

**SHERWOOD URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, December 20, 2016  
22560 SW Pine Street, Sherwood, Oregon 97140**

**REGULAR SESSION**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Clark called the meeting to order at 8:50 pm.
2. **BOARD PRESENT:** Chair Krisanna Clark, Jennifer Harris, Jennifer Kuiper, Linda Henderson, Renee Brouse, Dan King and Sally Robinson.
3. **STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Joe Gall, Assistant City Manager Tom Pessemier, City Attorney Josh Soper, Finance Director Katie Henry, and Agency Recorder Sylvia Murphy.
4. **CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. Adoption of September 20, 2016 URA Board Meeting Minutes**

**B. Adoption of October 18, 2016 URA Board Meeting Minutes**

**MOTION: FROM RENEE BROUSE TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA, SECONDED BY DAN KING. MOTION PASSED 5:0, ALL PRESENT MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR. (HARRIS AND HENDERSON NOT PRESENT TO VOTE).**

Chair Clark addressed the next agenda item.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A. URA Resolution 2016-004 Authorizing the URA Manager to sell property owned by the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency; cannery subdivision lot 1**

Assistant City Manager Tom Pessemier stated he would provide one staff report for all the resolutions on the agenda. He said this is a culmination of a process that has been underway for a number of years, starting with SURPAC discussions on URA owned properties and which properties the URA might want to divest itself of, and take those monies and reinvesting to either pay off debt or additional projects the Board may want to do in the future. He said since SURPAC dissolved the URA board has had conversations in work sessions about the properties, the market and ultimately decided to hire an appraiser to appraise five different properties. He said after a recent URA Board meeting, the three properties in the cannery area were the most ideal given the market conditions, to at least begin considering what we could do from a market perspective and ultimately begin selling those properties.

Tom said the three resolutions before the Board tonight are all for the cannery PUD that was done. He said Lot #1 includes the Center for the Arts building. He said the vision there has always been to partition a portion of the property for a pad that is close to Pine Street. He said it's about 4250 square feet. He said URA Resolution 2016-004 is authorizing the URA Manager to partition

that site. He said he also noted some restrictions relative to the sale of the property and explained; the building would be constructed to meet the requirements of the PUD that was approved for the cannery including the pattern book that was adopted by the City Council; that it has as similar look to the adjacent Center for the Arts building with more glazing or brick than is currently on the Center; ensuring that the building is compatible with the Center for the Arts and that the partition does not significantly impact the regular parking for the Center for the Arts. He said these are the conditions that we briefly spoke about and he wanted to apply more formal terms so that as we move forward there is some certainty as to what we would be trying to accomplish in working with a potential purchaser and still retain the character.

**B. URA Resolution 2016-005 Authorizing the URA Manager to sell property owned by the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency; cannery subdivision lot 3**

Tom addressed URA Resolution 2016-005 and said this lot is a piece of property that has been envisioned as a one story office/retail that would have a little bit of parking in the back. He said the conditions are; the building meets the requirements of the PUD including the pattern book and has a similar look to the Center for the Arts building, trying to keep the consistent pattern of the plaza and the Center for the Arts.

**C. URA Resolution 2016-006 Authorizing the URA Manager to sell property owned by the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency; cannery subdivision lot 4**

Tom addressed URA Resolution 2016-006 and said this lot is bigger and adjacent to the plaza and the restrictions would be; a building that was multiple stories and meets the requirements of the PUD including the pattern book; has a similar look to the Center for the Arts, with increased ground floor glazing, increased use of brick; and the use of the building is compatible with the adjacent public plaza.

Chair Clark addressed URA Resolution 2016-004 and opened a public hearing. With no public testimony received, Chair Clark closed the hearing and asked for Board questions.

Ms. Kuiper asked if there was any interest in the site. Tom responded he has spoken with someone that has interest and said they have an aggressive schedule due to the timing of their lease and said if we move forward we could see something happening this calendar year. She asked if staff had any concerns with the existing PUD development considerations for design that would inhibit aesthetics if it is facing in one direction rather than another? She asked if those existing design standards are going to ensure what gets developed on Lot 1?

Tom replied he believes so and said the pattern book as well as the Old Town requirements on the cannery side speak to reinforcing corners, a fair amount of glazing or glass on the building and said it should be something that is compatible and comparable.

