
City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting
January 12, 2016

Planning Commissioners Present:

Chair Jean Simson
Vice Chair Russell Griffin
Commissioner Chris Flores
Commissioner Alan Pearson
Commissioner Rob Rettig
Commissioner Lisa Walker

Staff Present:

Tom Pessemier, Assistant City Manager (work session)
Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director
Bob Galati (regular meeting)
Brad Kilby, Planning Manager
Connie Randall, Associate Planner (regular meeting)
Kirsten Allen, Planning Dept. Program Coordinator

Planning Commission Members Absent:

Commissioner Michael Meyer

Council Members Present:

None

Work Session

1. Industrial Land Use Districts Development Code Discussion

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director began the meeting at 5:30 pm, provided a memorandum dated January 7, 2016, survey results from online and direct mail surveys, and copies of the Industrial Uses and Similar Uses sections of the Sherwood Zoning and Development Code with comparable code sections from Hillsboro, Tualatin, Tigard, Wilsonville, and the Oregon Model Code (see record, Exhibits 1-3).

Planning Commissioners, Industrial land owners or representatives, and staff split up into three table groups. Groups were asked to answer three questions about industrial land usage in Sherwood and the Tonquin Employment Area (TEA):

1. What would you like to see?
2. What would you not like to see?
3. Regarding what you do not want, what are the main reasons/concerns?

Commissioners were asked to contribute what was learned in the discussion. The following comments were received:

- Utilize the Oregon Shovel Ready Program to get developers in the Industrial Use zone.
- Conditional Use Permits (CUP) make development difficult; reduce the CUP process.
- Other allowed use should be warehouse
- Prohibit adverse impacts that leave industrial uses such as noise, smoke, odor and light.
- TEA land is constrained; create exceptions for constrained land.
- Consider Industrial Use Standards. Should they apply to the entire development or only development along frontage roads?
- Flexibility is key.
- Be cognizant that Sherwood industrial land is not as attractive to industry because of transportation constraints and distance to I-5.

- Streamline and reduce costs for smaller businesses to locate in Sherwood.
- Is it what's inside the building or what the building looks like that matters?
- Provide infrastructure incentives.
- Rethink the employee oriented intent
- Do not limit support services like vehicle repair
- Look at goals for industrial instead of rules; make conditions clear.
- Allowed uses should be general, prohibited uses should be specific, conditional uses in between
- Utilize existing restrictions from Clean Water Services, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Environmental Quality, etc. Remove those and outdated restrictions.
- Allow for "other" uses such as future industrial uses not yet thought of.
- Find incentive programs available
- Remember industrial land is shielded from residential areas.
- Desired uses include local industries, warehousing, food processing, motor vehicle repair, beverage distribution, research and development.

Ms. Hajduk thanked participants and explained the next steps would be to hold a work session about proposed draft language with the Planning Commission on January 26 or February 9, 2016 with a goal to have a public hearing on new language on April 12, 2016.

The Planning Commission called recess at 6:51 pm to convene to the regular meeting.

Regular Meeting

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Jean Simson reconvened the meeting at 7:09 pm.

She moved to the consent agenda and asked for comments or a motion.

2. Consent Agenda

- December 8, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes approval

Motion: From Commissioner Alan Pearson to approve the Consent Agenda, Seconded by Vice Chair Russell Griffin. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Commissioner Michael Meyer was absent).

3. Council Liaison Announcements

None.

4. Staff Announcements

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager, reported the City Council approved the Mandel Property Zone Change and Plan Amendment, a three acre Neighborhood Commercial property to Medium Density Residential Low on January 5th. He reported that Council also discussed placing an outright ban on marijuana related uses for the November 2016 general election and placing a 3% local tax on the sale of marijuana. Mr. Kilby explained that the 3% tax was in case the ban failed; if both pass revenue cannot be collected. He noted that medical and recreational marijuana was separated as there was a strong belief by some of the city councilors that recreational marijuana use should be treated differently than medical marijuana use. The first reading for the ban will be on January 19, 2016 with the second reading February 2, 2016. Mr. Kilby commented that Measure 91 had passed and the police chief said he recognized that whether

Sherwood allows retail sales, growing, processing or manufacturing it will occur outside of Sherwood and he would like to have the resources available to help enforce the law for people breaking it. Mr. Kilby stated there was an approved medical marijuana distribution location on Tualatin Sherwood Road that had not opened, but would be grandfathered in and not affected by any ban.

Mr. Kilby explained that as of January 1, 2016 the Oregon Liquor Control Commission had started to send growers to jurisdictions to sign a Land Use Compatibility Statement (LUCS) that confirm they are allowed uses. Planning staff had signed one LUCS for the recreational growing in the industrial zone. He reported that at this time the City did not have any regulations in place and marijuana could be grown in industrial zones, but if a ban was passed or imposed before that person received a license from the state, they would not be able to grow there recreationally. It is currently a medical marijuana growing facility.

Mr. Kilby concluded by saying the public hearing was about the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan and with Planning Commission's recommendation would go to the February 2, 2016 City Council hearing on the same matter (Note: the public hearing for the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan was moved to a tentative date of February 16, 2016).

Chair Simson noted the late start of the meeting and said it was due to a public work session regarding Industrial Zone Uses and added an agenda item after the public hearing to discuss the work session and provide feedback to staff.

5. Community Comments

Kurt Kristensen, Sherwood resident said he lived on the east side of Sherwood and was on the other side of 99W near Edy Road and Terrapin the previous weekend where he saw three humongously ugly developments going up in the middle of a single family housing area. He said he had occasion to listen to a lot of residents that wondered how building permits were issued for the buildings. Mr. Kristensen stated they looked ugly and inappropriate on the long narrow lot and compared the building design to the Cannery Row Apartments design with a limited number of garage space underneath and two floors up on top. He commented that there would not be sufficient parking spaces for the number of people living there and what seemed to offend the residents more than anything was that the placement and zoning for those three huge buildings seemed inappropriate and odd because the entire neighborhood was single family housing. Mr. Kristensen encouraged the Planning Commission to take a look at what happened over there as people are very upset about it. He also encouraged the Planning Commission not to allow this kind of inappropriate infill in the future.

Chair Simson responded that she was not familiar with the project as it did not come before the Commission and suggested staff could obtain information and get back to Mr. Kristensen.

Brad Kilby answered that the property was zoned High Density Residential and there was a lot of other land in the area as well along Edy Road zoned for multi-family. He explained that even though it may not be developed that way today, large lot single family homes could ultimately develop to multi-family. Mr. Kilby said the development was 14 unit side by side townhomes; considered multi-family because they were on a single lot.

