



AGENDA

Community Advisory Committee Meeting #9

DATE: June 15, 2022

TIME: 5:30 – 7:30 PM

LOCATION: **In person: Sherwood City Hall, Council Chambers, 22560 SW Pine**

Citizen comments and public testimony may be provided in person, in writing or by telephone. Written comments must be submitted at least 24 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting start time by email to planning@sherwoodoregon.gov and must clearly state that it is intended as a general Citizen Comment for this meeting. To provide comment by phone during the live meeting, email or call (planning@sherwoodoregon.gov / 503-925-2308) at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting start time in order to receive dial-in instructions. Per Council Rules Ch. 2 Section (V)(D)(5), Citizen Comments, "Speakers shall identify themselves by their name and by their city of residence." Anonymous comments will not be accepted into the meeting record. If you require ADA accommodations, please contact the Planning Department at 503-925-2308 or email planning@sherwoodoregon.gov at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting time.

Meeting Purpose

- Review updates to the scenario assumptions and information
- Create draft scenarios

Agenda

5:30 PM	1. Welcome <i>Approve meeting summary from CAC #8</i>	Erika Palmer, City of Sherwood
5:35 PM	2. Public Comment	Erika Palmer
5:45 PM	3. Updates to Scenario Assumptions and Information <i>Please review the memorandum in the packet – updates to scenario assumptions have been made per CAC input. This is intended as a short “check-in” agenda item.</i> <u>Discussion questions:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>What comments or questions do members have regarding the updated assumptions and information for the scenarios?</i> <i>Are the assumptions on track? Are any further refinements needed?</i> 	Project Team
6:00 PM	4. Breakout Groups – Creating Draft Scenarios	Project Team

This agenda item will be a hands-on exercise to create “rough draft” scenario maps. The CAC will work in small groups to discuss and place land use “chips” on base maps.

Building on the plan ideas and concepts developed to date, the breakout groups will place chips for employment uses, mixed-use, parks and schools, and residential uses.

Following the breakout group work, the maps will be viewed and discussed. As a final step, the CAC will discuss next steps regarding community engagement in the scenario process.

7:25 PM

5. Summarize Next Steps and Adjourn

Joe Dills, MIG | APG



MEETING MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee (CAC)

DATE: April 21, 2022 – Meeting #8

TIME: 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM

LOCATION: Virtual Online, YouTube Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gHoMYp-lmQc>

CAC Members Present: Mare Furst, Jean Simson, Brian Fairbanks, Kennedy Hawkins, Emily Campbell, Councilor Doug Scott, Jim Rose, Councilor Tim Rosener, and John Clifford.

Consultants and Sherwood Staff Present: Joe Dills with MIG/APG, Kate Rogers with MIG/APG, Saumya Kini with Walker Macy, Erika Palmer, Planning Manager.

Agenda Item

1. Welcome and Introductions

Approve meeting summary from CAC #7. Kennedy Hawkins noted that he was not listed as a CAC Member Present. John Clifford noted he was listed twice as present.

2. Public Comment

Brian Fields said he lives on Eastview Road and is a member of the Eastview Road Neighborhood Association. He thanked Councilor Tim Rosener, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, and City Engineer Bob Galati for visiting their neighborhood on April 1 and listening to their concerns. He said the Association opposed the proposed western edge north/south connector and is concerned about the impacts the road would have on the existing neighborhood (see record, Exhibit A).

Carol Quam submitted written testimony which Erika Palmer read into the record. The testimony noted that in planning it is critical to clearly articulate the state law that is mandating the planning process (see record, Exhibit B).

3. Update to Scenario Assumptions and Information

Councilor Tim Rosener suggested discussing communication strategies with the public regarding the process.

Mr. Dills provided a presentation with assumption updates (see record, Exhibit C). He said the buildable land inventory (BLI) has been updated and said the mixed employment acres have been reduced by 20 acres but could grow. There were concerns raised about the reduction of mixed employment acres. Discussion followed.

SHERWOOD WEST CONCEPT PLAN

Mr. Dills said the estimate of total open space has been updated to reflect close to 40%. He said there are several tree farms in the area.

Kate Rogers commented on the housing balance assumptions and said according to Metro Title 11 the City must demonstrate ways to achieve a range of housing of different types, tenure, and prices. She commented on Metro Housing Rule that requires the City to zone land to allow 50% of new housing the opportunity to be multifamily or single-family attached housing. Based on the 2019 HNA the City is currently meeting the 50% rule within the current boundaries. The HNA assumed the 20-year forecast for new housing will be 50% single-family detached, 25% single-family attached, and 25% multifamily. The current buildable residential land cannot accommodate expected future growth and the greatest deficits are in medium and high density residential zones.

Councilor Rosener referred to the HNA and said it shows a deficit of 605 housing units over the 20 year period which is fairly small and can be accommodated without all of Sherwood West.

Jean Simson said this slide (see record, Exhibit C) is misleading and makes it sound like the City of Sherwood HNA is planning for 50% attached and multifamily and stated that is what the State requirements had us put in the document. She said the Metro Housing Rule has become a moot point with the HB 2001. She asked for clarity on the overall density target for Sherwood West because she thought it would be closer to 8 units per acre as opposed to 10 units. Mr. Dills said the 10 units is per net buildable acres and after speaking to Metro staff this is what other expansion areas have achieved. Councilor Scott said the HNA targets a number lower than 10, and that is what we should follow. Jean Simson said 8 units will provide more than adequate housing. Mr. Dills said the project team is trying to set Sherwood up for a Metro urban growth boundary approval if and when Council ask for expansion. Councilor Rosener said he wants Metro to explain why 8 units is not acceptable. He suggested submitting to Metro what we think is right and then let Metro say no and explain the no. Councilor Scott said we have an HNA that has a number in it and Metro has acknowledged the adopted HNA. Kennedy Hawkins said at the September 8 meeting the assumption was closer to 8 units per acre. Mare Furst agreed that her notes show 8 units. Jean Simson said we should do what is best for our community and stated we are a fringe community without transportation, and we are trying to build a jobs/housing balance as part of our Comprehensive Plan goals. Mr. Dills said he is hearing direction that Sherwood should make their case to Metro and asked when they want that conversation with Metro to start. Councilor Scott said the mandate of this committee is to provide City Council with an updated Sherwood West Concept Plan that meets the needs of the community and that an Urban Growth Boundary request to Metro is a separate issue.

