

From: [Bill Galaway](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: Re: Sherwood West Interested Parties List -- CAC Mtg. November 3rd 5:30 to 7:30 PM
Date: Thursday, October 28, 2021 9:18:26 AM
Attachments: [image007.png](#)
[image008.png](#)
[image009.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

Hi Erika;

My public comments:

1. In reading through the comments, it is obvious many residents do not understand (or don't care) that state law requires a review of the UGB on a regular basis. Perhaps an article in the local paper describing the process and the intended results. This article could include statistics as to how many residents actually hold jobs within the city.

2. The evaluation criteria states that "Neighborhood retail nodes provide residents with walkable access to goods and services." Given the most recent map shows commercial development at the far north and south points of Sherwood West, this is not walkable. One concept is a mixed commercial/residential development, similar to Orenco and Villebois. The committee should review the success and/or lack of success in these two areas to determine if this is viable for Sherwood.

3. If this plan is implemented, Edy Road becomes the central east/west traffic conduit. Edy is nowhere near capable of handling the load this development will add. It is currently a huge bottleneck on school days. Edy should get the same upgrade as envisioned for Elwert, similar to Sunset. This includes sidewalks, bike paths, turn lanes at all intersections. A roundabout at Copper Terrace should also be considered given the plan shows that road extending across Edy into a large development.

Thanks.
Bill Galaway

On 10/27/2021 4:56 PM, Erika Palmer wrote:

Hello Sherwood West Interested Party:

Attached is the Community Advisory Committee meeting packet for next Wednesday's meeting from 5:30 to 7:30 pm. Please email or drop off written testimony to City Hall 24 hours before the meeting if you wish to provide public comment.

If you have questions, don't hesitate to reach out.

Here is a link to the packet materials too:


https://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning_commission/meeting/48163/cac-5_packet.pdf

Thank you,

Erika Palmer
Planning Manager

City of Sherwood

22560 SW Pine Street • Sherwood, OR 97140

 503-625-4208

 palmere@sherwoodoregon.gov

 www.sherwoodoregon.gov

The Community Development Department is located on the 2nd floor of the City Hall/Library building and is currently open Monday – Friday 8am to 5pm

This email may contain confidential information or privileged material and is intended for use solely by the above referenced recipient. Any review, copying, printing, disclosure, distribution, or other use by any other person or entity is strictly prohibited and may be illegal. If you are not the named recipient, or believe you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the City of Sherwood at (503) 625-5522 and delete the copy you received.

From: [Colleen Resch](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: FW: Citizen Comment for Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee Meeting #4, September 8, 2021, 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Date: Tuesday, September 7, 2021 10:46:06 AM

FYI

From: John D. Vandenberg <john.vandenberg@klarquist.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 4, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Colleen Resch <ReschC@SherwoodOregon.gov>
Subject: Citizen Comment for Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee Meeting #4, September 8, 2021, 5:30 – 7:30 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

Citizen Comment for Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee Meeting #4, September 8, 2021, 5:30 – 7:30 PM

To: Erika Palmer, Planning Manager (Planning@Sherwoodoregon.gov)

Our below comment is intended as a citizen comment for the above-identified meeting. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you.

We live on Baker Road in the Sherwood School district.

Watching the hour-long City Council work session on August 27 regarding Sherwood West was troubling. From the comments of both Council members and Staff it is clear that the speakers believe the following.

Expansion of Sherwood is Inevitable: All speakers assumed that expansion of Sherwood was a given. The Mayor commented that “Sherwood won’t stop there” and the Sherwood West expansion was just the beginning.

Expansion of Sherwood is Desirable: All speakers assumed that expansion of Sherwood is desirable. With one exception there was no mention of any possible downside to expansion. The lone exception was a Council member mentioning that his Facebook poll results showed Sherwood residents concerned about added traffic caused by expanding into Sherwood West. But neither he nor anyone else commented on that concern.

No Effort Needs to be Made to Avoid Expanding Sherwood: No one suggested making any effort to avoid expanding Sherwood’s encroachment on nature. Mention was made of a Metro requirement that a City requesting a mid-cycle expansion of the UGB have taken certain steps to satisfy housing needs within its current boundaries. When it was noted that Sherwood had not taken these steps the discussion moved on, with no one suggesting that Sherwood should earnestly take steps to satisfy future housing needs within its current footprint.