Ms. Harris asked, assuming what goes in this location, they will have their own parking and would not be cannibalizing on what is already there? Tom replied, no, there would not be any room for additional parking. He said this was always envisioned, and when we were working with Capstone Development the parking was always a question, and one of the features that we realized is that

the parking for events will differ. He said the businesses would probably be more daytime operational types of businesses. He said Capstone wanted to purchase a portion of the parking lot and actually purchased parking spots, and said he did not know if this is what we would do and this is why the specific provision was noted, so that it did not negatively impact the Center for the Arts parking. He said Capstone was willing to pay for that and were willing to compensate the URA for some of the work that was done and we tracked that project separately to ensure we could recover those capital costs. He said this obviously is not going to happen and the parking will be shared. He said there is also on-street parking and parking along the back. He said there will be a site plan that they will have to go through and this is something that will be heard by the planning commission to make sure they meet the requirements. He informed the Board that the site plan was done for that site as it was one that was considered originally.

Ms. Harris stated, we did not have a tenant for the other space either? Tom replied, no, but they were all considered in the parking calculations. She said they have already considered a full service restaurant, the Center and that the 14 parking spot in the street are good? Tom replied, essentially.

Ms. Henderson asked what is the maximum height requirement for that building? Tom replied, on this side of the tracks it's three stories, 40 feet. He said we are planning for a one-story building.

Ms. Kuiper referred to Tom indicating "planning" and asked if this is codified. Tom replied he did not specify that it is a one-story building, but it would not make sense to do more. Ms. Kuiper commented regarding aesthetics and referred to the Center for the Arts being a two-story building.

Ms. Harris stated they did not want a building that is two-stories.

Ms. Henderson asked if staff envisioned the building being perpendicular to the Center? Tom replied yes. She confirmed longer and along Pine Street, Tom replied yes.

Mayor Clark asked for other questions, with none heard, she asked for a motion.

**MOTION: FROM LINDA HENDERSON TO ADOPT URA RESOLUTION 2016-004, SECONDED BY RENEE BROUSE. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

Chair Clark stated since staff has provided a staff report for all three resolutions, she addressed **URA Resolution 2016-005 authorizing the URA Manager to sell property owned by the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency; cannery subdivision lot 3.**

Chair Clark opened the public hearing. With no testimony received, she closed the public hearing and asked for a motion.

**MOTION: FROM LINDA HENDERSON TO ADOPT URA RESOLUTION 2016-005, SECONDED BY DAN KING. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

Chair Clark addressed **URA Resolution 2016-006 authorizing the URA Manager to sell property owned by the Sherwood Urban Renewal Agency; cannery subdivision lot 4**

Chair Clark opened the public hearing, with no testimony received, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Kuiper referred to the cannery square and the water feature and asked if a building gets constructed here with a back that is just facing the water feature, would that be considered legally as a compatible use, because the way it's written in the code. She further clarified a building not being of a compatible use. Tom replied from a planning commission perspective and given the fact that it is in Old Town and there is zero requirements, the planning commission as long as it meets PUD standards and reinforces the corner, has glazing and other things, it would certainly meet code requirement. He said he specifically put in the conditions that the use of the building is compatible with the adjacent public plaza, so this would be something the URA Manager would be looking at as they are working with the sale and would try to make the sale contingent on certain things, such that we would make sure that it would be, because we would have to go above and beyond what the planning commission could require, just based on the Old Town standards and the PUD.

Ms. Kuiper clarified and said it would be contingent upon a sale, staff would be looking at the plans to see if in fact that is something we want to sell. Tom replied we would probably condition the sale to make sure they did provide us plans.

Ms. Harris commented regarding compatible being subjective and gave examples. Tom replied it is subjective and that is why you have a URA Manager that you trust they are thinking about those things and not having something that will negatively impact the plaza.

Chair Clark asked for other Board questions or comments, with none received she asked for a motion.

**MOTION: FROM MS. HARRIS TO ADOPT URA RESOLUTION 2016-006, SECONDED BY MS. ROBINSON. MOTION PASSED 7:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.**

## **6. ADJOURN**

With no further business, Chair Clark adjourned to a URA Executive Session at 9:15 pm.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Clark called the Executive Session to order at 9:20 pm.
- 2. BOARD PRESENT:** Chair Krisanna Clark, Jennifer Kuiper, Jennifer Harris, Linda Henderson, Renee Brouse, and Dan King. Sally Robinson was absent.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Joe Gall and Assistant City Manager Tom Pessemier.
- 4. TOPIC:**
  - A. Real Property Transactions, Pursuant to ORS 192.660 (2)(e).**

## **5. ADJOURN:**

Chair Clark adjourned at 10:10 pm.

Attest:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sylvia Murphy, MMC, Agency Recorder

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Krisanna Clark, Chair