Kate Rogers commented on parks and schools and said the 2021 Parks and Recreation Plan recommended that Sherwood West consider a sports complex and potential field house and potentially a community park south of Edy Road, adjacent to natural area. She said they had discussions with the School District and have updated the assumptions for acreage needed for a Middle School from 40 acres to 25-30 acres. She said the District has capacity in existing schools for the first 10 years of growth in Sherwood West. Discussion followed.

Mr. Dills said the land use designations have been updated as well as density ranges. He said they are still retaining the idea of village planning/village zone and provided examples. Councilor Scott referred to village planning and asked if it will lock in unit types. Mr. Dills said yes, you can create a master plan specific area even pre-annexation. Councilor Rosener referred to cottage clusters and asked if they fall in the 11-18 units/acre. Mr. Dills said yes. Jean Simson said she asked for these numbers to be reduced and she is not comfortable with her name being associated with this. She would like to revisit the middle housing having 11-18 units/acre. Mr. Dills said the 11-18 units/acre is reflective of those housing types and to address the gap between 11 units/acre and 16 units/acre. Jean Simson said that gap has existed in this community for years. Councilor Scott said the gap is not an accident. Mr. Dills asked if the committee wants to apply the current code into Sherwood west or craft new zoning tools. Jean Simson said the current density now can be quadrupled with the implementation of HB 2001 and is hesitant to increase density in Sherwood West with this unknown impact of HB 2001. Councilor Scott is opposed to apply the old zone and said it is a broken tool that does not work now with HB 2001. John Clifford asked how parking will be accounted for. Councilor Rosener said there is new legislation being discussed at the State and Metro that will reduce parking requirements further. Mare Furst referred to comments about 55 plus communities and asked if that is an option that can be accommodated in Sherwood West. Mr. Dills said you can create opportunities then the market can deliver. Councilor Scott suggested leaving out parking and street width from this plan with the rule making coming out of the State. Mr. Dills summarized the land use designations and said the density ranges can be changed. Jean Simson requested that the middle housing be changed to 10-16 units/acre and multifamily be reduced to 16-24 units/acre and that the calculations should assume the highest density number in all the zones.

Jean Simson referred to housing and job balance and said this it is not providing enough jobs according to the 2 residents per 1 job target. Mr. Dills said there is a need to improve the imbalance and the team will need to bring back information regarding an appropriate target ratio.

5. Community Engagement Strategy

Discussion followed about community outreach and having an open house.

Mr. Dills commented on the next steps and said this is not ready to present to the public yet. He said with the direction given tonight and the Sherwood messaging and suggested another committee meeting. He stated the maps and tables need to be updated. John Clifford said information on HB 2001 should be presented at the open house.

Ms. Palmer discussed outreach and said they visited with the Eastview neighborhood residents recently and held a coffee discussion with residents from Mandel Farms. She said both groups provided good feedback and she has another coffee discussion scheduled for early May.

Jean Simson suggested providing links and one page documents at the open house regarding issues driving this process.

Mr. Dills asked for email feedback on the maps that were not addressed at this meeting. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.



SHERWOOD WEST DRAFT SCENARIOS (REVISED)

TO: Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
 FROM: Project Team
 CC: Sherwood West Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
 DATE: June 8, 2022

Overview

This memorandum is a revision to the Draft Scenarios memo presented to the Sherwood West CAC and TAC in April 2022. The assumptions and draft scenarios have been revised in response to feedback from the committees, and further discussion with City staff and partners. This represents the fourth step in the City's discussions regarding the Sherwood West Concept Plan scenarios (alternatives). Steps to date have been:

1. November and December – Background information and scenario concepts
2. February – Design studies of the central area of the plan
3. April – Draft scenarios for discussion and refinement
4. June – Revised draft scenario assumptions and information

This memorandum describes:

- Updates to the assumptions for the scenarios
- Revised draft scenarios

The project team is looking for Committee input on these materials so they may be updated as needed and subsequently shared with the community. At its June meeting, the CAC will: (a) discuss the updated scenario assumptions; (b) create draft scenario ideas in a hands-on exercise; and (c) determine next steps for community engagement.

Updated Scenario Assumptions and Information

BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY (BLI)

The net amount of buildable land in Sherwood West is summarized below. The BLI approximates the buildable land base: about 250 acres for employment uses and 300 acres for residential uses. These numbers will vary based on specifics in the scenarios but are good approximations for discussion purposes.

Note: These numbers have been updated based on reconsideration of Upland Habitat and Institutional designations within the Mixed Employment areas in the northern portion of Sherwood West. See further discussion of these updates below.

Table 1. Sherwood West Buildable Land Summary

TOTAL GROSS ACRES	1,291
TOTAL NET BUILDABLE ACRES*	641
<i>Less Mixed Employment Acres</i>	<i>254</i>
<i>Less Future Neighborhood Park Acres</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Less Future Community Park Acres</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Less Future New Elementary-Middle School Site Acres</i>	<i>40</i>
Net Buildable Residential Land Supply (Acres)	310

* Net buildable land calculation includes removal of constrained land, deduction of 0.25-acre from lots greater than 0.5-acre with a dwelling unit, and a percent deduction for future street right-of-way.