Climate Change, Wildlife, Loss of Habitat is Not Relevant: No one mentioned climate change, wildlife, loss of habitat. The closest anyone came, in the hour-long discussion, to discussing the environment was a repeated comment that the trees along Sunset are beautiful to see. No one said anything to suggest that turning pastures, trees, open spaces into roads, parking lots, buildings requiring air conditioning, etc. would cause the slightest harm to anything of value.

Metro’s Criteria for Expansion are a Mere Obstacle to be Overcome: Several Metro criteria for seeking an expansion of the UGB were mentioned. No one endorsed those criteria or said anything

to suggest that Sherwood shared the concerns behind those criteria. On the contrary, a Staff representative said she “could make some arguments there” and in effect that she could manage to write up something to comply with some of those criteria.

We write to ask that someone on the CAC speak up at the September 8, 2021, meeting and thereafter, to urge the Committee and the City to take a step back in the face of climate change, loss of pollinators, drought, etc., re-think its priorities, and table any and all talk of expansion and instead focus on planning inside the City’s current footprint. At the very least, please insist that all Sherwood West proposals include now—without delaying until momentum toward expansion cannot be stopped—a sincere assessment—not lip service—of trees lost, impact on pollinators, increased traffic (and emissions), light pollution, noise pollution, GHG emissions, increased energy usage for air conditioning, etc., higher surface temperatures from heat-absorbing pavement replacing cooling trees, etc., impact on owls, other birds, wildlife, etc.

Before dismissing our concerns, please ask yourself how widely shared in the Sherwood community they likely are, and consider the results of the Facebook poll we mentioned above:



<https://rosener.com/sherwood-west-poll>

We no longer have the luxury of business (and growth) as usual.

Thank you.

John D. Vandenberg
Jane F. Bicquette
29040 S.W. Baker Road
Sherwood

From: [Colleen Resch](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: FW: Citizen Comment for Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee Meeting #5, November 3,
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 8:45:02 AM

From: John D. Vandenberg <john.vandenberg@klarquist.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2021 11:10 AM
To: Colleen Resch <ReschC@SherwoodOregon.gov>
Subject: Citizen Comment for Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee Meeting #5, November 3,

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

Citizen Comment for Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee Meeting #5, November 3, 2021, 5:30 – 7:30 PM
To: Erika Palmer, Planning Manager (Planning@Sherwoodoregon.gov)

My below comment is intended as a citizen comment for the above-identified meeting. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you.

In evaluating the Open House feedback, please consider:

1. By a margin of 4.73 to 1, respondents to Council Member Rosener's Facebook poll disagreed that Sherwood West "would have a positive effect on our community."
2. The Open House survey avoided any such question, and instead posed questions presuming that this westward sprawl is both inevitable and desirable, avoiding any mention of possible downsides.
3. The City did not mention the Open House survey in the Archer or Sherwood Gazette or otherwise publicize it widely to the general public.
4. Probably many respondents to the survey work for the City, or are developers or otherwise have a financial interest in the expansion.
5. Yet, nearly half of the respondents went beyond the specific questions asked to oppose the expansion, in whole or in part.

Thank you for your service.

John D. Vandenberg
29040 S.W. Baker Road
Sherwood

From: [Colleen Resch](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: FW: Sherwood West Citizen Public Comment Nov 3rd.
Date: Friday, October 29, 2021 2:17:50 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Lynn Berry <gracedx2@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2021 1:22 PM
To: Colleen Resch <ReschC@SherwoodOregon.gov>
Subject: Sherwood West Citizen Public Comment Nov 3rd.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

This statement is intended for citizen public comment regarding the Nov 3 meeting for Sherwood West development.

I learned of this proposed development for the Sherwood West area from a neighbor on the Nextdoor App and my research on this matter is ongoing.

My family and I oppose the development due to increased traffic concerns, pollution, destruction of land, farms and natural habitats. The vast majority of Sherwood citizens oppose this development and resist developing into a city similar to Beaverton, Hillsboro, and other rural towns that have been enveloped with development that has brought crime, pollution, homelessness, and lack of resources. Sherwood is a lasting gem of a beautiful, desirable, safe and family oriented city. The continued loss of open spaces and rural components will ruin Sherwood. If the majority of Sherwood citizens oppose this development, how are these plans still going forward? The few who will make millions on this project are ignoring and taking advantage of Sherwood's citizen's wishes and rights to their city. Please, my family, neighbors, friends and I are demanding to cease this catastrophic development.

