



Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan

A long range look at our future.

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Packet

FOR

**November 19, 2015
3:30 – 5:00 PM**

**City of Sherwood
Community Room
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, Oregon**



Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan

A long range look at our future.

**City of Sherwood
SHERWOOD WEST PRE-CONCEPT PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
City of Sherwood Community Room, City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140**

**November 19, 2015
3:30 – 5:00 PM**

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. Agenda Review**
- 3. Community Feedback**
- 4. Final Preferred Concept Plan**
- 5. Implementation and Funding Tools**
- 6. Final Plan Document Comments**
- 7. TAC Response and Closing Comments**
- 8. Adjourn**

*Meeting documents may be found online at www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwoodwest
or by contacting the Planning Department at 503-925-2308.*



Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting #6

November 19th, 2015, 3:30 – 5:00 pm
Community Room, City Hall
22560 SW Pine Street
Sherwood, OR 97140

AGENDA

Time	Subject	Lead	Action Requested
3:30	Welcome/Thank You Agenda Review	Brad Kilby, Planning Manager Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Greene	
3:35	Community Feedback	Anais Mathez, Cogan Owens Greene	
3:45	Final Preferred Concept Plan	Martin Glastra van Loon, SERA Architects	Review and discuss
4:15	Implementation and Funding Tools	Lorelei Juntunen, ECONorthwest	Review and discuss
4:30	Final Plan Document Comments	Kirstin Greene	Submit final changes
4:45	TAC Response and Closing Comments	CAC Members	
5:00	Adjourn		

More at www.sherwoodoregon.gov/sherwoodwest.com Thank you!





MEETING SUMMARY

Members Present

Mike Dahlstrom
Rob Fagliano
Bob Galati
Public Works representative

Staff Present

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager
Connie Randall, Associate Planner
Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Greene
Anais Mathez, Cogan Owens Greene
Martin Glastra van Loon, SERA Architects
Lorelei Juntunen, ECONorthwest

Conversation summarized by conversation or topic area.

Welcome/Announcements

- Brad Kilby, City of Sherwood, welcomed the technical advisory committee to the final phase of the process.
 - A public open house planned on Oct 22nd. The event will present the hybrid concept plan and will be located in the new Sherwood Center for the Arts building.
 - The final TAC meeting is scheduled for Nov 19th.
- Brad explained that the plan is not intended to be an adopted document, but to serve as the foundation for future discussion and refinement. It does not define zoning or address density, but does establish the types of land uses and general locations. Additional work will be needed in the refinement planning phase to make sure appropriate regulations and design standards are established.

Agenda/Schedule/Project Updates

- Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Greene, introduced herself. She discussed what makes Sherwood communities great, valued and cherished, and notes the City's appreciation for continued guidance and feedback. She reiterated that there are just a couple meetings left in this planning process. She reviewed the committee's progress to date, noting that the following tasks have been completed:

technical analyses, identification of core values, review of existing conditions and natural features, development of preliminary alternatives, and completion of two community surveys.

- Brad mentioned that the City will move forward with a Comprehensive Plan Update within the next few years. We will talk about density and what that means in Sherwood, with a focus on missing middle housing.
- Brad announced that they met with the Planning Commission. They were supportive of the plan and thought it was better than Villebois. They had positive things to say about the process, indicating that most people have heard about it.
- Kirstin noted that the Planning Commission, while on the tour of Villebois, mentioned how some of the retail is vacant. It is important to do this right in Sherwood. A refinement plan it will be the appropriate place to look at that kind of information.

Community Feedback

- Anais Mathez, Cogan Owens Greene, reviewed survey results.
 - Mike Dahlstrom: Concerned that participation is so low and that it is not scientifically valid to make these statements because it is not entirely representative of the entire community.
 - Kirstin and Brad agree, saying that this is just one piece to the puzzle. Historically, there are low levels of participation in Sherwood. But the City has been great about going out in the field and talking to people.