EMPLOYMENT ASSUMPTIONS

Mixed Employment Acreage

The assumption for total Mixed Employment acreage in Sherwood West thus far was based on a study of buildable lands conducted last year. A summary of the findings for that study were presented at the August 2021 meetings of the TAC and CAC. The BLI identified 198 net buildable acres of land that would meet the suitability criteria for Sherwood West’s target employment uses, as identified in the Economic Opportunities and Strategies memorandum. This includes large, flat, developable areas with transportation access.

The following changes are reflected in the updated BLI calculations:

- **Added Upland Habitat area.** The BLI initially deducted 100% of the area identified as Upland Class B Habitat under Metro Title, consistent with prior BLI methodologies. That included a large swath (approximately 72 acres) of forested land in the northern portion of Sherwood West. However, a portion of that forested habitat area has already been cut down, as seen in recent aerial imagery. Based on input from the TAC and CAC and further research into the Title 13 requirements, that forested area has been added back into the buildable inventory. If it were to be developed, 30% of the tree canopy would need to be retained pursuant to Sherwood Development Code 16.142.070 – “Trees on Property Subject to Certain Land Use Applications.” Accordingly, this update adds back approximately 50 acres of viable Mixed Employment land.¹
- **Added institutional acreage.** The project team added back 20 acres of land that had previously been deducted from the Mixed Employment acreage to account for a potential property

¹ In the future, when the land is added to the Urban Growth Boundary, the City will conduct more detailed planning (known as Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy analysis) to determine more precisely what habitat areas are to be protected.

acquisition for Institutional or Public Uses. However, direction from the CAC was to maximize the employment potential in this portion of Sherwood West where there is the most land suitable for Mixed Employment uses.

- **Added local hospitality site.** The team added 10 acres to account for the proposed local hospitality site on Kruger Road.
- **Subtracted small commercial node.** The team removed 4.5 acres from the Mixed Employment total that had been identified as a potential mixed-use node just north of the high school, since that concept was not favored by the CAC.

Jobs-Housing Ratio

One of the main goals for updating the Sherwood West Concept Plan is to incorporate employment land and to prioritize job growth and expansion of the city's tax base, as directed by the Sherwood City Council. Sherwood currently has a jobs-to-housing ratio of 0.9, meaning that for every 10 households in the city, there are 9 jobs.² There is no standard jobs-housing ratio that is right for all communities, but it can provide a helpful guide to the balance between employment uses and residential uses in the city. Generally speaking, if the jobs-housing balance is too low, this may indicate inadequate job availability for area residents and the need for residents to commute elsewhere for work. Conversely, if the jobs-housing balance is too high, adequate housing may be unaffordable or unavailable to workers in that area, leading to issues such as housing unaffordability and traffic congestion from workers commuting into the city.

Beyond the basic jobs-housing ratio, it is also important to have balance in the types of employment in the community. According to 2019 Census data, approximately 92% of local Sherwood residents work outside of the community.³ This suggests that some residents are seeking employment outside Sherwood because the jobs available within the city do not match their needs.

Adding more employment land in Sherwood West is intended to help balance the jobs-housing ratio in the city, help balance the types of jobs in the community, and allow more residents to live and work in Sherwood. This has benefits in terms of quality of life, traffic congestion, and lower emissions.

Employment Estimates

As directed by the CAC, the project team has prepared preliminary estimates of the job potential for Sherwood West, and associated jobs-housing ratio.

Based on the maximum possible land devoted to Mixed Employment uses (254 net acres), the team estimates a total capacity of approximately 5,400 jobs. The calculations and assumptions used to reach this estimate are included in the tables in Attachment A. The jobs-per-acre estimates are from the

² Average Employment – Oregon Employment Department, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, 2020. Number of Households – Metro 2040 TAZ forecast by Households, January 2016, Sherwood Housing Needs Analysis 2019-2039, adopted December 2020, ORD 2020-010.

³ U.S.Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies, LEHD. <https://onthemap.ces.census.gov/>

Metro 2014 Urban Growth Report⁴ and from the scenario planning software Urban Footprint.⁵ The employment types are based on Leland Consulting Group's "Economic Opportunities and Challenges Memo." The roughly-estimated acreages for each employment type are based on the draft Mixed Employment concepts presented at the August 2021 TAC/CAC meetings.

The jobs-housing ratio estimate for Sherwood West depends on which housing scenario is assumed (housing metrics are discussed below). However, based on the range of estimated housing units from approximately 2,500 to 4,400 and the total estimated employment capacity of 5,400 jobs, Sherwood West could have a jobs-housing ratio of between 2.1 and 1.2. When combined with the current ratio in the City of Sherwood, the overall jobs-housing ratio for the city increases to roughly 1.2 or 1.0.

Again, these are initial rough estimates of employment capacity for Sherwood West. A more dialed-in estimate for the draft scenarios will be prepared when they are evaluated during the next project phase.

Phasing

Employment growth in Sherwood West will happen gradually. Initial development is expected to happen in the central portion of the study area, which has the best access to existing utilities and transportation. The northern area that is largely dedicated to Mixed Employment faces challenges to extending infrastructure. It would be necessary to extend public utilities in order to develop the area north of Chicken Creek, along both sides of Elwert Road, west of Roy Rogers Road, and south of Scholls-Sherwood Road. The extension of sanitary sewer, water and stormwater facilities is described below:

- **Sanitary Sewer** – to provide sanitary sewer service to the development area, a sanitary sewer trunk line extension would be taken from the existing trunk line located along the Chicken Creek corridor, which runs from south to north then east to the existing Sherwood sanitary pump station. Upsizing of the existing Chicken Creek sanitary sewer trunk line and Sherwood pump station may be required to handle the additional flows from the development area.
- **Water System** – to provide water service to the development area, a trunk line extension would be taken from the existing water trunk line located in Elwert Road, extended north along the Elwert Road alignment, east along the Scholls-Sherwood Road alignment, then south along the Roy Rogers Road alignment connecting to the existing water trunk line on Roy Rogers Road that is within the existing city limits. This extension creates a looped trunk system for providing the necessary service to the development area.
- **Storm Water** – depending on individual private site development projects, either regional or private stormwater collection, conveyance, treatment and detention systems, along with hydromodification systems will be required. Discharge will most likely be to the Chicken Creek

⁴ Metro Urban Growth Report: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/urban-growth-report>; 2014 UGR Appendix 6: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2015/10/27/2014UGR-Appendix-6-employment-land-demand-analysis-Final.pdf>.

