on Sherwood Blvd and Langer Drive. Mr. Maciejewski said that traffic near the edges of the Town Center boundary dissipates and on Hwy 99 any growth in that corridor will have to be mitigated. Mr. Maciejewski informed that DKS Associates studied key intersections within the city and there were three intersections on Hwy 99W that did not meet mobility targets in the future under the proposed Town Center Plan. He indicated the intersections and the cost to the City for mitigation and the improvements to be made. Any other intersections that become overloaded so that they fail will also have to be mitigated.

99W / Home Depot – assumes that SW Langer Farms Parkway is extended to 99W [\$275 K]
(add westbound left turn lane)

99W / Edy Rd – Sherwood Blvd [\$1.1 M]
(add dual westbound and eastbound left turn lanes)

99W / Meinecke Pkwy [\$5 K]
(signal phasing modification for left turn lane)

Mr. Maciejewski said that the analysis does not show when the intersections have to be mitigated due to failure, but that the Plan would need to include a funding source to perform the mitigations over a twenty year period. Discussion followed.

Mr. Maciejewski explained that there were options that would not require the traffic intersection mitigations he identified.

Multimodal Mixed-Use Area Designation (MMA) is allowed for areas where there are high densities of mixed uses, transit service, parking management is in place and the need for capacity improvements may be removed. He said there were several jurisdictions that are in the process of creating MMAs, but no established areas. Brad Kilby said there were questions about MMA's and staff would recommend against them at this time. Discussion followed.

Alternative Mobility Targets for 99W Corridor would include working with the State to allow more congestion and might reduce the need for capacity improvements.

30% Town Center Trip Reduction is allowed in the Metro area and is similar to an MMA. It assumes a 30% reduction within the Town Center Plan area. Parking management may be an outstanding factor to achieving this reduction in Sherwood. This reduction would eliminate the required mitigation for the double left turn lanes at 99W and Sherwood Blvd.

Mr. Maciejewski said the tradeoff was more traffic congestion for smaller walkable roads.

Michelle Miller reminded the Committee of the Town Center Goal and some identified policies to be implemented with the plan:

Town Center Goal

Future residential growth, economic development, and public investment in the Sherwood Town Center will enhance urban vibrancy, encourage active transportation, and improve safety and efficiency for all modes of transportation.

Policies

Highlight Unique Characteristics of the Town Center Area

Encourage and active Mix of activities and uses

Ensure a Pedestrian-friendly environment

Higher density in the Town Center

Transportation improvements

Parking is available for the use proposed

Public investment in amenities and infrastructure

Michelle said there were three tiers in the Town Center Action Plan; Adoption which includes a Comprehensive Plan and map amendment and Development Code changes, Short Term Next Steps which require more public input and are possible to achieve within five years, and Long Term Actions items which will also require more public input/study and are achievable within 10 years.

Michelle said the adoption package would include plan amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, updates to the Plan Map and Transportation System Plan, and the following proposed development code amendments:

- Amend townhome requirements
- Restrict or prohibit new motor vehicle-related and land-extensive uses in Retail Commercial and General Commercial zones
- Prohibit [*or restrict*] construction of new drive-through facilities
- Allow certain civic & commercial uses outright, rather than as conditional uses
- Reduce minimum front setbacks in the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zone & for single-family attached and multi-family housing in certain locations
- Require that projects using the Commercial Design Review Matrix earn minimum points on specific standards within the Town Center
- Remove height restrictions in Smockville Area and implement height requirements (40 ft.) of underlying Retail Commercial zone 50 ft.

Michelle discussed results from the Sherwood Town Center Plan Online Survey about the Action Items and said about forty responses had been received, but not all questions were answered. Some of the comments were primarily supportive of walkability and getting rid of auto-dependent uses in the commercial zones. Many answers revealed that there was some confusion about whether the plan included the proposed Walmart site and of the similar naming of both.

Michelle said that staff was looking for feedback regarding the plan, policies and action items in preparation for adoption hearings in June/ July 2013. She stressed that it was a long range plan and the changes will take place over time.

Chair Allen commented about the process for adoption and opened the floor for public comments.

4. Question and Answer Forum

Zana Mays, 21724 SW Wheat Place, Sherwood. Ms. Mays thanked the members of the Steering Committee for the many long hours devoted to make Sherwood a great place to live by attending meetings and reading/ studying the material prior to the meetings. Ms. Mays commented that planning for the City next year or for the next ten to twenty years is a complicated process. Ms. Mays said she had not attended many Planning Commission meetings but was impressed by Commissioners who listened and responded to citizen's concerns at the previous meeting on May 14th regarding Walmart.