Lynn Berry
21715 SW Aldridge Terrace
Sherwood, OR 97140
503.369.4536

October 28, 2021

Public Input regarding the Sherwood West Development Plan

Dear Erika Palmer, Planning Manager for the City of Sherwood, Sherwood Mayor, and the Sherwood City Council:

My husband and I moved to Sherwood over a year ago because of the fact it is a small community and the rural areas surrounding it offer a charm and relief from urban sprawl. It is sad to see up the street in neighboring communities huge developments taking over farmland and vital habitats. When we first heard of the Sherwood West Plan, we were greatly distraught. It feels like the plan is being railroaded without careful thought as to how this will impact the quality of life here. Also, we are greatly concerned about how this plan will affect the Tualatin River Wildlife Refuge, and the Title 13 areas (designated sensitive habitat upland environments) that are clearly marked in the Sherwood West Development Plan area (see map I've included from the Sherwood West Plan).

As we've noted before, there are many, many business and industrial buildings sitting empty in Sherwood right now. To say you need this development for "light industry" is ludicrous. And the fact you want single and multiple family homes in this area makes the potential for urban sprawl, crowded neighborhoods, lack of parking, the need for building more and improving current roads important issues. The traffic already along Edy and Elwert has become heavy just in the year we've lived here. We can't imagine what it will be like if this development goes through as planned.

The mindset that to be successful communities need to grow, grow, grow is outdated. It's time to rethink what we value and use our inventive minds to create other opportunities for financial well-being within the jewel of a town we already have.

We have friends who were up here last spring looking for a small farm to buy. We checked into the two farms on Edy road next to our Oregon Trail neighborhood and were shocked to hear they've already been claimed by developers. I'm very curious how that can be since this plan has not been approved.

Here was a real situation where a young couple who have a great deal of knowledge about land management and agriculture, who could have been an asset to the community of Sherwood (they wanted to contribute to Farmer's Market and have a fruit and vegetable stand to even give away food!). We desperately need small family farms!! We also need share this land with our fellow creatures whose homes are on this so called "vacant" land. Has anyone thought about how they might feel? Where do they go when the bulldozers arrive?

Obviously, I am very passionate about this matter. We've seen communities flatten and destroy habitats, cut down old growth trees, and force wildlife to flee (often into the cities) and lose valuable family farms all in the name of progress. Has anyone been paying attention? We are at

a pivotal moment here. We can stop this madness and choose a wiser approach. We don't have to copy other communities just because they are destroying valuable open space, it doesn't mean we have to.

I ask that you halt the Sherwood West Plan to make time to reconsider if there is a real need for it, and to consider other options to help the wonderful city of Sherwood grow in ways that will be sustainable. That will preserve its reputation as a small, friendly, progressive community with a thriving Art Center and engaged citizens. That we value the sensitive watershed areas around us with their essential flora and fauna and wildlife, something worth preserving for now and for the future of our children.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Marianne Bickett

From: [Sarah Larsen](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: Sherwood West
Date: Monday, October 25, 2021 8:58:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

Hello,

I just found out about the Sherwood West project and I looked over the details. I live in the Mandel Farms neighborhood on the corner of Edy and Elwert and I have some concerns about "Street Framework: Option 2." It looks like it would make Elwert a main artery and Elwert would be "significantly rebuilt." Elwert is already too busy with over 9,000 cars per day; I can't imagine what 14,000 cars per day would sound like. I saw a Facebook post about this topic and many of my neighbors are concerned about what this would do to our sweet little community. Most of us moved to Sherwood to escape the hustle and bustle of larger towns, so this is very concerning. We purchased our home because it is directly across from 2 farms, but it looks like those will may be replaced with large housing developments. Elwert is already dangerous enough as it is for our children. It looks like I am too late to make official comments, but how can my voice be heard?

Thank you,
Sarah Larsen

From: [Colleen Resch](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: FW: Sherwood West Development Plan
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 10:28:28 AM

From: Steve Marriott <scmarriott11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 1, 2021 10:26 AM
To: Colleen Resch <ReschC@SherwoodOregon.gov>
Subject: Sherwood West Development Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

Dear Sirs:

I am not in favor of the provisions of the Sherwood West Development Plan. Before any more land should be incorporated in to the Sherwood city limits, the adjacent infrastructure needs to be updated. Neither Edy nor Elwert are wide enough to handle the current traffic load let alone the increased traffic the Sherwood West Development Plan will cause. Sherwood does not need to grow because some developer wants to get rich by raping the land and stuffing multi-family dwellings so close together that emergency services like fire trucks can barely fit the resulting narrow roads.