Draft Hybrid Plan

Martin Glastra van Loon, SERA Architects, talked about his analysis of the landform as a means to understand the character and identity of Sherwood West. Martin described each feature, asking *“how are we going to fit new neighborhoods into this landscape?”* He divided the area into 4 districts and provided a brief overview of each:

1. North end district:

- a. Area anchored by the school.
- b. Synergy created between the neighborhood node and the school.
- c. Park feature is extended towards the northeast and the athletic field.
- d. Trails designed to connect through parks (dotted green line), powerline corridor, down to the chicken creek.
- e. Another park is proposed on the west side of Elwert.
- f. Residential densities are designed to be reduce toward the edges of the district and on steeper slopes. Residential densities are indicated with color variation.

2. Far west district:

- a. Realignment of Edy/Elwert is continued in this portion of the plan with the intent to serve western districts by mitigating impacts to wetland area and reducing cut-through traffic.
- b. The realignment is expected to have less impact on the natural environment and initial cost estimates indicate that it would be more cost-effective as the improvements would be shorter and smaller in scale.
- c. The realignment would also likely deter freight traffic while maintaining a fairly direct connection to Scholls-Sherwood Rd.

3. West district:

- a. Realignment of Edy/Elwert created the opportunity for another residential district.

- b. Two mixed use centers are proposed: a larger one on the southern end near church and at the crossroads of a parallel route that ties in with the realignment; and a smaller mixed use area at Handley Street will serve existing and future neighborhoods. It is walking distance from Edy Ridge.
- c. The steep topography on the west end lends itself to more dispersed housing. Housing intensities are represented with darker orange on the plan.
- d. The plan also identifies the planned and funded intersection improvement at the Elwert/Kruger/99W intersection.

4. Southwest district:

- a. A parallel street is proposed to continue along the contours to connect the southwest district to Chapman Road.
- b. This district includes the gateway district idea envisioned in the SE corner of district. Considering housing along Hwy 99 is not ideal, hence the potential for a gateway to be located there.
- c. A park is situated on the saddle between two hilltop residential areas.
- d. The hilltop park would have big views, similar to Synder Park.

TAC member comments:

- Rob Fagliano: The school district had PSU do a population forecast. Their initial findings indicate that one school may not provide for the needs of the community. Another point is that when we are considering schools, we are talking 1-1.5 mile walking radius. If we have to cross a huge thoroughfare (and the other side of the thoroughfare contributes to the needed density to warrant another school), we'll need very safe crossing areas.
- Martin: Regarding the location of schools, people had a difficult time placing them in close proximity to existing schools. However, given the nature of Hwy 99, which cuts up Middleton School, and with the volume of housing going in there over time, it makes sense to have something near the mixed use center.
- Kirstin: requested that Martin and Lorelei follow up with Rob.
- Mike: TDT is missing from funding options. In North Bethany there is a county service district and local improvement district, and the City had identified 75% of the TDT for adjacent roads. This is a departure from the TDT's original intent. This precedent might put us in some position to argue for a brand new county approach to frontload some of the transportation infrastructure.
- Lorelei: Should we be including a county service district?
 - Mike: That is probably premature until you start looking at density and potential development contributions.
- Kirstin: Regarding the access points on Edy and Roy Rogers roads, is it okay to show the amount that we have now, or should we get more specific?
 - Mike: I would prefer to see Bob and Steve (Washington County planner) have further discussion on that, as it is a technical discussion.

Funding and Implementation

Lorelei Juntunen, ECONorthwest, explained the direction we are going with the implementation plan.

The high points include:

1. A reminder that we are doing a pre-concept plan, meaning that funding and phasing is high level and suggestive rather than prescriptive. We need to first identify major barriers for implementation and take a first cut at tools that make most sense. We also need to discuss

phasing, i.e. where it generally makes sense to start out, not necessarily with an associated timeline. That's the level of detail we're dealing with.

2. We should also consider commentary regarding how to set up retail for success and make it work. Some information is there and available to help create a more successful platform for supporting retail.