⁵ Urban Footprint provides data for various building types (e.g., industrial, tech office, hotel, etc.) based on real-world examples of each type. Included in the building type summaries are typical jobs-per-acre figures. <https://urbanfootprint.com/>

stream corridor. There are no existing public stormwater systems that could be extended that would be able to provide stormwater service to the development area north of the Chicken Creek stream corridor.

Because of these challenges, development in the northern area is likely to happen in later phases of development in Sherwood West.

ESTIMATE OF TOTAL OPEN SPACE

Sherwood West has the potential to be a very green community. Below is an estimate of overall open space. These estimates have been updated to reflect the adjustments to Upland Class B Habitat noted above.

Notes:

- Parks, trails and open spaces set aside as part of development projects will generally be publicly accessible, except for certain natural resource areas.
- Trees will be retained according to the Sherwood Development Code and will likely require additional open space. The project team is working on an estimate of preserved tree groves (outside of Title 13 resource areas) and will provide updated metrics at a subsequent Committee meeting.

Table 2. Sherwood West Open Space Estimates

Open Space Type	Acres	Percent of Total Area
Baseline Open Space*		
Title 13 resource lands (Riparian Class I and II, Upland Class A, 30% of Upland Class B in Emp. Areas) and Steep Slopes	305	23.6%
Community Park (minus Title 13 areas)	20	1.5%
Neighborhood Parks	18	1.4%
Natural gas line easement outside of other open space	15	1.2%
SUBTOTAL – BASELINE OPEN SPACE	358	27.7%
Open space established during development review (assumed at 15%)	47	3.6%
TOTAL ESTIMATED OPEN SPACE	405	31.4%

* Additional open space from tree retention outside of Title 13 areas will occur, but is not included in this estimate, except for in Mixed Employment areas.

INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLIC USES

Community Parks

Sherwood's updated Parks and Recreation Plan (2021), discusses recommendations for park, trail, and facility development throughout the City and within planned growth areas such as Sherwood West.

Recommendations for parks and facilities within Sherwood West include the following:⁶

- Provide parks or park amenities in natural areas and along trail corridors to meet the 10-minute walk goal.
- Site a community park south of Edy Road, potentially adjacent to a natural area.
- Consider a sports complex within Sherwood West to include rectangular fields with lighting and potentially a new fieldhouse. A sports field complex would be used for soccer, lacrosse, rugby and Ultimate frisbee, and could be located within a community park or as a stand-alone special use facility. The complex should include at least six full-size rectangular fields. Fields should be lighted, can be natural or synthetic turf and should be marked for other field sizes and other sports. The complex should include parking, restrooms, Wifi, storage, and support facilities such as concessions, a tournament hub and office space. At least 10 acres of relatively level, developable land is needed to accommodate a sports field complex of this type. More fields would be desirable, if a large enough site could be secured. In addition to a sports complex, a new Sherwood Field House is desirable adjacent to the sports field complex. More land would be required to accommodate both the fields and the field house.

Schools

The project team has been coordinating with the Sherwood School District on future school planning in Sherwood West. Based on initial guidance, we had been assuming that 50 acres within Sherwood West would be set aside for a future elementary (10 ac) and middle school (40 ac). At the February Committee meetings, we reviewed conceptual design studies for the central portion of Sherwood West, and discussed potential locations for the elementary and/or middle school within that area.

However, subsequent discussions with the School District have revealed two things:

1. Middle schools in the district need 25-30 acres (depending on topography), not 40 acres. These updated land area assumptions are reflected in the draft scenarios.
2. Based on growth assumptions, it is estimated that the district will have sufficient capacity in its existing schools for at least the first 10 years of growth in Sherwood West.

Early development in Sherwood West is likely to happen where infrastructure is proximate—such as in the central area near the high school. Because new school facilities are not anticipated to be needed in those early phases, schools should not be planned within the central area of Sherwood West. However, as Sherwood West is built out, there will likely be demand for additional school facilities; therefore, it is

⁶ Source: Sherwood Parks & Recreation Master Plan (2021).

https://www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/Engineering/page/342/sherwood_parks_recreation_master_plan_final_optimized_for_web_viewing_finalmay2021.pdf

appropriate to plan for an elementary and middle school in future phases of Sherwood West. These would most likely be planned in the area north of Chicken Creek—where the land is flatter and more conducive to school siting—or potentially in a flatter area at the south end of Sherwood West.

Institutional vs. Mixed Employment

The April 2022 version of the scenario maps showed a portion of the northern area near Roy Rogers Road as “Institutional and Public,” based on opportunities for a potential community park or other public use in that area. However, input from the CAC indicated that we should reserve as much of that northern area as possible for Mixed Employment uses, given that it has the best locational attributes for large employment uses in Sherwood West. Therefore, the assumptions in this memo consider that acreage for Mixed Employment.

HOW MUCH ATTACHED HOUSING SHOULD BE PLANNED FOR SHERWOOD WEST?

