
**City of Sherwood, Oregon
Sherwood Town Center
Steering Committee Minutes
February 12, 2013**

Steering Committee Members Present:

Chair Patrick Allen
John Clifford
Russell Griffin
Lisa Walker

Staff Present:

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director
Michelle Miller, Associate Planner
Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Brad Albert
Michael Cary
James Copfer

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Community Development Director, Julia Hajduk called the meeting to order at 6:08 pm.

2. Agenda Review

The agenda consisted of a presentation and discussion of Sherwood Town Center Plan Alternative Evaluation Report of the Sherwood Town Center

3. Consent Agenda

There were no consent agenda items.

4. Community Comments

There were no community Comments

5. Old Business

a. Presentation and discussion of Sherwood Town Center Plan Alternative Evaluation Report
Julia introduced Darci Rudzinski, Angelo Planning Group and Chris Maciejewski, DKS Associates to discuss the Sherwood Town Center Plan and informed the Committee that Russell Griffin and John Clifford were also members of the Stakeholders Advisory Committee (SAC).

Ms. Rudzinski began a presentation (see record, Exhibit 1) and said that throughout the process she asked the SAC foundational questions regarding what the Sherwood Town Center should look like; where the activity area should be and how intense they should be. Ms. Rudzinski said the Sherwood Town Center should look like Sherwood and capitalize on characteristics that have the most meaning for people, building on them. The plan is not limited to size, but needs a boundary, a definition of what town center is with goals, policies, and action items to help make the town center come to fruition.

Ms. Rudzinski said that staff and consultants helped the SAC come up with a draft vision statement that is the overarching vision guiding the process.

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.

Ms. Rudzinski explained that the project goals were developed early in the project.

- *Goal 1 – Community Involvement: Provide meaningful opportunities for community members to be involved in the Sherwood Town Center Plan process, including those most directly affected by the outcomes, as well as the community at large.*
- *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.*
- *Goal 3 – Land Use and Transportation: Develop a plan for the Sherwood Town Center that supports economic development and urban vibrancy, encourages active transportation, and improves safety and efficiency for all modes of transportation.*
- *Goal 4 – Plan Coordination: Ensure consistency with existing local and regional plans and land use regulations, particularly recent updates to plans and regulations. Coordinate efforts with planning processes in progress.*
- *Goal 5 – Implementation: Develop an appealing, cost-effective, and politically achievable plan to implement project recommendations.*

Ms. Rudzinski explained that the process is a little over half way through and just passed the alternatives evaluation portion of the project, that guidance was received from the SAC, TAC and members of the public and consultants were trying to build a plan around a preferred alternative.

Ms. Rudzinski commented that a town center boundary should include all of the activity areas and places where people go to get goods and services. She said green space is a big part of Sherwood and also what makes town centers vibrant adding that the Cedar Creek Trail it is an enhancement to the City's transportation system.

Ms. Rudzinski explained that there are three "nodes" of activity; Six Corners, Old Town and the emerging Langer Farms PUD and a market analysis and a transportation analysis were done that looked for opportunities and constraints within the boundaries of the study area. She said opportunities were identified with things to build on in the community and the public was asked for feedback at the first open house with the result being three alternatives developed from the feedback.

Ms. Rudzinski explained that Alternative 1 focuses squarely on Old Town and was concerned with access and getting people to that area. If Sherwood were to experience more growth, it would be in Old Town and concentrated growth would occur through land use changes and transportation.

Chair Allen asked regarding the paradox of people saying they wanted more growth in Old Town and the controversy that happens when development comes to the Old Town area.

Ms. Rudzinski answered that as information comes forward about the implications of certain land use in particular areas people begin to understand the tradeoffs. Part of the exercise was to describe and find areas that could, over time, intensify and provide more activity, more types of uses and more support for existing businesses. Ms. Rudzinski said it could even include the need for certain types of businesses, but conversely there would be more traffic, more congestion downtown (that may require circulation changes), and parking issues when there are more businesses and restaurants. Ms. Rudzinski said transit was discussed and the need for more users in order to get more frequency, but in order to have transit you need to have people in nodes of concentrated areas.