Lorelei asked if there were any comments or thoughts on this outline, noting how she categorized the tools and weighed the different tools against a series of criteria. No one tool that will do the job. It's a combination of tools tied to a phasing strategy. First attempt to identify the most important:

1. GO bond: The benefit is that you get a lot of money upfront, which is essential in this situation due to the need for expensive infrastructure that is necessary to set in place. This option is very stable and predictable. The political acceptability of this no less here than in the state of Oregon. Citizens do need to vote – it's an additional rate charged against properties.
 - Bob: It is unlikely that Sherwood voters will go for this, so we should give it a zero.
 - Brad: Does not necessarily agree-things might look different in the future, especially if there is a lot of growth pressure. People might find this more acceptable if they see infill they don't like or they really like the Sherwood West plan and want to see it implemented.
 - Bob: To relieve pressure along Hwy 99, the realignment would be available for considerable MSTIP funds. That argument could be made for funding parts of Sherwood West.
2. Supplemental SDC: Charge an additional SDC. This came to the top because it is a source that is most commonly being used for expansion. It steps up the amount every year for 5 years. Lorelei says she would be surprised if it's *not* part of the funding plan.
3. LID: A local improvement district fund draws a boundary along an area and property owners voluntarily tax themselves for agreed-upon infrastructure improvements. This funding source is interesting in that capacity is limited by willingness of property owners. It is unlikely that an LID would ever cover the entire cost but it's nice to generate buy-in.
4. Urban Renewal: Legally, Sherwood West could be eligible. Politically it is very difficult to use.
5. CET: On the list because it can be used for schools and there is already one in Sherwood. It is not available for other types of infrastructure investments.
6. Utility Fee: Idea is that users of the system (police, fire, etc) should pay to use it or could be tied just to Sherwood West. Political acceptability is unknown. Administration ease exists, as bills area already administered by the City. Streets, sidewalks, stormwater fees already exist in the utility fee. While there is a lot of gripe about utility fee, we hear that everywhere. It is an option.
7. Transient lodging tax: (Gateway district) would not generate much revenue but nice way to recognize development has an impact on the community.

Lorelei mentions that the county service district fund has been used in some expansion areas but this quickly gets into questions about annexation. It would not create a district in an area that was inside city limits but it is a tool that could potentially be used. This is the major funding tool being used in Bethany.

Phasing

Bob Galati, City Engineer, presented the potential phasing for the plan, stressing that this was his opinion only.

- Phase A includes all needed infrastructure and is the most logical place to start construction. Phase A2 would be a minor addition with minimal additional costs. His main question is: *what's going to drive development in which area next? The upper area or lower area?* It's important to price everything out first.

- Phases B1 and B2 are next based on cost of infrastructure development. One drawback is that the sanitary system must be extended through the Brookman area. The line is in master plan but relies on Brookman coming in.
- Phase C1 is going to be the driver. He notes the cost difference between the two Edy/Elwert realignment options: (1) Option A: \$69 million for 2 bridges and (2) Cost of Option B: \$80 million to lift and fill the road, plus mitigation costs. He reminded the group that these are rough numbers but the difference is significant enough to indicate that Option A would be the better of the two options. The driver for getting Option A done would be the school coming in to the north.
- Phase D is all predicated on the water system. That can be really expensive, and is last on the chart.

Closing Comments/Adjourn

- Brad reminded the room of the Open House on October 22nd and the final TAC meeting on November 19th. Brad adjourns the meeting at 5:15pm.



Thank you for taking the time in advance of our November 19th, 2015 meeting to review the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan. This document is a reflection of the planning process to date, and will benefit from your final feedback.

You are welcome to keep the draft document and submit any comments or edits below, or you may mark up your plan and hand it in. **Please submit this worksheet or your marked-up plan at the meeting on November 19th, 2015.** If you need more room on this worksheet, you may add additional pages or transmit them via email to Connie Randall at RandallC@sherwoodoregon.gov

I. Acknowledgements

General Comments or Specific Edits:

II. Purpose

General Comments:

Page No. *Specific Edits*

<hr/>	<hr/>

III. Planning Process

General Comments:

Page No. *Specific Edits*

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Specific Edits</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

IV. The Sherwood Growth Story

General Comments:

Page No. *Specific Edits*

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Specific Edits</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

V. Sherwood West

General Comments:

Page No. Specific Edits

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Specific Edits</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

VI. Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan

General Comments:

Page No. Specific Edits

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Specific Edits</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

VII. Sherwood West Phasing and Funding Strategy

General Comments:

Page No. Specific Edits

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

VIII. Looking Ahead

General Comments:

Page No. Specific Edits

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

IX. Appendices

General Comments:

Page No.

Specific Edits

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Specific Edits</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Other Notes:

Thank you!