Housing, and specifically multi-family and middle housing forms, is a sensitive issue in Sherwood. As a general approach to the Concept Plan, the CAC has been clear that the priority is to prepare Sherwood’s vision for the plan and not focus on what may be required by regional or state agencies. Accordingly, the following information is provided for context only.

Metro Title 11

Title 11 of the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan addresses planning for new urban areas added to the urban growth boundary. The City of Sherwood is required to have a Title 11-compliant Concept Plan for Sherwood West before it can be added to the UGB. In the Concept Planning process, Title 11 requires cities to address housing needs, set housing goals, and consider actions necessary to achieve a range of housing of different types, tenure, and prices. Housing needs for the Concept Plan area must be addressed in the context of the housing needs of the city (per the Sherwood Housing Needs Analysis or HNA), the county, and the region (if data is available).

Metro staff has advised the City of Sherwood to target an overall residential density of approximately 10 dwelling units per net acre for Sherwood West. This is an opinion based on experience with other expansion areas and Metro’s policy focus on equity, housing choice, and affordability. It is not a numerical requirement. The Title 11 requirement for the Sherwood West Concept Plan will be for the City to describe how it is meeting its housing needs.

Metropolitan Housing Rule

The Metropolitan Housing Rule (OAR 660-007) requires cities within the Metro UGB to designate sufficient buildable land to provide the opportunity for at least 50% of new residential units to be single-family attached housing (i.e., townhomes) or multifamily housing. In other words, the City is required to zone land such that 50% of its new housing could be (not must be) multifamily or single-family attached housing. According to the HNA, the City of Sherwood currently meets the 50% rule for land within city limits. To maintain compliance, any new areas added to the city must also meet the 50% rule—this includes Sherwood West. New requirements for middle housing complicate how to demonstrate compliance with this rule.

Sherwood HNA

Sherwood’s most recent Housing Needs Analysis was prepared in 2019. The analysis, with a focus on meeting state requirements, assumed that the forecast for new housing in the city will be: 50% single-family detached, 25% single-family attached, and 25% multifamily. As noted above, the Concept Plan will need to describe how it is addressing the City’s housing needs relative to Title 11. When the land is added to the UGB, the City will do more detailed planning for housing and how housing need is being addressed.

HOUSING DENSITY ASSUMPTIONS AND ESTIMATES

Based on CAC guidance in April, and input from CAC members subsequent to the meeting, the project team made several changes to the residential zoning and housing assumptions:

- **Apply the Sherwood Development Code zoning.** For the multifamily and single-family (“Neighborhood”) zones, we are now assuming the same density ranges as in the SDC’s existing zones--HDR for multifamily and LDR, MDRL, and MDRH for single-family zones. For the middle housing zones, there is no comparable zoning in the current SDC, so we’ve applied density ranges that fall between the HDR and MDRH ranges.
- **Assume build-out to maximum density.** The housing metrics assume that land will be built to the maximum allowable density for each zone, reflecting recent experience in the City.
- **Assume a percentage of middle housing in Neighborhood Zones.** Middle housing will be permitted in the Neighborhood Zones, as required by House Bill 2001, but it is unknown how much middle housing will actually be developed. Based on current development trends (as gleaned from sources such as developers in the region and housing economists), the project team’s best guess is somewhere in the range of 5-10% of single-family areas developed with middle housing. CAC members have requested testing of a range of percentages to identify what the possible outcomes could be.

The housing metrics tables on page 13 identify the total number of units—and associated densities—assuming that 10%, 20%, and 50% of the Neighborhood Zones could be developed with middle housing at maximum allowed densities (25 units per net acre). These are theoretical possibilities, not predictions.

Note: The City will need to choose housing and employment numbers to use for infrastructure analyses for the Concept Plan. Those numbers could be a range. Looking ahead, the Concept Plan itself could even include a range of potential growth outcomes.

- **Add more potential zones.** The last version of the draft scenarios identified four base zones: Multifamily, Middle Housing, Green Neighborhood A, and Green Neighborhood B. The revised scenarios include two additional zones:
 - **Cottage Zone** – Cottage clusters appear to be one of the more desirable middle housing types by the Sherwood community; therefore, it was suggested by CAC members that we include a zone dedicated specifically to this housing type.

- **Neighborhood-Medium/High Zone** – Also per CAC suggestion, we included a small-lot single-family zone based on the current MDRH zone, which would allow up to 11 units per net acre. Middle housing would also be permitted in this zone.

These zones are described further in the next section.

Residential Land Use Designations for the Concept Plan

As discussed in December, the CAC is interested in “new tools” for use in the Concept Plan. The April 2022 version of this memo included an update of proposed land use designations to use for the Concept Plan.

Table 3 below is an updated version of the residential zones and adds two new zones: Cottage Zone and Neighborhood-Medium/High Zone. The Multifamily, Middle Housing, and other Neighborhood (formerly “Green Neighborhood”) categories are also carried forward. In addition, the “Village” zone has been removed from the draft scenarios per discussions with CAC members, as described in the Village Planning section below.