Commissioner Walker asked if it was similar to the townhomes along Sunset Blvd in the Woodhaven subdivision and if it was one building with 14 units. Mr. Kilby responded that it was three buildings with 14 units total and acknowledged that it was an odd shaped lot adjacent to an existing single family neighborhood. Commissioner Walker questioned that there were other lots nearby that are also zoned High Density Residential and a staff level decision because it was a permitted use. Mr. Kilby responded that it was a decision approved in 2009 during the recession that did not expire due to a resolution from

Council allowing extensions to land use decisions (see Sherwood Zoning and Development Code 16.90.030). Julia Hajduk added that it went through the site plan process with the Hearings Officer.

Chair Simson summarized that the property spoken of by Mr. Kristensen was zoned High Density Residential and neighboring property could redevelop in the same type of development.

With no other comments, Chair Simson closed the community comments and moved to the public hearing.

6. New business

a. Public Hearing – PA 16-01 Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan

Chair Simson began the public hearing by reading the public hearing statement stating the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council. She said the hearing was legislative so ex parte contact did not apply. Chair Simson asked for the staff report.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager informed the Commission that the action before them would not end in a formally adopted plan. He noted that there were several people representing the applicant; He said he, Connie Randall, and Bob Galati were staff representing the City and introduced Kirstin Greene and Anais Mathez from Cogan Owens Green (consultants), Martin Mr. Glastra Van Loon from SERA Architects (urban design), Lorelei Juntunen and Beth Goodman from EconNorthwest (economist, HNA, phasing program, funding options), Kevin Timmins and Jason Liam from Otak (graphic information systems support/mapping), John VanStaveren from Pacific Habitat Services (natural resources review) and Chris Maciejewski from DKS Associates (traffic consultant). Mr. Kilby said there were also representatives of the Sherwood West Community Advisory Committee present; Tony Bevel, Rick Pannell, Ida Wilks, Diann Matthews, Patrick Franco and Chair Jean Simson (Planning Commission Representative).

Mr. Kilby began a presentation for the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan (see record, Exhibit 4) beginning with a map of the Sherwood West urban reserve area. He said the area was west of Elwert Road, south of Scholls Sherwood Road, west of Roy Rogers Road and north of Hwy 99W and Chapman Road; the furthest eastern boundary was Eastview Parkway.

Mr. Kilby explained that the plan document was intended to be tool for the community to rely on in future discussions related to growth and expansion in Sherwood and because it was not being adopted the plan was purposely set up as a tool with fluid options. For example there are two transportation alternatives for the extension of Elwert Road north of Edy Road. Mr. Kilby said the plan was not intended to be a hard and fast decision today, because the decisions would not be made until the land was brought in to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and a refinement plan completed for the area.

Mr. Kilby explained that Urban Reserves were lands that Metro had put in place around the existing UGB areas for future expansion over the next fifty years. He noted that the Sherwood West area was one of a host of rural reserves in the metro area, but Sherwood was the first to plan for an Urban Reserve area outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. He explained that areas known as Rural Reserves were areas that would not change designation regarding expansion by Metro for the next fifty years.

Mr. Kilby stated that Sherwood West was about 1,291 acres; a big addition to the city boundaries, but Sherwood would still be relatively small with the area brought in to the city. He said the plan document was a Metro funded document and explained that the plan document contained:

- Executive Summary,
- Outline of the planning process,

- Discussion of the history and growth of Sherwood
- Discussion of how the baseline for the project was achieved,
- The Concept plan
- Existing conditions and challenges involved with growing in the area
- Necessary improvements to support urban levels of growth
- Phasing and funding strategy plans to inform on cost of improvements
- Next steps and recommendations
- Appendices; background information collected throughout the effort

Mr. Kilby stated the overall plan attributes derived through the public process were the most pressing issues to be considered in the concept plan. They included compact “ten minute” neighborhoods, protection of resources, access to nature and trails, schools and neighborhood scale serving retail. He said there were two potential school locations identified as a place to begin the conversation; chosen to geographically spread the school district around for prospective neighborhoods. Mr. Kilby acknowledged a rezone of the Mandel property from commercial to residential and stated retail properties would be much smaller than the three acre Mandel property and would be geared toward serving the immediate needs of the neighborhood.

Mr. Kilby emphasized that the planning for the Sherwood West area was done through a Metro funded grant that was requested because Sherwood was running out of land for residential development. He said a Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) was conducted by EconNorthwest to gather the data on existing housing needs for a future comprehensive plan update. He reported the HNA was in draft form with raw data and the policy decisions associated with the data had yet to be made, however, from the raw data we know that Sherwood had experienced annual growth rates between 3-8% since 1990. Metro said that Sherwood would grow at 0.7%. Mr. Kilby explained that the area considered for the inventory encompassed all lands within the existing urban growth boundary which included the Brookman Road area. Mr. Kilby indicated that annexation of the Brookman Road area had been difficult and said the question was where to grow from here. He reminded the Commission that Sherwood was consistently ranked as one of the top small towns in America; a safe place to live, with good schools, people like living out here and there was no reason to believe that there would not be a continued demand for people to relocate to Sherwood. He said there would likely be a strong and continued demand for additional land. Mr. Kilby cautioned that without expansion the city would begin to see more infill projects, requests to rezone, and neighborhoods transforming to higher densities through accessory dwelling units.

Mr. Kilby turned the table over to the consultants.

Kirstin Greene, managing principle with Cogan Owens Greene stated that she took the social contract in Oregon regarding community engagement and land use planning very seriously and said it was more than state mandated, but a relationship between citizen’s and their government about how the communities will grow. She said the public involvement for the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan was both unique and deep and she appreciated Community Advisory Committee member attendance and hoped they would speak about how they felt about their involvement. Ms. Greene commented that the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan was unique with respect to it being a preliminary concept plan before an area is added to the Urban Growth Boundary. She commended staff for taking on the challenge seriously by inviting and meeting with most of the property owners in the study area. She said the public involvement plan was created with the CAC and was intended to have

- Consistent messages to encourage understanding of the benefits of a concept planning
- Frequent and effective community engagement; achieved with several hundred community members involved throughout the process
- Participation over time increase; staff and the consultant team piloted new techniques including online engagement
- Community concerns were identified and addressed throughout the process

Ms. Greene stated as consultant she considered the plan a co-creation with the Community Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee members and it could not have been done without them. She displayed a broad list of fifteen community engagement activities conducted over the course of the eighteen months outside of the Community Advisory and Technical Advisory Committee meetings that took place.