Ms. Mays was interested in Action #7 in the Town Center Action Plan that discusses parking and said that there should be at least one parking space per apartment, townhouse, or home. Ms. Mays said that she did not support removing the requirement that garages be provided.

Nancy Taylor, 17036 SW Lynnly Way, Sherwood. Ms. Taylor commented regarding the traffic study done for the Town Center Plan and said that the studies don't seem to reflect what is happening on a daily basis and questioned the quality of traffic studies for the City and County; jurisdictions that she pays taxes to.

Chris Maciejewski, responded that the twenty year analysis assumes that there have been significant improvements to Tualatin Sherwood Road through Washington County's MSTIP project to provide additional lanes at the intersection at 99W from Borchers Drive to Langer Farms Parkway so there should be less congestion and that is why the analysis is not showing that significant improvements are needed at that intersection.

Mr. Maciejewski commented that there is a certain standard that the City has adopted for a minimum performance level and most locations within the City are well below that level and can accommodate more traffic. The traffic studies measure against that standard.

Chair Allen inquired about the intersection at Tualatin Sherwood Road and 99W. Mr. Maciejewski responded to Chair Allen's inquiries and said that the intersection is 95+% utilized and is at capacity. He said that ODOT does not consider sitting at the light for multiple cycles a failed intersection. Mr. Maciejewski commented that the signals on Tualatin Sherwood Road are not coordinated and said the County has near term project to coordinate them.

Bridgette Storey, 23900 SW Redfern Drive, Sherwood. Ms. Storey said she works for the Chamber of Commerce and had the original artist renderings in her garage for Old Town and asked why what was promised to the businesses was pushed aside for high density apartments. Ms. Storey commented on money used to plan for a cultural arts center and said demolishing the building at that location was a waste of taxpayer dollars. Ms. Storey said it was disingenuous for the Planning Commission to say it has no impact or input into what will happen with Tualatin Sherwood Road and should disclose what the County is planning and how it will mesh with the Town Center Plan so that everyone understands. Ms. Storey commented on what Sherwood will look like and asked if we wanted to draw additional traffic or serve the current growth rate. She said large businesses would bring in traffic that the city's infrastructure cannot support. Ms. Storey commented that it was disingenuous to say that the City doesn't have to implement these plans and said it would happen through taxes or levies . Ms. Storey commented that citizens would like to

know what the actual plan is instead of hypotheticals and said that there needs to be a written plan before anything is implemented.

Chair Allen responded that the 33 action items are reasonably detailed. The Plan was an effort to show what the City could be like in the future and how the City could consider many different elements.

Ms. Storey asked if the citizens had a say in what Sherwood will look like or if the process was beyond citizen input. She said she had heard that by the year 2020 Sherwood would have a population of 36,000 and by 2030 it would be 50,000. Ms. Storey said people are wound up because they do not feel like they do not have a lot of input in what the city is going to look like. She commented that she would like Sherwood to have a reasonable growth rate and not bring a lot of additional traffic by people who would not normally come here. She acknowledged that Sherwood would continue to grow and commented on rapid growth without levying new taxes. Ms. Storey asked why Sherwood has high System Development Charges (SDC) that discriminate against small businesses.

Ms. Jean Simson replied that Ms. Storey was asking same questions that the Steering Committee was asking. She said that when she first moved to Sherwood there was a lot of discussion about bringing in commercial development and a push to make Old Town more vibrant and active. Ms. Simson commented that part of the Plan was trying to address these issues. Ms. Simson encouraged participation in the survey that gives citizens the ability to voice their opinion about the issues like the height limit in Old Town. She said if 40 people tell the Committee that they don't want to raise the height in Old Town then the Committee knows and Citizens are at the perfect point to be able to comment and change the way that Sherwood grows or remains the same. Ms. Simson commented that if you don't increase the density then you don't increase the traffic or business opportunities for people in Sherwood. And that is what the Commission has to struggle with.

Ms. Storey accepted the difficulty in creating a balance and commented that her biggest frustration was that Sherwood is not a small business friendly environment. She suggested bringing in more small businesses and making this a friendlier place instead of large businesses. Ms. Storey referred the original drawings she mentioned earlier and asked why that plan was discarded because that plan was more aesthetically pleasing than what is proposed. In reference to the cultural arts center, Ms. Storey commented that there should be accountability for the wasted money.