Table 3. Potential Concept Plan Residential Zones for Sherwood West

Zone	Purpose and Attributes
Multifamily Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: To provide intentional locations for apartments and condominiums in Sherwood West. • Apartments, condominiums, townhomes, triplexes, and quadplexes would be permitted in this zone. • Draft density assumption: 16.8-24 dwelling units/acre would match the City’s High Density Residential (HDR) Zone and are assumed for this zone. (Note that modern apartment projects are being built at densities in the 30+ units/acre range.)
Middle Housing Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: To provide intentional locations for specific middle housing choices of duplexes, townhomes, and cottage clusters. • Detached dwellings (aka single family) other than cottage clusters would not be permitted, allowing the zone to focus on specific middle housing forms. • Draft density assumption: 5.5-11 dwelling units/acre are assumed for this zone. (Matching the density range for the City’s Medium Density Residential High [MDRH] zone.)
Cottage Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: To provide intentional locations for cottage cluster housing. • Cottage clusters are groupings of relatively small homes clustered around a shared courtyard or open space. They often feature shared or clustered parking areas and may have one or more community buildings for shared use by the residents. Cottage clusters can resemble traditional single-family homes; however, one of the key differences is that some of the cottages will

Zone	Purpose and Attributes
	<p>not abut the street, and may have access only from a pedestrian walkway or shared driveway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottage clusters are often seen as an attractive alternative to traditional single-family homes because of their smaller footprints and emphasis on shared amenities, which can foster a sense of community. These features can make cottage cluster housing appealing to many seniors, small households, and first-time homebuyers. • Because the Cottage Cluster zone would not permit standard single-family homes, this zone would not be subject to the requirements of HB 2001. As such, the City would have flexibility to establish siting and design standards that are more tailored to Sherwood West. This could include larger minimum lot sizes, higher open space requirements, stricter or looser limits on cottage size, and more detailed design standards. However, it would be important to ensure that the standards do not make cottage clusters infeasible or unattractive to developers—especially since no other housing type could be built in this zone. • Draft density assumption: 12.8-16 units/acre
<p>Neighborhood Zones</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: To provide land for a range of single and middle housing types, ensuring open space with each project. • These are the zones for single detached homes; by law, the full range of middle housing must also be allowed (with design standards) because single detached dwellings are permitted. Duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses, and cottage clusters would all be permitted. • Three types of Neighborhood zones are explored in the draft scenarios: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighborhood-Medium/High – This zone was added in this revised version of the draft scenarios and is based on the current Medium Density Residential High (MDRH) zone. This would be applied in flatter areas with larger sites where there would be more flexibility for creation of smaller lots and somewhat higher densities. <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Draft density assumption: 5.5-11 units/acre.</p> ○ Neighborhood-Medium – This was known as “Green Neighborhood A” in the prior draft. The density assumptions have been adjusted to match the current Medium Density Residential Low (MDRL) zone. This zone would also be applied in flatter areas with larger sites. <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Draft density assumption: 5.6-8 units/acre.</p> ○ Neighborhood-Low – This was known as “Green Neighborhood B” in the prior draft. The density assumptions have been adjusted to match the current Low Density Residential (LDR) zone. This zone would be applied in hillside and hilltop areas, and in parcelized areas with existing homes,

Zone	Purpose and Attributes
	<p>where lots would be larger and densities would be lower. This would better accommodate topography, utility access, partial development, and other features, which would typically require larger lot zoning.</p> <p>Draft density assumption: 3.5-5 units/acre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all three Neighborhood zone types, the City’s current 5% open space requirement for subdivisions could be bumped up to 10%; in PUDs, the minimum 15% could be increased to 25%. The open space could be flexibly used for trails, community gardens, tree preservation, etc. • Also in all three zones, development would be allowed to “block up” their open space to help preserve/enhance natural areas. Homes would be allowed to have smaller lots in exchange for larger areas of consolidated open space. This is known as “cluster development” or “conservation development.” Near Chicken Creek and other resource areas, cluster development could be a requirement to ensure these resources are preserved. • Potential Zoning Tools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Minimum/maximum lots per acre (rather than units per acre)—varied by zone type (Medium/High, Medium, or Low). ○ Minimum lot size varied by zone type and housing type. ○ Minimum open space varied by zone type. ○ Designation of natural areas, minimum open space acreage in cluster development. ○ Flexible lot standards in cluster development (e.g., no minimum dimensions).

HOUSING ESTIMATES

Using the above land use designations and other assumptions about middle housing, how much housing might be built in Sherwood West?

Depending on how much middle housing is built in the Neighborhood zones, and the acreages assigned to each zone, the total amount of housing could range from roughly 2,500 units up to 4,400 units. The low end of the range represents no middle housing being developed above the base maximum density in the Neighborhood-Medium/High, -Medium, or -Low zones. The high end represents 50% of the Neighborhood zones being developed as middle housing at maximum allowable densities. (Note: The project team does not believe this is a likely outcome for these areas. As noted above, we think the more likely outcome is 5-10% of the Neighborhood zones built with middle housing and the remainder with single-family, which would result in closer to 2,700 total units.)

These housing estimates are summarized in Tables 4 and 5 below. Detailed calculations for the housing metrics are included as Attachment B. Version 1 of the tables shows potential outcomes if acreages are

SHERWOOD WEST CONCEPT PLAN

assigned to the Middle Housing and Neighborhood-Medium/High zones. Version 2 shows potential outcomes if these zones are excluded (but the Cottage Zone is still included).

Table 4. Housing Metrics Summary - Version 1: All Zones

	Density Range (Net)	Total Acres (Net)	% of Acres	Total Housing Units (with Percentage of Middle Housing in Neighborhood Zones)			
				0%	10%	20%	50%
Multi-Family (HDR)	16.8 to 24	28	11%	672	672	672	672
Middle Housing Zone	5.5 to 11	14	5%	154	154	154	154
Cottage Zone	12.8 to 16	28	11%	448	448	448	448
Neighborhood-Med/High (MDRH)	5.5 to 11	14	5%	154	174	193	252
Neighborhood-Medium (MDRL)	5.6 to 8	90	34%	720	873	1,026	1,485
Neighborhood-Low (LDR)	3.5 to 5	90	34%	448	627	806	1,343
TOTAL		264	100%	2,596	2,947	3,299	4,354
<i>Total Average Density</i>				9.9	11.2	12.5	16.5
<i>Total Average Density with Open Space*</i>				8.4	8.4	9.5	14.0