Ms. Green showed the vision statement of the plan and said consultants were struck with the quality of Sherwood as a community. They knew they could only help create a plan that would complement and build on the City's existing form and character. She told the Planning Commission that they would see throughout the plan that it was understood development would need to contribute to the overall fiscal health of the community.

Ms. Green stated the goals for the overall plan were met or exceeded as measured by the evaluation criteria. The design included the community attributes that Sherwood residents highly valued, as mentioned by Mr. Kilby; access to nature, recreational opportunities, transportation choice, development that recognizes Sherwood's heritage and implementation that is pragmatic.

Ms. Green congratulated the City on being the first community in this region to take on urban reserve planning and offered that the experiment had ended up very well. She indicated Mr. Glastra Van Loon would summarize the draft plan and Ms. Randall would talk about implementation and strategies once the area was brought into the Urban Growth Boundary.

Martin Glastra Van Loon, urban designer with Sera Architects of Portland highlighted some of the analyses and lessons learned from the citizens' and technical committee's input throughout the process. He said they became the building blocks for the plan and he sensed that they really resonated with a lot of folks in town. He said it was a two part analysis; Sherwood's growth over time and the land forms on which the city grew.

Mr. Glastra Van Loon said in the last 130 or so years the City of Sherwood had evolved dynamically from a small town with horses and carriages, to changes resulting from the train and automobiles coming to town. He stated in 1895 Sherwood was platted with nine blocks in what is now historic Old Town Sherwood along Railroad Street. If we fast forward 130 years Sherwood had a population of about 19,000 and a much broader, wider ranging city spread out over the landscape. He said most residents were very content with the quality of life that existed and a "small town feel" was a term consultants heard all the time throughout the process. Mr. Glastra Van Loon noted that there were physical reasons behind Sherwood's growth; the total footprint of the town looked large, but it breaks down into smaller components of neighborhood scale. He explained that walkable neighborhoods became one of our leading principles of the planning process and said Sherwood today contained ten or eleven distinct walkable areas. He defined walkable as having a radius of about a quarter mile or a five to ten minute walk from the center of the circle to the edge and said it seemed to coincide with a lot of Sherwood's

existing neighborhoods. Mr. Glastra Van Loon showed that all Sherwood's neighborhoods fit in a circle with a radius of about a mile and when the Sherwood West planning area was added it could add another five or six of those walkable districts or neighborhoods that would still fit inside a 1.5 mile radius circle. He said a 1.5 radius was still small scale and gave a sense of neighborhood scale to the town as whole.

Mr. Glastra Van Loon explained that another component that became important to the planning was the land form pattern that the city grew into. He said the team coined the term as "nestled in the landscape" and showed a United States Geological Survey map from the 1950s of early Sherwood with downtown Sherwood area and railroad spur. He pointed out contour lines where the city was settled along the edge of the Tualatin River floodplain and the hills that go up towards the southeast; a varied landscape with a lot of quality. Mr. Glastra Van Loon showed the Chehalem Mountains to the west, Parrett Mountain to the south, Tonquin Scablands to the east and the Tualatin River to the north and said these land forms had a real impact on the Sherwood experience: The Chehalem Mountains were always in the backdrop in the higher elevations with Newberg on the other side; The Tonquin scablands were flat areas from the late ice ages and a threshold in the landscape that must be crossed to and from Tualatin; and Parrett Mountain was toward the south and hemmed in the town on the southern end. Mr. Glastra Van Loon expressed that the landscape was wide open on the north end of town with the Tualatin River floodplain and said this was important, because it told about the settling of Sherwood and about the compartmentalization of those walkable neighborhoods.

Mr. Glastra Van Loon stated that another signature character of Sherwood was the creek system. He said he thought Sherwood was deliberately settled on Cedar Creek for the access to water, drinking and raising crops and as it grew it butted up towards Rock Creek to the east in the Tonquin Scablands and Chicken Creek towards the west. He noted that Cedar Creek was a big part of the community; where Stella Olsen Park was located with summer events and connections to the trail system and neighborhoods along this beautiful natural resource. He commented that Cedar Creek also gave a real moment that was like a portal in the landscape in the form of a green tunnel embracing travelers from Newberg. He said he did not think a lot of people realized how integral the creek system was to the quality of life in Sherwood. Mr. Glastra Van Loon showed several pictures: Rock Creek in the scablands, a creek coming off of Parrett Mountain feeding into the Tualatin River, Chicken Creek, Elwert Road and Roy Rogers Road. He repeated that Sherwood was nestled into the landscapes of hills, valleys, canyons and creeks and summarized that this meant that anyone who lived or worked in one of the walkable neighborhoods was only a five or ten minute walk from a fantastic natural resource that had a regional reach and he thought it really was a unique quality for the community. Mr. Glastra Van Loon stated that this resonated with a lot of folks in the community and Sherwood should build on that.

Mr. Glastra Van Loon said that engage landscape that is not flat towards in the Sherwood West area, but rolling hills cut up by Chicken Creek and a branch of Cedar Creek, named Goose Creek, that crosses underneath 99W. He explained that this divided the study area into sub-districts for future potential neighborhoods that would build on those qualities of being a short walk from a natural resource. He showed areas labeled North, Far west, West, and Southwest and an aerial map of the area with the hills, rivers and the cities of Tigard, Tualatin, and Wilsonville.

Mr. Glastra Van Loon said the planning process with the community, stakeholders and Technical Advisory Committee developed three alternative concepts early on that tested different ideas and locations for different land uses, then the City solicited input and tested the different ideas ending in a preferred plan.

He described the different sub-districts beginning at the northern end.

The NORTH quadrant is a large piece of land that could comfortably hold one of the walkable neighborhoods. It is hemmed in by Chicken Creek on the south, Roy Rogers on the east side and Scholls Sherwood and Labeau Road on the west. There is a power line corridor cutting diagonally through the northeast corner of the land which has been used that as a delineation between the neighborhoods and a sports and recreation location. Several different uses were tried in this area, with a general consensus that a sports and recreation facility would work well to serve both Sherwood and regional neighbors that come to play Sherwood teams with easy access off of Roy Rogers Road.