Julia explained that the idea of only Old Town being a town center was before any alternatives were developed and once people realized what that would look like they no longer thought that the town center should be merely Old Town.

Mr. Maciejewski added that there might also be definitions of what you do not want as part of the town center and while Metro guidelines suggest 40 people per acre as a density guideline in a town center, Metro was clear that Sherwood can make the town center what the City wants it to be. Mr. Maciejewski said high capacity transit from Portland to Sherwood will require that higher density however, and consultants have been guided to about ½ of that density that is more in line with the character that is there today.

Julia said that if the community wants high capacity transit, then staff will work towards that, it just is not as easy a sell.

Ms. Rudzinski explained that Alternative 2 is the entire study area and understands the importance of connections between 99W and Old Town. It concentrates more on what can be done in the Six Corners area, making it a multi-model mixed-use area that fits a town center definition. Ms. Rudzinski said that Alternative 2 emphasizes making 99W less of a barrier by slowing down traffic and narrowing it to help people get across it and to accommodate high capacity transit. Ms. Rudzinski said that the high capacity transit would go down 99W and Sherwood Blvd. into old town and there would be a big emphasis on north to south bike and pedestrian connections.

Ms. Rudzinski explained that the Alternative 3 focuses on the inside of the natural boundaries and re-envision Langer Drive as a main street, making it more pedestrian friendly with building entrances facing the street. She said Alternative 3 is a combination of development and redevelopment by looking to Six Corners and Old Town to absorb some of the 20 year growth through more density over time.

Ms. Rudzinski commented that gateway locations were discussed in all three alternatives, as well as land use assumptions and transportation needs. In Alternative 3, high capacity transit would occur along Langer Farms Parkway and all alternatives include bike and pedestrian improvements.

Ms. Rudzinski said the alternatives were weighed against the goals and objectives that were established and traffic implications showed that there are issues with signalized intersections that do not meet state targets.

Ms. Rudzinski commented that a comparative analysis was made by comparing each alternative with the set criteria and none of the alternatives were perfect. She said the information from the comparative analysis was taken to the second open house where the public was asked which alternative best builds on or promotes the unique character of the area and what allows for the best mix of land uses and housing that promotes economic development and growth. Ms. Rudzinski said that City staff had created a survey with additional questions pertaining to walking distances, transit service within the city, desired amenities, and what was most important to help the city prioritize resources and investment.

Ms. Rudzinski said that Alternative 3 was strongly supported and although there was some discussion to include the residential area south of Old Town the SAC voted not to include this area. Ms. Rudzinski showed a list of potential implementation action items as a recommendation for the Town Center Plan and said the Committee may want to provide direction to modify the development code, to consider the Old Town Overlay and needed parking management. Ms. Rudzinski said that the next step was to develop an implementation report on how to reach the goals, with policies and a financial report.

Julia stated that staff wanted direction from Steering Committee, whether it was a consensus to move forward with Alternative 3 as recommended by the SAC and TAC, or to move forward with adjustments, so the consultant team could analyze it in greater detail. Julia asked for feedback from the committee regarding thoughts or concerns that need to be considered as the consultants prepare the implementation report.

Chair Allen asked for reaction to the recommended option. All present committee members were in favor of Alternative 3 voicing concerns for traffic and improving the intersections at 99W to make it easier for people to cross safely. Questions were asked regarding attendance to public meetings and concerns expressed about making a choice that would later be unfavorable, but too late in the process to amend. Discussion followed regarding public outreach and the decision making process.

Julia remarked that staff would work on finding ways to improve public involvement.

5. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54 pm.

Submitted by:



Kirsten Allen

Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: May 28, 2013