Table 5. Housing Metrics Summary - Version 2: Excludes Middle Housing and Neighborhood-Medium/High Zones

	Density Range (Net)	Total Acres (Net)	% of Acres	Total Housing Units (with Percentage of Middle Housing in Neighborhood Zones)			
				0%	10%	20%	50%
Multi-Family (HDR)	16.8 to 24	31	12%	744	744	744	744
Middle Housing Zone	5.5 to 11	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Cottage Zone	12.8 to 16	36	14%	576	576	576	576
Neighborhood-Med/High (MDRH)	5.5 to 11	-	0%	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood-Medium (MDRL)	5.6 to 8	79	30%	632	766	901	1,304
Neighborhood-Low (LDR)	3.5 to 5	118	45%	588	823	1,058	1,763
TOTAL		264	100%	2,540	2,909	3,278	4,386
<i>Total Average Density</i>				9.6	11.0	12.4	16.6
<i>Total Average Density with Open Space*</i>				7.6	8.2	9.4	14.1

* 15% open space, integrated into development, is counted as part of the residential land base.

VILLAGE PLANNING

The prior version of the draft scenarios focused more heavily on the concept of master-planned villages, where a mix of land uses, walkable community design, and open space can result in quality new development that reflects Sherwood values. Villages are assumed to be created through master planning processes that are either City-led or developer-led prior to annexation into the city. Precedents for village planning are Villebois Village and Frog Pond West in Wilsonville. Woodhaven is a local example of an areawide master plan that resulted in quality development.

At the February meetings, the Committees reviewed design studies for two key opportunity areas in Sherwood West—north of SW Haide Rd (“North Village”) and south of SW Kruger Rd (“South Village”). These areas are primed for future development, offering locational and topographic features that lend themselves to a broader mix of uses and village-style development. These concepts were incorporated into the draft scenarios presented in April, with the village concept representing the key differentiating feature of Scenario B, as compared to the more traditional zoning scheme of Scenario A.

Village master planning will remain an important tool that the City of Sherwood can employ in future planning phases of Sherwood West. However, rather than serving as a key differentiator between scenarios, the project team suggests reframing village planning as a tool that could be applied to any zoning scenario. Village master planning provides more certainty for coordinating multiple developments into cohesive neighborhoods. It allows communities to coordinate unique elements like views, trails, specific greenspaces, public uses, and streetscape design. Village planning also allows communities to be more precise in defining the location of various uses and housing types, and to be more specific in designing how an area looks and feels. The City should continue to consider future village master planning as a tool for Sherwood West, but will not be a defining concept in the revised draft scenarios.

Creating Draft Scenarios

When the CAC is comfortable with the scenario assumptions described above, it is time to create the Concept Plan’s scenarios (aka alternatives). For the June CAC meeting, the project team proposes that the CAC do a hands-on exercise to create “rough draft” scenario maps. The idea is to create the maps interactively, rather than commenting on work that the project team has prepared in advance. At the June meeting, the team will bring base maps and land use “chips” for employment, residential, parks and schools. The base maps will have initial streets and trails that have been discussed to date (which can be refined as part of the process). The scenario development process will build on previous work and ideas discussed to date – some of which are listed and linked below.

PLAN IDEAS IDENTIFIED TO DATE

Employment

Mixed employment areas generally as shown in the Mixed Employment plan concept.

- Northern areas: large employment or business parks, multi-tenant flex space, tech parks.
- South of SW Kruger Road: Multi-tenant flex space, healthcare or clinic, some retail, light industrial.
 - Alternative discussed in February: mixed-use destination uses (retail, restaurants, wine-country related uses, flexible mixed use).
- South area (north of SW Chapman Road): multi-tenant flex space, possible warehousing or distribution, particularly for wine-related uses.

Open Spaces and Institutional Uses

- The Chicken Creek Greenway as a key natural resource area and regional trail corridor.
- Open spaces are connected where possible and comprised of: “Title 13” natural resource lands, community parks, neighborhood parks, the natural gas pipeline easement, trail corridors and open space integrated into future developments.
- Two community parks – minimum of 10 acres each.
- Neighborhood parks serving every neighborhood (estimate of nine 2-acre parks).
- A future elementary school (10 acres), likely built in later phases of the plan.
- A future middle school (25-30 acres), likely built in later phases of the plan.

Transportation

- Well-connected and safe streets and trails throughout the plan.
- SW Elwert realignment to the west of the existing Edy Road intersection.
- SW Elwert as a well-designed, safe and pedestrian-friendly street (See SW Elwert Design Concept).
- North-South perimeter collector road (conceptual, long range, 2 alignment options north of Chicken Creek).
- Potential for local transit in the long range future.

Residential

- Use of Sherwood Comprehensive Plan residential zones, updated (See Table 3).
- Application of Sherwood design standards.
- Location guidance for residential types:
 - A “transect” of housing form, where housing types and densities transition from high to medium to low in an intentional way.
 - Multi-family housing in multiple smaller locations within the plan.
 - Neighborhood-Medium/High (smaller lots) in flatter areas.
 - Neighborhood-Medium in flatter and gently sloped areas.
 - Neighborhood-Low in sloped areas and near existing rural homesites.

RESOURCES FROM SHERWOOD WEST CONCEPT PLAN WORK TO DATE

Note: some of the linked maps and information has been updated by subsequent discussions. These are provided here as background information only.