The neighborhood is organized around the school similar to other parts of Sherwood with the school in the heart of the neighborhood, a neighborhood park and an extension of a linear park that runs through the neighborhood and hooks up with Chicken Creek and the trail system nearby. A trail system (represented by green dots on any of the maps) connected into planned and existing trails in Sherwood. East of the school was a small mixed use commercial node to serve the neighborhood. It could be a deli, coffee shop; something very small that allowed people some services without using a car to go into the bigger shops for every little errand. The housing would be more intense around the school. On the west across Elwert Road there are more hills and a park that could be connected to the trail system.

The WEST quadrant is directly adjacent to existing neighborhoods east of Elwert Road and seems to be one of the most easily accessible areas to grow into. It handles the intersection of Edy Road and Elwert Road which was discussed extensively during the process. A version of the roadway configuration shows a re-alignment of Edy Road and Elwert Road to cross Chicken Creek at its narrowest point, removing the existing crossing. The idea is to save money and resources with the re-alignment and allow traffic to flow through, but divert it enough to discourage truck traffic. This idea will have to be corroborated later on with further study.

There is a second school location in the heart of the West quadrant with a slightly larger mixed use node south of the school. Between those two components there is a neighborhood park and trail system connecting the two. Housing intensities increase in these areas and towards the west there is a distinct hill labeled *hillside residential* where the housing intensity decreases because of topography and existing residences. There is also a park on the ridge just south of Kruger Road near the existing water reservoir where a second reservoir may be added. A park similar to Snyder Park on the east side of town was added on top of the hill where you can look out over the community. There is an additional mixed use node to serve local neighborhoods across from Handley Street that would also serve existing residents east of Elwert Road.

In the alternate option for the intersection of Edy and Elwert Roads instead of going straight across the alternative Elwert Road bends to the west with a roundabout to the extension of Edy Road, crossing Chicken Creek at its narrowest spot to another roundabout on to Edy Road to the west or to Elwert Road to the east. Development would require the existing alignment of Edy and Elwert intersection to be brought up to urban standards and the impact of that needs to be compared with the impact of the alternative to make a well informed decision at the time of development.

The FAR WEST quadrant has residential potential as well as the potential for a nature park in the upper left corner. There is already some land set aside for a nature preserve; a pristine and steep area with a lot

of creek branches. Around that area there is an opportunity for a small residential neighborhood and more hillside residential south of Edy Road. In the pocket surrounded by creeks and branches of creeks is a small hillside residential neighborhood.

The SOUTHWEST quadrant is south of the west quadrant and north of Chapman Road. There is a steep hillside on the west side that shows a roadway parallel to 99W up to Edy Road in a north/south direction. This new route would divide the steeper land from the flatter land that is more developable. There is opportunity for a residential neighborhood, a small neighborhood park and an area for a gateway district. The gateway district is a result of a strong interest in the community to capitalize on Sherwood's location adjacent to or "at the gate" of wine country. This may be an area for a visitor's center, welcoming center, lodging, or tasting rooms to take advantage of the economic driver.

Mr. Glastra Van Loon turned the time to Connie Randall, Associate Planner.

Ms. Randall explained that the phasing and funding strategy was a high level, 50,000 foot view, or preliminary. She said the strategies were described in detail in Section 7 of the planning document and that the intent of this part of the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan was to identify the big ticket infrastructure needs and options for meeting those needs. She indicated that these options would then be studied in depth and vetted through a public process during a refinement planning process as areas were brought in to the Urban Growth Boundary. She asked the Planning Commission to keep in mind that projected households and densities used to estimate the costs for infrastructure improvements were not definite. Instead there is a high level magnitude of order on what those infrastructure needs and costs could be for comparison and to lay a foundation for refinement plans as areas are brought into the Urban Growth Boundary.

Ms. Randall indicated that development in Sherwood West would require significant infrastructure investments to bring rural roads up to urban standards, to cross creeks and other natural habitat areas, and to address topography challenges for storm water drainage, water and sewer provision. She said the community identified a desire and a need to preserve resource lands and sensitive habitats as well as to provide parks, trails and recreational opportunities. She stated there was also a recognized need to ensure that future school district needs were adequately planned for.

Ms. Randall referred to the two options for the Edy Road and Elwert Road alignment and commented that how this intersection was improved would affect how the adjacent lands were developed in the phasing of development. She explained that the project team had evaluated phasing and costs for City controlled hard infrastructure such as the roads, sewer, water, storm water, site preparation, traffic elements, and right of way acquisition. Ms. Randall noted that through the public process the areas had been identified on these maps and were revised from a 1, 2, 3, 4 designation to an A, B, C, D designation to convey that the areas represented groups of infrastructure improvements needed to be completed rather than the sequence of when improvements would happen. She said the A, B, C designation did indicate some sequence, in the sense, given the current environment with respects to regulation, and market conditions, community preferences, and it appeared that areas A and B could be developed easier and more cost effectively than C and D. She noted that it was clear in the plan that there was a preference that areas A, B, and C develop before D, E, and F; and that areas E and F be looked to be last as the topography in those areas posed the most challenges to delivering services and actually getting infrastructure to them.

Ms. Randall explained that in general, area A had good development potential as it was relatively flat, adjacent to existing city development and contained City owned land that could be leveraged for development. She said it also included a roundabout at the Elwert Road and Kruger Road intersection that was already planned and funded and was not part of Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan, but the City could capitalize on that if development occurred in the area. She disclosed that development of the Areas A and B would rely on a temporary sanitary sewer pump station until a new sewer trunk was extended through the Brookman Area, across 99W and up through area B and said it was important to note that Clean Water Services (CWS) has expressed concern over pump stations, especially temporary ones, however they do exist in the region, and could be a viable option in this particular application. Ms. Randall said if this alternative was not viable at refinement planning with more in depth studies, the planned sewer trunk could be developed in the initial phase through Brookman and across 99W to serve areas A and B, concurrently if needed. She said staff believed that requirement was less costly than starting in another area such as C.

Ms. Randall informed that development in the north area required crossing Chicken Creek and expensive transportation improvements to the Edy Road and Elwert Road alignment which was why it was recommended that areas A and B develop before area C. She said several variables could affect the need for land and the order in which it was needed. She said Area C was the proposed home to two significant features; a school facility and a sports and recreation area and the desire for those types of development could cause the City to look at area C ahead of areas A and B. She reminded the Commission that this was all a high level best guess of when development would happen.