Dean Boswell, 22796 SW Lincoln Street, Sherwood. Mr. Boswell said he had many questions that he could not get through and Chair Allen asked him to send them via email to the planning commission. Mr. Boswell said he was not opposed to the Plan, but items in it that do not address current issues. Mr. Boswell questioned the need for a Planning Commission and said that Sherwood wants to grow in a healthy way, with efficient roads, and the City Council and Planning Commission are supposed to be working for the residents of Sherwood. Mr. Boswell commented on anarchy from skateboarders and asked if the City was planning for a skate park. He purported that the City has a lot of plans, but does not fully think them out or ask the right questions, and is letting the County and State dictate what is good for Sherwood.

Chair Allen responded that the Planning Commission's purpose was twofold: to advise the City Council on how land and facilities within the city are used and to look at development to see if it

meets those rules set by the Council. He said that a lot of the issues get really complicated and agreed with the frustration with Tualatin Sherwood Road. Chair Allen said it is complicated because the County owns Tualatin Sherwood Road and the State owns our highway 99W and they can decide what to do with their road. Chair Allen informed that the Planning Commission controls how the land gets used and makes recommendations to City Council that they may or may not use. He commented that the code changes are not “real” until there is an actual development and once there is an actual development it is hard to change the rules. He said we need people engaged when we talk about the rules because that is where it matters and the Planning Commission does better when it has lots of input.

Mr. Boswell asked if we could sue the county or state to do what is right. An audience member suggested attending County or State meetings. Chair Allen concurred and responded that there may be ways to litigate but as a property owner they have a lot of latitude to do what they want.

Brad Kilby added that the County was in the process of updating their TSP and now was the time to engage with the County and ask them what they can do to improve the capacity and functionality of Tualatin Sherwood Road. He said the City is not able to stop development, but can put mechanisms in place that look for quality over quantity. The City is not trying to be unfair to small business, but has heard that citizens want development to pay for improvements instead of raising taxes. Brad said that this is where SDC charges come from and while it may seem inequitable to small business the fees are based on the number of traffic trips generated and the number of plumbing fixtures, so Walmart will have more of each of those and will pay higher SDC's than a small business.

Robert James Claus, 22211 SW Pacific Hwy, Sherwood. Mr. Claus commented regarding one name being mentioned in the Town Center Plan documents, misspellings, and said the acknowledgments fall short. He commented on the need for collaboration with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and said it was a central feature of the town with its riparian corridors. Mr. Claus commented on installing a storm water facility on Columbia Street, increasing density and the effect on Stella Olsen Park walkway to the refuge. He spoke about density and suggested the apartments being built by City Hall were agreed on before public input was received and have decreased in value due to urban planning. Mr. Claus commented that the place was turning into something that nobody wants to live in. He said the action points [in the plan] called for more density, smaller units, more SDCs, and was about creating an income source for a staff.

Lori Randel, 22710 SW Orcutt Place, Sherwood. Ms. Randel said she lives across from the “insta-slums” on Willamette Street and she would love to make sure that does not happen again in Sherwood. She said she had encouraged participation in the Town Center Survey and asked that the results be published online. Ms. Randel commented that she was not especially trusting of the City, but that it was getting better with the new administration. She expressed her concern about density and commented that Old Town was already a walking district. Ms. Randel said the City does not need five story buildings, infill in every possible location, or zero setbacks. Ms. Randel suggested that traffic studies are not reality and should be put aside. She voiced a hope that much of the Plan, that does not fit Sherwood, would be discarded because we do not need to be a town of 40,000-60,000 people as Metro thinks we should.

Nadia Belov, 22741 SW Lincoln Street, Sherwood. Miss Belov said she was confused regarding the naming of the Sherwood Town Center Plan and the location where Walmart is planning to go and asked if there was a cap on building size or the number of buildings allowed.

Planning Manager, Brad Kilby answered that the Light Industrial District limits building size to 60,000 SF, but there is no size limitation in Commercial districts. He said there are height, setback, and parking requirements that dictate the size of the structure, but there is not a cap if you meet the other dimensional standards. Brad said there is no moratorium on the number of sites that can be built to a similar size as Walmart.

Chair Allen said there is a limited number of acres that are allowed to be developed that way, so the number of buildings that can be built is finite.

June Reynolds, 22438 SW Hall Street, Sherwood. Ms. Reynolds said she has been involved in Sherwood since 1962 and has watched the City and State change over the many years. She expressed her concerns for rapid growth and said as the ad hoc historian for Sherwood she objected to the moniker of 'Town Center'. Ms. Reynolds commented that the town center has always been Old Town and she highly objected to Walmart calling their development the Sherwood Town Center.