Plan Concepts Documents

- [Mixed Employment Areas](#)
- [Greenspaces for Sherwood West](#)
- [Chicken Creek Greenway](#)
- [Active Transportation](#)
- [Livable and Connected Streets](#)
- [Great Neighborhoods](#)
- [SW Elwert Road Design Concept](#)

Design Studies Reviewed in February

- [North and South Village Design Studies](#)

Preliminary Scenarios Reviewed in April

- [Preliminary Scenarios](#)

EMPLOYMENT ESTIMATES

	Total Acres (Net)	Jobs / Net Acre (est.)	Total Jobs	Percent of Jobs	Percent of Total Net Employment Acres
Flex Space	110	18.8	2,064	38%	39%
Industrial	110	18.0	1,976	37%	39%
Office	6	65.2	391	7%	2%
Commercial / Retail	15	35.9	539	10%	5%
Hospitality	3	28.7	86	2%	1%
Mixed Empl. Subtotal	244		5,057	94%	86%
Schools	40	7.8	314	6%	14%
TOTAL	284		5,370	100%	100%

*Note: The Mixed Employment subtotal of 244 acres excludes the 10-acre site planned for a local hospitality use.

ACREAGE ESTIMATES BY EMPLOYMENT TYPE & STUDY AREA

Mixed Employment Study							
Area (from BLI)	Buildable Acres	Flex	Light Industrial	Office	Commercial	Hospitality	TOTAL
1	181	90	90	-	-	-	181
2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	29	6	6	6	10	1	29
4	34	14	14	-	5	2	34
TOTAL	244	110	110	6	15	3	244

*Note: The Mixed Employment subtotal of 244 acres excludes the 10-acre site planned for a local hospitality use.

JOBS-HOUSING RATIO

	Current City	SW- Low housing	SW- High housing	Total City+SW- Low Housing	Total City+SW- High Housing
Total housing units	7,220	2,596	4,386	9,816	11,606
Total jobs	6,500	5,400	5,400	11,900	11,900
Jobs-Housing Ratio	0.9	2.1	1.2	1.2	1.0

HOUSING METRICS BASED ON DENSITY RANGES IN SHERWOOD DEVELOPMENT CODE +/- THE IMPACT OF HB 2001

Buildable Residential Acres has been updated to 310 (based on adjustments to mixed employment acreage), Resulting in Net Residential Acres = 264. LDR calculates to make the required total.

Buildable Residential Acres Allocated in Sherwood West	310
Open Space Required by Code (average)	15%
Net Residential Acres (less open space)	264

	Existing Sherwood (Net) Density Range units per acre	Existing Sherwood Maximum Density without HB2001	HB 2001 Super Max Density (4x Existing SF Zones or 25 townhomes)	Sherwood West Residential (Net) Total Acres	% of Acres	Existing Sherwood Maximum Density X Acres = Total Units	% of Units	Maximum Density with HB 2001 Super Max Density	Maximum Density in MF, MH, and CC + Assumption of 10% of acres built to HB 2001 Super Max density.	Maximum Density in MF, MH, and CC + Assumption of 20% of acres built to HB 2001 Super Max density.	Maximum Density in MF, MH, and CC + Assumption of 50% of acres built to HB 2001 Super Max density.
Multi-Family (HDR)	16.8 to 24	24	-	28	10.6%	672.0	25.9%	672.0	672.0	672.0	672.0
Middle Housing inc. twnhm	new	11	-	14	5.3%	154.0	5.9%	154.0	154.0	154.0	154.0
Cottage Cluster	new	16	-	28	10.6%	448.0	17.3%	448.0	448.0	448.0	448.0
Neighborhood-Med/High (MDRH)	5.5 to 11	11	25	14	5.3%	154.0	5.9%	350.0	173.6	193.2	252.0
Neighborhood-Medium (MDRL)	5.6 to 8	8	25	90	34.2%	720.0	27.7%	2,250.0	873.0	1,026.0	1,485.0
Neighborhood-Low (LDR)	3.5 to 5	5	25	90	34.0%	447.5	17.2%	2,237.5	626.5	805.5	1,342.5
Totals				264	100.0%	2,595.5	100.0%	6,111.5	2,947.1	3,298.7	4,353.5

Sherwood West Average Density	9.9	23.2	11.2	12.5	16.5
Sherwood West Net Average Density (with required open space)	8.4	19.7	9.5	10.6	14.0

	Existing Sherwood (Net) Density Range units per acre	Existing Sherwood Maximum Density without HB2001	HB 2001 Super Max Density (4x Existing SF Zones or 25 townhomes)	Sherwood West Residential (Net) Total Acres	% of Acres	Existing Sherwood Maximum Density X Acres = Total Units	% of Units	Maximum Density with HB 2001 Super Max Density	Maximum Density in MF, MH, and CC + Assumption of 10% of acres built to HB 2001 Super Max density.	Maximum Density in MF, MH, and CC + Assumption of 20% of acres built to HB 2001 Super Max density.	Maximum Density in MF, MH, and CC + Assumption of 50% of acres built to HB 2001 Super Max density.
Multi-Family (HDR)	16.8 to 24	24	-	31	11.8%	744.0	29.3%	744.0	744.0	744.0	744.0
Middle Housing inc. twnhm	new	11	-	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	-	-	-
Cottage Cluster	new	16	-	36	13.7%	576.0	22.7%	576.0	576.0	576.0	576.0
Neighborhood-Med/High (MDRH)	5.5 to 11	11	25	-	0.0%	-	0.0%	-	-	-	-
Neighborhood-Medium (MDRL)	5.6 to 8	8	25	79	30.0%	632.0	24.9%	1,975.0	766.3	900.6	1,303.5
Neighborhood-Low (LDR)	3.5 to 5	5	25	118	44.6%	587.5	23.1%	2,937.5	822.5	1,057.5	1,762.5
Totals				264	100.0%	2,539.5	100.0%	6,232.5	2,908.8	3,278.1	4,386.0

Sherwood West Average Density	9.6	23.7	11.0	12.4	16.6
Sherwood West Net Average Density (with required open space)	8.2	20.1	9.4	10.6	14.1

Difference between A and B: (56.0) 121.0 (38.3) (20.6) 32.50