Ms. Randall explained that new infrastructure required to develop land in Sherwood West would require a mix of new and existing funding sources. She said that, as much as possible, the City tried to have development pay for itself and sought to maximize the revenue from existing sources such as Transportation Development Tax, System Development Charges, Major Streets Transportation Improvements Program, and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, but there will likely be a gap between the amount of revenue generated from these sources and the cost of the public improvements. Ms. Randall called this a “funding gap” and noted that staff had identified in the plan new tools that could be looked at once the actual amount of the funding gap was determined. She said consultants had done some initial look at a variety of tools and highlighted a few, but she would not go into depth, because there was no need to use any of them until it was clear what the needs were.

Ms. Randall indicated the purpose of the public hearing was to seek a recommendation for City Council to accept the plan for future use as a tool and in terms of development it was a fifty year look. She showed a chart of the development process for the area over the next fifty years and commented that the City was at the preliminary concept plan stage and before development could happen Metro needed to decide to expand the Urban Growth Boundary, which typically happened every six years, that Metro will look at the boundaries again in three years to see if there is a need. She explained that Metro decided there was not a need to expand the Urban Growth Boundary regionally recently, and if Metro decided that the boundary did need expanded there would be an additional year long process to determine which of all the regional Urban Reserve areas was the place to expand. Ms. Randall reported that Metro would have to decide that expansion should take place in Sherwood and said the City had the ability to lobby for what it considered appropriate so one of the reasons for creating the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan was to be ahead of curve and to be able to inform Metro that the City had done some study on what was appropriate for our community including which areas were appropriate or not appropriate

to come in to the city. She said the City had an understanding of the cost to serve those areas and the obligations it would take on if the area was brought into our Urban Growth Boundary.

Regarding phasing, Ms. Randall explained that it examined groups of infrastructure that needed to happen and not necessarily that all of area A would come in at one time or maybe areas A and B could come in at the same time. The phasing looked at those areas and the ties to infrastructure improvements that needed to happen depending on the need.

Ms. Randall recounted that if Metro decided to expand in Sherwood, the refinement planning would take place next and refinement planning would be a public process similar to the Sherwood West process, but with more detail. The specific area that has been brought in to the Urban Growth Boundary would be looked at and that in depth details regarding infrastructure needs, the cost for financing, densities and intensities on types of use and appropriate zoning would be applied in that area at a property level decision. She said this process typically takes one and a half to three years from inception to adoption and once an adopted concept plan was in place, then annexation was required. Ms. Randall commented that annexations in Sherwood required voter approval, plus it would require property owners that want to come in to make a petition to the City to be put on the ballot before an annexation vote. This process takes typically six or more months. Ms. Randall noted that the Brookman area was brought into the Urban Growth Boundary in 2002 and was without a passed annexation request in 2016.

Ms. Randall explained that successful annexation requests would typically take another eight to twelve months to get through land use applications and public hearings to actually apply the zoning. She said public improvement construction happened before building permits to build homes or businesses were issued; all the road improvements and utility extensions had to happen before they can build any structures. That usually takes another six to twelve months depending on how complicated the improvements are. Ms. Randall noted that once public improvements were done the residential home and retail commercial construction could take place over the next three to twelve months or more. She concluded that the fastest Sherwood could get through to completed buildings, if everything was aligned and the city had funding available at the first minute would be about ten years. It may very well be longer.

Brad Kilby said that before beginning public testimony he would like members of the Community Advisory Committee to say a few words about their experience, lessons learned or their thoughts about the plan. He indicated he had written testimony; one from a single property owner and one from attorney, John Rankin, who represented several property owners in the area (see record, Exhibits 5, 6). Mr. Kilby asked the Commission to consider when reading the testimonies that the concept plan was not set in stone, the area will still need refinement planning to address concerns expressed such as the Edy Road and Elwert Road alignments and those decisions were not being made by the Planning Commission or the City Council at this time. He said they were in the plan as options on purpose so the community could have a discussion about them when they come in to the City whether the improvements made economic sense and if they were willing to compensate the affected property owners.

The following comments are from the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan Community Advisory Committee members.

Tony Bevel indicated he had lived in Sherwood since 1998 and his area of town had expanded and grown. He commented that it had a been a great experience to be on the committee and he thought everyone had a good heart in the planning, had contributed, had a lot to give and wanted to do what was

right. He noted that they focused a lot on the Edy Road and Elwert Road alignment and the roundabout that may be fifty years down the road, but that traffic was a problem now. Mr. Bevel commented that Edy, Kruger, and Chapman Roads were problems now and although he knew it was not within the scope of the project to deal with it, the city could get a foot forward and see what could be done in the early stages to move Sherwood West forward. He said if he had his wish of wishes he would wish that the City did not have to think about adding on to Sherwood, because it is a great town. He acknowledged that Sherwood was going to grow and this was a good first step. He suggested addressing the Edy, Kruger, and Chapman Roads problems now.

Rick Pannell said he was a resident in the Far West area of the study area and he thought the process was productive. He agreed with Mr. Bevel that there was a lot of great discourse that came from all involved and it was really hard to wrap his head around a lot of it, because it was at such a high level of planning. He commented that maps were put together and estimates were made on something that from the very beginning was described as “what we see when we jump out of an airplane”. Mr. Pannell said when the committee started looking at some of the maps it began to become real, but the time frames were very far out. He remarked that it would shock him if the plan did not change quite a bit between now and whenever it was implemented, said people talked about transportation quite a bit and it was obvious it was on their minds. He disclosed that he traveled through Edy and Elwert Roads every day, and to the Y all the time because his kids swim, and it was clearly a challenge that was only peripherally addressed with the plan. Mr. Pannell commented that when talking about moving the intersection he did not know which option would be cheaper. Mr. Pannell said the one thing he took away from the whole experience was that there were a lot of attributes of Sherwood that everyone really liked; small town feel, farms in the vicinity, access to nature. In his opinion even though we have these great natural features that surround and protect the city they were not unwavering and without proper management or dedication of the people that live here they will disappear; wetlands would be filled in or hills built to the top so Sherwood will end up looking like Tualatin or the border to Tigard. He stated it would take dedication by the City and its representatives to protect those things that are important.

Ida Wilks said she lived on the northeast corner of Elwert and Edy Roads and it was an interesting spot as Chicken Creek runs through her lower pasture. She reported she has seen a lot of change and when we moved to the area fifty-four years ago her kids could ride horses up to Jess Mason’s Country Store at Six Corners where there was hitching post. Ms. Wilks said Sherwood was a wonderful place to raise a family and her preference was to go for Option 2 because her driveway was on Elwert Road, but Mr. Glastra Van Loon did not agree with her. On the other hand, she did not know if Mr. Glastra Van Loon had looked at the very large and expensive homes that were being built on Edy Road. She said her other observation was along the east side Elwert Road where developments had sidewalks and bike paths and this would continue to happen as long as people built on the road. Ms. Wilks stated it was important to build in a way to make it safe for people.