Ms. Reynolds said she has walked this town for over 12 years, but she does not walk on 99W or Tualatin Sherwood Road because they are highly dangerous roads and they will never be walkable. She commented that a trail to the wildlife refuge would also be dangerous walk or bus ride. She commented that a walking bridge across might work, but walking to the Walmart store would not be a lovely experience. Ms. Reynolds remarked about traffic congestion because of density and asked that the City support services. She said that she worked at the high school for ten years and staff joked around about taking over the Target building when it failed for a second high school. She asked if there was money for schools, sewer, water and roads and said she did not think that this community could support more development.

Tony Bevel, 17036 SW Lynnly Way, Sherwood. Mr. Bevel commented that people were at the meeting because there was distrust in the City government and said that he hoped Mayor Middleton kept his campaign promises. Mr. Bevel said he lived on a street off of Roy Rogers Road that receives cut through traffic from people trying to avoid peak hour traffic and suggested traffic bumps be considered. He said there was a meeting about a year ago where he was told they could not be used because of fire trucks. Mr. Bevel commented that other cities use them and Sherwood should consider using them for neighborhoods where people circumvent traffic and go through local neighborhoods.

Naomi Belov, 22741 SW Lincoln Street, Sherwood. Ms. Belov commented regarding the Walmart property being in the Urban Renewal District and asked about the property taxes not going towards schools, fire, police and roads. She asked if the tax funds would be used to pay the city government's salaries.

Chair Allen responded that Planning Commission members are citizen volunteers and Ms. Belov should inquire from the City Council because they are the directors for the Urban Renewal Agency. Chair Allen explained that when an Urban Renewal District is created the value of the properties

within the district is frozen and the property taxes for new development go to pay for the approved projects in the Urban Renewal District. He said that when the list of approved projects is complete the district either ends and goes away or the Agency adds more projects through the amendment process. Chair Allen described the school portion as complicated, because the more the city generates in property taxes, the less the state sends. Chair Allen said a small percentage of the revenue pays for the administration of the district but the Planning Commission does not administer any of it.

Meerta Meyer, 24002 SW Middleton Road, Sherwood. Ms. Meyer asked if traffic analyses from 1995 to current could be provided on the website with a comparison of the population growth for the City since 1995. Ms. Meyer expressed her concerns for how the trips are calculated in the Capacity Allocation Program (CAP) and said it should be reevaluated. She commented on a lack of design standards within the City saying there were only guidelines for developers and said design standards should be established separately through a public process. Ms. Meyer suggested there should be incentives for small businesses and discounted SDC fees for first time business owners similar to what the City of Gresham has done.

Elizabeth Farnum, 16933 SW Cobblestone Drive, Sherwood. Ms. Farnum asked why higher density was encouraged.

Chair Allen responded by saying that his family moved to Sherwood when the population was about 9000 and there were many reasons why one would move to Sherwood; good schools, nice neighborhoods, parks, walkable areas, Old Town. He commented regarding living at the edge of the metropolitan area and close to farms and rural areas. Chair Allen observed that Oregon continues to grow and there are two choices for where those people can go; at a higher density or to push into the rural areas. He said that one of the ways to preserve the farm land, forests, and riparian areas is to increase density. Chair Allen noted that in his time living here there have been several annexations pushing the boundary out and said that if we want to keep the density and neighborhoods the same then the only choice is to move into the farm fields. Chair Allen commented that he enjoyed finding produce from Sherwood at grocery stores elsewhere in the state.

Ms. Simson agreed and commented that how to increase density, protect the farmland, and still keep an old town feel was a difficult task and a hard balance.

Ms. Farnum asked if the communication has been made with the schools regarding the Town Center Plan and commented on vacancies in the existing buildings.

Ms. Simson answered that Oregon law will not allow the City to prevent development because there is insufficient room in the schools.

Michelle Miller added that there is no proposed change to zoning so the changes come with incentives for developing where there are no buildings. The policies in the plan may dictate that the City wants to encourage walkability and offer incentives to create the appropriate mix.

Chair Allen added that a traditional strip mall or box store would be car dependent and the Plan hopes to create an environment where it is better for more small businesses. He said that it may be

tempting to wait because of the poor economy, but it would be too late to create a plan when the economy improves. Chair Allen commented that his perception of what may go in the three story buildings could be doctor/ dentist's offices or small professional business.

Ms. Farnum commented that it rains nine months of the year and suggested that Bridgeport Village, another pedestrian friendly shopping center in the area, was less busy in the winter months.