The Sherwood West Development Plan is flawed in many ways and appears to have been written by the developer. I am firmly against this plan.

Sincerely,

Stephen Marriott
Trails End Dr
Sherwood

From: [Zander Brown](#)
To: [Erika Palmer](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Sherwood West
Date: Monday, November 1, 2021 7:31:13 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting this email and/or know the content is safe.

Erika, please submit this as a citizen public comment for the November 3rd CAC meeting.
Thank you.

To the committee:

As a resident of Sherwood who lives West of 99, and who would actually be impacted by this development, I believe Sherwood West is an underdeveloped and unsupported idea and we all should take this opportunity to end development and refocus on our current city and growth within the boundaries. It appears as if the planning committee doesn't know about the wishes of the town's residents, as in every single poll taken, the vast majority of the open house commentary, and (albeit anecdotal) every person I have talked to is against this development. It's possible you haven't heard the outcry from the opposition, that is due to the fact most residents have no idea a River Terrace 2.0 is planned in their city.

It seems unreasonable that against unanimous opposition this council continues to push this plan. I understand that money is involved for those developers who provided the first public comment and continue to try to sway people in the local paper. They have a vested interest in this happening, but there are so many better options than Sherwood West. The only people that seem to approve of this plan are ones who stand to make a great deal of money or those of you who have spent a great deal of time planning it and continue to perpetuate the sunk cost fallacy.

Sherwood is a designed, small town bedroom community. Yes, we understand businesses provide the most tax dollars for you, but residents of small towns and bedroom communities move to places like Sherwood to avoid precisely what you propose in Sherwood West. If you want this town to be Tigard, which is what Sherwood West is emulating, you lose what makes Sherwood, well Sherwood. We heard from you on the 27th, that people want to move to Sherwood. They do (and I did) because it wasn't Tigard or Beaverton. They won't move here when plans like this make it similar to those cities, you'll get more vacancies and lose the soul of the neighborhood.

90% of respondents on the open house and the vast majority who answered the poll hosted by Councilor Rosener were opposed to the entire development. Their demands are simple. Invest in parts of town that are widely available. Add more multi-family housing to existing locations so that we increase livability in the town. Work on expanding current roads and building better natural areas. Why do we HAVE to grow?

The only people who seem to WANT to expand are the developers.

Traffic is already abysmal on major thoroughfares and none of the solutions provided will solve it. The idea of moving Elwert out at an angle would be fine if that lessened traffic, but it won't. The additions of new businesses on the side of 99 will make it even busier and drive

more truck/thru traffic down Elwert. The letter read in the last meeting (at least 4 minutes of it) about housing diversity should be considered. By annexing a new area in order to meet the lower income housing requirements you are simply segregating the group off in Sherwood West. You seem to proclaim that we need mixed employment buildings but the businesses in Sherwood proper are already struggling. What makes you think this is not going to be perpetually "for lease" properties as well? I suppose investing in Old Town and surrounding areas via re-zoning and development is out of the question?

In the 2040 plan, Sherwood outlined an increase in quality of life for their current city, not to increase the size of the city and leave parts of it wither. If you build a shopping center on H99 and Sunset, build a shopping center on Scholls Sherwood/Roy Rogers and combine that with the shopping centers on Tualatin Sherwood road, what do you think will happen to Old Town? Ask anyone who lived in Beaverton or Hillsboro when they expanded and put shopping areas at their borders. It died. No one wants to battle traffic to Old Town when there are options at every entrance to a city. You're condemning Old Town.

Traffic will be awful, you'll ruin the small town feel, you will segregate lower income housing to an area that currently provides a wonderful natural buffer from Newberg. And no one who isn't on the committee or making money from this plan will be happy.

Please take one moment to honestly look inside (and maybe ask a neighbor who doesn't know about Sherwood West) to see whether this is a plan to actually HELP Sherwood despite unanimous opposition, or if it just seems like you have to keep going after the hard work you have put in. It's not too late to pivot to something the community will appreciate and approve of, but if you keep on this path it will be. We will all be watching.

Zander Brown
Resident of Sherwood