Diann Matthews said she also lived on the corner of Elwert and Edy Roads and was part of the Mandel family that had a long history in Sherwood, but not the part that recently received a zone change. She said she grew up with an extended family and Ms. Wilks’ children. Ms. Matthews commented that she liked the process that was done, thought it was a great process and to be pro-active. She said there were a lot of things learned from it and it was good for the whole community to be visionary. Ms. Matthews pointed out that there were two options, not a preferred option; one to redirect Elwert Road and one to keep it the way it is. She personally preferred to keep Elwert Road the way it was and thought roads running straight, in a grid fashion, moved traffic more effectively, like in the City of Portland. She

commented on newer communities like Tualatin, Beaverton, and Tigard that use cul-de-sacs and road re-routing to make them look scenic, but that traffic did not flow that well and traffic was a problem out here. Ms. Matthews said Sherwood was a bedroom community, people are coming and going out of the community, and plans needed to be cognizant of traffic times getting back and forth to work. She expressed that the integrity of her property would be affected if Elwert Road was re-routed.

Mr. Franco chose not to comment saying other members of the committee had covered his.

Brad Kilby, Planning Manager returned said it concluded the presentation. He offered to answer questions from the Commission. No questions were received.

Chair Simson asked for public testimony.

Kurt Kristensen, Sherwood resident, said he lived on the east side of Sherwood, but every day for the last fifteen years he had driven down Sunset Blvd and crossed 99W. He said 99W was hard to cross and coming back in the evening he could not go that way because traffic was backed up three miles. Mr. Kristensen said development had already impacted his transportation system and he was afraid that Sherwood would lose all of the attributes that we like about it. He expressed concern about the funding gaps and said he did not think the Plan would pay for itself by a long shot. He said he thought that water, sewer and school taxes would hit residents like a ten ton truck coming full on. Mr. Kristensen commented on Sherwood voters rejecting the Brookman expansion and he felt that overall a different look at this whole approach was missing. He said it was clear that voters and residents in Sherwood were not in agreement with Washington County or Metro officials about expansion and how it would play out was above his pay grade. Mr. Kristensen suggested that it would be worthwhile long term to look at Corvallis's model of purchasing green space surrounding the city in order to prevent the kind of growth that this plan was proposing.

Mr. Kristensen said he wanted to introduce a new concept to this kind of deliberation called a cost benefit analysis. He stated that before becoming a middle school teacher he spent a quarter of a century as a project manager and always found it beneficial to have a cost benefit analysis whenever grandiose plans were proposed. Mr. Kristensen suggested that as the Planning Commission and City Council moved forward with PA 16-01 and setting the stage for adding 1,291 acres to the City of Sherwood over the next fifty years it would be prudent to look at a few details and assumptions: current residents have voted down the third annexation proposal for Brookman spending a lot of funds and time for the annexation proposals, in the last ten years the Planning Commission and Department had similarly adopted the Southeast Sherwood Master Plan to add about 50 acres to the City's boundaries on his side of the city and, to date, the city, resident voters, and DEQ had yet to reach an affordable and prudent manner to satisfy neighbors and city residents that the area could be cleaned up, contaminated soil removed, and responsible integration of trails, roads, and utility systems built out in a manner that was cost effective to the city and safe for residents following the recommendations from the yearlong hearings.

Mr. Kristensen said the Sherwood West planning idea proposed to add 1,291 acres and to his thinking that amounted to another thirty thousand residents over the next fifty years and it boggled his mind to think about what that would do to all of the city's attributes. He reported that he had lived in Sherwood for more than fifteen years and watched it grow from about three or four thousand to nineteen thousand and he was not sure that his quality of living had improved. Mr. Kristensen said in general he thought the city planning department had done a great job representing developers and perhaps not so great a job of representing the rest of us. He suggested that it would seem prudent to take a look at a cost-benefit

analysis for the Plan and commented that when he got a proposal for another issue from Washington County the proposal indicated how much additional cost per thousand of assessed valuation the proposal would cost him. He commented on funding gaps and uncertainties and said that the Water Master Plan was in the hole with such big numbers that none can comprehend it. Mr. Kristensen suggested the Planning Commission refer the plan back to the Planning Department and to ask Council to have an outside firm audit the proposal to put firm numbers that can be understood how it would impact his bottom line. He said when he retired he would not like to be surprised by another couple of thousand dollars in annual takes. Mr. Kristensen turned in additional written testimony (see record, Exhibit 7).

Bob Schlichting had turned in a request to speak form but was unable to stay at the meeting to comment. Chair Simson offered that he still had an opportunity to testify at City Council level.

Staff was asked not submit rebuttal testimony. Chair Simson called for a recess in order to read the written testimony at 8:31pm and reconvened at 8:41pm. She noted that the Community Advisory Committee members testified as representatives of the applicant and provided input on the process. She said the record was kept open for anybody left in the audience that would like to testify with a personal opinion.

Tony Bevel, Sherwood resident said that when he first applied to be appointed to the CAC committee he thought he would have a chance to build Utopia and that is kind of what it was like. He said the plan was something that would take a fifty year process and would be refined many times. Mr. Bevel wished Sherwood would not grow, but like it or not Sherwood was going to. He said he lived in Sherwood, he loved it and probably everyone in the room would like to have it stay the same. Mr. Bevel commented that this was an opportunity to step in the right direction and even if it might be totally wrong at least it began the process.

Chair Simson closed the public hearing for deliberation. She said one of the most telling moments for her, as a member of the committee, was when she saw Mr. Glastra Van Loon's face as he explained what made Sherwood special; when he discovered that it was the way Sherwood was nestled within the topography that Sherwood had grown. She commented on the moment coming from Newberg, through that tunnel of greenery and when coming home from the beach she knew she was almost home when she hit that spot or when coming from Hillsboro and past Al's Garden Center and the open green spaces, and how every time when she is almost she home passed a piece of natural area. Chair Simson said Sherwood was protected and surrounded by those areas and she thought, just as the citizen comments received, that this was part of Sherwood that had to be protected and to ensure it was well defined in the plan. She pointed out that portions of the original language that explained this had been removed from the preliminary draft as seen by the Community Advisory Committee. She said the changes were on pages 31-34 that included words like *define the unique identity of Sherwood by walkable neighborhoods nestled in creeks hillsides and valleys* and asked for stronger language indicating the need to protect Sherwood's character and walkable neighborhoods. Chair Simson wanted it restated for people in the future, so they knew that wide creek corridors, buffer zones and making the gateway entrance to Sherwood, to make you feel like you are entering someplace other than just going from Tigard to Tualatin or where Portland to Gresham, because there was no distinction, were important. Chair Simson offered that what made Sherwood unique was that it was nestled in nature and was important to protect; that Sherwood was distinct because of its natural space. She asked if she should reopen the public testimony in order to request that the applicant to go back and revisit the landform analysis and identity pages to make the language stronger starting on page 28.