Eugene Stewart, PO Box 534, Sherwood. Mr. Stewart said he no longer lives in town, but owns property in the City and used to live in town. He said that there came a time when down town could no longer support the needs of the residents because they could no longer support a family. Mr. Stewart commented that the City should be looking at why no new businesses have come to Old Town and said that all of the commercial business is being concentrated in six corners. He said this will create traffic problems and have motorist cutting through Old Town without stopping. Mr. Stewart commented that narrowing streets to calm the traffic creates a problem. Mr. Stewart commented on the roads in Idaho and a need for a Citizen's Involvement Plan. He said there were good people in Sherwood with good ideas that could mix with staff and the Committee's ideas for less opposition.

Brian Hagan, 22471 SW Murdock Road, Sherwood. Mr. Hagan commented that his property looked over the Federal land where there are signs that say "No Trespassing" and his understanding was that the bird refuge was spread out in many different areas around Washington County. He said he was aware of State and the County regulations and asked if there was coordination with the Federal Government and the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge.

Michelle answered that if there is a current proposal for property nearby the refuge then they would receive notice of the project and the city sends out notice to all of the agencies within the area concerning the project. She said that the City partners with the Refuge and knows the areas that the Refuge has protected. Michelle commented that the City follows CWS and DSL requirements that are often in tandem with what the Refuge would require.

Chair Allen suggested that the City should reach out to the Refuge regarding the Town Center Plan project.

Mr. Hagan commented that he understood why a company would want to come to Sherwood, but that he did not see any benefit to the community.

Kathy Hollamon, 14735 SW Brooke Court, Sherwood. Ms. Hollamon commented she has been a high school teacher for twenty years and that we should be planning for our schools. She said when she began teaching she shared 50 students with another teacher and now she teaches 56 kids with 4 teaching assistants in one class and her teaching is compromised with so many students at one time. Ms. Hollamon said she has knocked on doors to inform residents of possible ordinances for the City regarding Walmart and most concerns were about traffic, crime, and the type of people that a Walmart would bring. Ms. Hollamon cited crime, business practices, and not being family friendly as other reasons. She commented that residents love Sherwood and asked the Committee to consider slowing down development. Ms. Hollamon commented about a projected 50,000 population for Sherwood and said she like the neighborhoods in Sherwood and

was less excited about higher density. Discussion followed about where the 50,000 population projection came from.

Brian Smith, 21037 SW Houston Drive, Sherwood. Mr. Smith recommended that the survey remain on the website to give people an opportunity to respond.

Chair Allen closed the public testimony and reminded that there will be other opportunities to testify regarding the Town Center Plan.

Chair Allen called for a recess at 9:06pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:15 pm.

Chair Allen proposed that there was not sufficient time to thoughtfully go through the action items and asked for suggestions on how to proceed to prepare for the joint meeting with City Council.

Michelle Miller suggested that it was important to have a plan, plan boundary and to get direction from Council on transportation improvements. She said the adoption plan contains eight code changes that are technical in nature and the short term or long term items can be bundled and time frames discussed.

Chair Allen commented that the Committee needed guidance from Council regarding higher density and what was trying to be achieved foundationally.

Jean Simson suggested breaking up density for each district and asking if the plan is on track for higher density in Old Town, allowing Accessory Dwelling Units and mixed use opportunities in central neighborhood district, and walkable community for the commercial district. She said each district was distinct and should have unique overlays for each. Ms. Simson also wanted more input regarding the Town Center boundary. Discussion followed.

Brad Kilby suggested that the committee get the big picture questions answered by Council and work out the details in work session. He reminded everyone that the plan will go to Planning Commission and City Council for public hearings. The work session will include from what the existing code would allow, to how it would change under the Town Center Plan. Discussion followed with possible points identified as discussion items with City Council:

- Old Town Density
- Inclusion of central neighborhood in the Plan
- Making Langer Drive a walkable community
- Mixed Use on Sherwood Blvd.
- How the Plan interacts with the existing old town overlay
- Traffic Standards and options for using alternative approaches to congestion

Prompted by a question from the audience regarding the confusion between the Sherwood Town Center by Gramor Development and the Sherwood Town Center Plan by the City, Tom Pessemier Assistant City Manager, informed that City Manager Joseph Gall had been directed by the City Council to write a letter to Gramor Development to recommend that they change the name of the development. (Note: the Gramor Development website is now using *Parkway Village at Sherwood.*)

The Steering Committee concluded the meeting. Chair Allen said the next Steering Committee meeting would be a work session and would not receive public comment. He encouraged participation in the Town Center Survey on the website.
www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwoodtowncenter

5. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Kirsten Allen

Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: *August 13, 2013*