Mr. Kilby replied that the hearing could be reopened and a motion made to forward the draft along with the stronger language. Chair Simson asked for an explanation of the transportation and land use law restrictions in the urban growth boundary. Mr. Kilby responded that the consultant would need to answer.

Chair Simson said they would reopen the hearing and asked for an explanation of what it meant in the plan on page 21 where it said "*Oregon land use restricts the options available to include only new or expanded travel facilities within the urban growth boundary*".

Ms. Greene replied that she believed the statement was intended to show that in order to focus new transportation options within the UGB, it would require a goal exception for a new travel facility outside of the UGB, because in order to cross farmland the state requires a goal exception to prove why it would be a better location than any other place within an existing UGB. She offered to fix the phrasing in the plan. Mr. Kilby noted that the Sherwood West area would have to be brought into the UGB before any of the transportation improvements could be brought to urban standards.

Chair Simson noted testimony received about transportation concerns and asked if the Commission wanted to include any additional input for the City Council and her thought was that the plan captured the essence of the citizen input. She related that the two options at the Edy and Elwert Road intersection were equally viable and until more refinement planning was completed it was unknown which option would work better. Chair Simson said she trusted consultants to incorporate the Planning Commission's comments into the draft document directly to the City Council and asked for any other comments from commission members.

Vice Chair Griffin stated that the Rankin letter expressed concern about the stated lower cost of the single crossing option compared to the cost of keeping the road straight and forcing it up to urban standard. He said the letter indicated there was no evidence in the report that it would cost less and asked how Option 1 was decided to be less expensive than Option 2, as well as if the roundabouts would restrict truck traffic and have a calming effect going north/south.

Chair Simson directed the Commission to page 37 of the Plan that discussed the transportation options for the interception of Edy and Elwert Road and to Appendix 8, the Transportation Options Alternative Analysis Report.

Bob Galati, City Engineer came forward and reported that he did a rough cost estimate and looked for magnitude factors of difference; not just hundreds of thousands, but millions or tens of millions of dollars in difference. He said he tried to base the analysis on what was done with the Transportation System Plan Update and the Implementation Plan which took all the construction projects and applied construction estimates to them. Mr. Galati explained that he took those values and used the same process described in the implementation plan to estimate the cost at a high level of review. He said relative to the other projects Options 1 and Option 2 were very expensive and when dealing with realigning the road either vertically or horizontally it will be expensive no matter what. He explained there were some assumptions based on what was known for the environmental impacts of upgrading the intersection, how much mitigation would be offset (the cost of land that had to be purchased to expand wetlands and mitigate), future mitigation from the County, CWS or the EPA (experience says they will increase). He

said that in fifty years there will likely be a larger mitigation requirement for the impacts to environmental resources.

Mr. Galati reported that an estimate for each of the phases was received that included a range of costs for improvements. For Area C (see Figure 10.1 and 10.2), Option 1 was estimated as \$65-80 million, and Option 2 was \$80-95 million inclusive of everything; engineering, design, construction and contingency costs. Mr. Galati reminded the Commission that the estimates were taken at a hundred thousand foot level and the range of numbers was the magnitude of the cost overall. He acknowledged that a \$70 million project was expensive, yes, but the difference from \$70 million to \$80 million was significant. He said he could drive it down and make exact calculations, but thought it was better to indicate that, based on the assumptions, on a scale of magnitude one project was more expensive.

Commissioner Walker commented that the objection in the testimony was that one option was considered preferred, instead having the choice of two options with costs that may not be the only consideration to make a preferred plan.

Mr. Galati agreed and said in the future both options would be evaluated from a design standpoint, because the impacts were unknown and interim development may result in other constraints. He maintained it was a great idea to keep both options open and viable and said the rational mind wants to know the thought process that gave cost estimates. In the future, there will be an analysis in much finer detail that will give cost estimates based on construction costs and values at the time. He added that the improvements would need to occur when Area C develops and not until Area C had the pressure to develop. After a discussion staff was directed to add the detailed cost estimates to Appendix 8. Mr. Galati clarified that the detailed cost estimate was not a range and the range [by others] included a 15% swivel for contingencies.

Vice Chair Griffin commented that Metro granted money for the study and asked about not doing anything with the Plan. Ms. Hajduk responded that the Planning Commission did not have to move forward, but the point was to accept the Plan as a tool to help inform the City, not to adopt the Plan. She said if the City chose not to accept the Plan, the City would not be informed when dialog with Metro happened in the future.

Brad Kilby noted that the work was already done and asked if there was any harm in accepting the information. He said the City was not making any decisions on anybody's land, and the plan was left as broad as possible. Zoning had not been assigned, options were based on cost estimates at a very high level and the plan was developed with the community over fourteen months spending \$221,000 of Metro's money and some of our own to get the process done.

Vice Chair Griffin referred to Mr. Kristensen's comment about Sherwood's growth and said he wanted to get onto the record that the city needed to at least plan for growth and if the voters continue to say no, at least there would be a plan in place.

Ms. Hajduk reported that the planning process for the Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan had been amazing, she was thrilled to see so many Community Advisory Committee members present, and the public involvement had been marvelous, but this planning process was different from anything that Sherwood or the region has ever done, because it was a pre-concept plan and the city started the process with "We don't want Metro to bring something into the UGB and tell us what it is going to be. We want

to identify what our community wants” and that is exactly what the process has done. She said the plan would help at the staff level and the political level when Metro considers Urban Growth Boundary expansions. The Plan would allow the City to tell Metro that we have gone through this wonderful process with involvement and buy in and this was what our community has said. She said the Planning Commission and City Council could choose to do nothing, but it negated what has been done.

Vice Chair Griffin commented about development complaints from citizens and acknowledged Sherwood’s recognition as a great place to live. He said he wanted the people to understand that the city was not in a rush to add 1300 acres to the city, but if we don’t plan then someone else will plan it for us.

Chair Simson added that if we don’t plan and don’t have a place to grow, people will still want to come to Sherwood and instead of people having a place to build there will be redevelopment in the form of infill, accessory dwelling units, and townhouses. She said Sherwood was a place that people wanted to move to and those who lived in Sherwood in the late seventies wanted it to stay a small town, but people who moved here a year ago did so because it was a small town with good planning in place. She said Sherwood has grown so much, but it was still a small town that looks good and by planning for it correctly Sherwood could continue to be a good place to live.

Chair Simson compared the annexation of Area 59 with the Brookman area. She said Metro had dictated that Brookman would come into the city looking a certain way, whereas the community had reached out to Metro with the need to build a school resulting in Edy Ridge Elementary and Laurel Ridge Middle Schools and the area was working well. She said the community agreed with the new schools and the community surrounding them and it felt like the Sherwood West area could come in to the city as managed growth instead of forced development.

Regarding the preferred alternative language for the transportation options, Chair Simson suggested a change to clarify that the preferred alternative had two transportation options.

Commissioner Alan Pearson stated that he was one of the newer residents of Sherwood as a three year resident and even though Sherwood went from 3,000 to 19,000 residents it kept its small town feel by having identifiable neighborhoods. He commented on the different neighborhood signs he sees and said when he ran for City Council last year, he made a point to talk to as many people as he could asking their concerns. He explained that one lady had complained that her neighborhood did not have a sign identifying her neighborhood and what made Sherwood unique was that it was a town of neighborhoods. Commissioner Pearson remarked that Sherwood could continue to grow and still be a town of neighborhoods. He said Sherwood was a small town of 20,000 people and was going to be a small town of 50,000 as long as we were a town of neighborhoods and that was what The Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan was with five or six neighborhoods already identified.

Commissioner Pearson said he was reminded of the Chinese proverb that *a journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step* and pointed out that the pre-concept plan was the first step to something fifty years down the road. He said the Commission was not committing to anything, but committing to think about it, to look at it, to continue to do what Sherwood does better than any other place he has lived in his life; involving the citizens of the town in how it grew and developed. He said a town that does not grow and develop dies and growth can either be up, down or sideways. Commissioner Pearson said nobody wanted to see the town die, but everyone wanted to see it continue to grow and prosper and be not the eighth, but the best place in the nation to live.

Commissioner Pearson remarked that the plan was not even etched in silly putty, but it was a start, and if we don't start we are never going to go anywhere. There would be no progress or continuing to be the best place to live. He acknowledged that there were things about it he did not like and things the people on the Community Advisory Committee that worked together for months did not like, but they compromised, talked about it, thought about it and will continue to think about it, refine it, and change it because nothing stays the same. He commented that when the situation on the ground changed, the plan would change and advised not to get lost in the detail at this point because we are nowhere near detail. This is just an overall concept to think about; to let Metro know we are thinking about it and planning for it.

Commissioner Pearson complimented persons involved with the making of the plan for their time, expertise, energy and said they should be proud of themselves as they were not recognized properly. He said the Commission should send the plan on to City Council.

With no other comments the following motion was received.

Motion: From Vice Chair Russell Griffin that PA 16-01 Sherwood West Preliminary Concept Plan be forwarded to the Sherwood City Council with a recommendation of approval with changes discussed. Seconded by Commissioner Chris Flores. All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor (Commissioner Meyer, was absent).

7. Discuss Industrial Use work session

Chair Simson explained that five commissioners attended the work session. She indicated that Julia Hajduk would be drafting language based on feedback from the work session and provided an opportunity for the Commission to provide input regarding what was learned. Discussion followed with Ms. Hajduk indicating she would use the existing code language as a general base and word-smith it to be a more general. Ms. Hajduk said her sense was that the Planning Commission was leaning to more general code language than she had thought and cautioned that the work session involved property owners, brokers and developers and asserted that the community's values and needs should also be protected.

Chair Simson commented that it would be easier to get rid of the chart of permitted and conditioned uses making those uses more general and create a grid of prohibited uses. The prohibited uses in the grid would enable the Commission to address what the citizens' concerns were. She said the Employment Industrial (EI) areas were remote with no adjacent residents so what was prohibited in Light Industrial (LI) might not be prohibited in Employment Industrial, but in general, manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution should be allowed in all industrial areas as there was not a lot of difference between the three industrial zones.

Vice Chair Griffin commented that throwing everything out was maybe not the preferred method, but he felt that the chart was too detailed. He said he was told that the EPA, ODOT, and DEQ had laws in place, because almost everything produces a byproduct or waste and all of it was usually handled. He said he would love to see state of the art research and technology in Sherwood or some other unique thing, because the code was not limited. He said maybe Sherwood did not want to be drone manufacturers, but drones are toys so under the current code we could have those. Vice Chair Griffin suggested taking a fresh look at the code; maybe not like Hillsboro's four or five categories, or Tualatin's decision heavy process, but the Sherwood way. He said his table group indicated people came to Sherwood to look at the land and after researching the code decided a two year process was too long so

they chose someplace else. He said he felt like the code was a little antiquated and could be a little more general while defining only those drastic items that Sherwood did not want and maintaining the look and feel of Sherwood.

Chair Simson asked for more information on the Oregon Shovel Ready Program run by the state that enabled industrial properties to develop. She understood that because Sherwood had so many uses that are conditional it was a red flag and properties were not eligible for the program or if they were it was so cumbersome they choose not to do it.

Julia said she would make sure Tom Pessemier was available to help keep in mind the employment aspect for the Tonquin Employment Area (TEA) and if Sherwood ultimately decided to allow warehouses or distribution, she wanted to remember the reason why they were initially limited.

Chair Simson commented that warehousing in Sherwood would not be warehousing like a distribution center in Clackamas, because Sherwood does not have transportation access and thought it would be on a smaller scale. She said she worked in a warehouse environment that had a lot of employees, because it is small scale. She said Sherwood should not exclude warehousing from the industrial area.

Ms. Hajduk said the next work sessions would be for the Planning Commission to reach a comfortable level to be able to recommend a Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) notice followed by additional meetings and a public hearing. She mentioned that the Oregon Shovel Ready Program did not *allow* development to occur, but is a sign for developers looking to build where they can know size, land uses, infrastructure, costs, to indicate the sites are shovel ready. She acknowledged that the conditional uses added uncertainty that may be a factor. Discussion followed including the possibility of including restaurants limited in size and retail in retail businesses.

Planning Commissioner Announcements

None.

8. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 7:58 pm.

Submitted by:



Kirsten Allen, Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: February 23, 2016