
City of Sherwood, Oregon
Planning Commission Meeting
December 13, 2016

Planning Commissioners Present:

Chair Jean Simson
Vice Chair Russell Griffin
Commissioner Chris Flores
Commissioner Michael Meyer
Commissioner Rob Rettig
Commissioner Lisa Walker

Staff Present:

Josh Soper, City Attorney
Julia Hajduk, CDD Director
Bob Galati, City Engineer
Michelle Miller, Senior Planner
Connie Randall, Senior Planner
Michelle Babcock, CDD Administrative Assistant

Planning Commission Members Absent:

None

Council Members Present:

None

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Jean Simson convened the meeting at 7:01 pm.

2. Consent Agenda

a. November 22, 2016 Planning Commission Minutes approval

Motion: From Vice Chair Russell Griffin to approve the consent agenda, Seconded by Commissioner Michael Meyer. All Commissioners voted in favor.

3. Council Liaison Announcements

None.

4. Staff Announcements

Julia Hajduk, Community Development Director said there was an opportunity for a grant to send a Planning Commissioner to the Smart Growth Conference in St. Louis, Missouri and announced that Planning Manager interviews were scheduled. Ms. Hajduk encouraged the public to apply for the vacant Planning Commission position. Applications would be accepted until December 30, 2016 to be appointed in January 2017. She announced land use applications were expected for the Springs Assisted Living and a submission for the commercial property on 99W, owned by the Pfeiffer family, where the mobile home park once stood. She stated the Oregon Street Townhomes project had been put on hold and asked Connie Randall, Senior Planner to explain.

Ms. Randall handed out a memorandum to the Planning Commission (see record, Exhibit 1). She said in reviewing the applicant's material for the Oregon Street Townhomes project an issue arose concerning which development standards to apply to the proposed development which was important because it established the required density range, minimum unit size, parking and a whole host of standards. She explained the issue was that in Old Town a Conditional Use Permit would allow townhomes, but there were not development standards for townhomes in a Retail Commercial zone. She said she did not believe that the intent of the code was to expect developers to go through the additional process of a Planned Unit Development with the Conditional Use, but that was all that was available. To address the issue, staff recommended a city initiated text amendment to clarify the development standards applicable to townhome development on property

zoned Retail Commercial and Medium Density Residential Low in the Old Town Overlay District. She proposed a work session with the Planning Commission in January 2017 followed by the standard public hearing process for a text amendment.

5. Community Comments

None were received

6. New Business

a. Public Hearing – SP 16-08/ LLA 16-01 Sherwood Hotel Site Plan (Michelle Miller)

Chair Simson read the public hearing statement. She asked for ex parte, bias or conflicts of interest.

Commissioner Meyer declared a conflict of interest and stated he was the owner of Generations Bar and Grill on the property next to the proposed hotel and recused himself.

Commissioner Flores stated he went to the neighborhood meeting for the proposed development and said it would not affect his ability to base his decision on the criteria.

Commissioner Griffin disclosed his son owned a home at Smith Farms Estates, a few hundred feet from the proposed development, and had discussed the proposal. He stated it would not affect his ability to make a decision.

Chair Simson asked if any member of the audience wished to challenge any Planning Commission members' ability to participate. None were received. Chair Simson explained the Planning Commission was the final hearing authority unless the decision was appealed to the City Council, then asked for the staff report.

Michelle Miller, Senior Planner, gave a presentation of the staff report for SP 16-08 and LLA 16-01 (see record, Exhibit 2) and said the application was for a four story, seventy-three room hotel on 1.26 acres on two combined tax lots. The applicant proposed a combination of both onsite and offsite parking to meet the parking requirements and have asked to consolidate the two parcels into one parcel. She described the proposed site adjacent to Pacific Hwy and SW Meinecke Parkway, surrounded by residential and commercial properties. Ms. Miller stated the site was directly adjacent to Smith Farm Estates (residential) and Cheyenne Plaza (commercial). She said there was a spectrum of low density residential to high density residential nearby including High Density Residential along Vintner Lane; other properties along 99W were zoned General Commercial. Ms. Miller made note of the city-owned water quality facility located on Smith Avenue zoned Institutional and Public. She showed a picture illustrating the improvements along Meinecke Parkway with Cheyenne Plaza, Smith Farm Estates and said there were four trees on the site in the background and said it was an undeveloped area.

Ms. Miller showed an illustrated view of the proposed hotel, the site plan layout, parking, and adjacent building locations. She said the applicant was proposing an access easement to share access between Cheyenne Plaza and the hotel to serve as a secondary access to the site. There would be no access in between the two buildings and the primary access would be a right in, right out access at the tail end of the property on SW Meinecke Parkway to give enough distances to the intersection on 99W. There was an existing concrete wall that would need to be removed for site distance reasons and to provide access to the driveway.

Ms. Miller noted there were commercial design standards for the elevations of the proposed building where the primary entrance was required to be visible from the street and there needed to be a mix of building materials with a design geared toward human and pedestrian scale. She focused on the windows on the ground floor, elevated material such as brick, articulation created with the wood

framed windows, and the different paint colors on the upper floors. She showed the south elevation as viewed from Meinecke Parkway and noted the lobby area on the right of the drawing and the landscaped and seating area on the left with the swimming pool in the center by a windowed area.

Ms. Miller stated several comments from the community had been received about site circulation and neighborhood transportation concerns. She explained that access to the site was gained from SW Pacific Hwy, either from the north or south, through the lighted intersection on SW Meinecke Parkway (heading down Meinecke Parkway the lot cannot accessed directly to the left because of the boulevard treatment in the form of landscaping and a berm), go around the roundabout and back up Meinecke Parkway into the site. She said a Traffic Impact Analysis that looked at the intersections within 1000 feet of the site was completed for the project. She noted a conservative estimate was for 80 rooms, because it would reflect more traffic than the proposed 73 rooms and a 2% population growth was also added to reflect what the hotel would produce in the year 2017 when it was anticipated to be constructed. Ms. Miller said the evaluation included the impacts of the AM/PM peak times and peak school travel times and traffic engineers looked at the crash data at various intersections. The results were that the hotel would generate 650 trips per day, dispersed during the day with AM weekday peak trips at 43; PM weekday trips at 48 additional cars. The analysis indicated that there was a sidewalk gap of about 100 feet on Alexander Lane that would be eliminated with improvements for the Cedar Creek Trail construction along the property frontage as conditioned by an Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Miscellaneous Permit for the right of way. The traffic analysis estimated that the hotel trips were regional with most people coming to the hotel using 99W to access the site. Other trips could be employees using SW Meinecke Road from the interior of the city. The results were that the weekday morning peak would infrequently spillover and block the drive to the hotel for less than 30 seconds. Ms. Miller explained that if the right in, right out was not constructed on Meinecke Parkway access would be from Meinecke Road and up Smith Avenue, to get to the businesses on Alexander Lane including the hotel. With the new right in, right out access, more trips would be through SW Meinecke Parkway and access provided to Cheyenne Plaza would generate fewer trips on SW Smith Avenue as a result.

Ms. Miller said the parking standards were different for each type of use in the city; in this case a hotel use required at a minimum one parking space for each hotel room proposed. For a 73 room hotel the applicant proposed 62 onsite parking spaces and had entered into an agreement with Cheyenne Plaza to share parking and to construct an improved access drive between the sites, to add parking spaces at Cheyenne Plaza and to share the trash enclosure; adding twelve parking spaces to meet the minimum requirement. She said the agreement called for patrons of the hotel to use the shared parking in the evening when most patrons would be arriving at the hotel. The joint use is consistent with the Code to allow for different times of day when vehicles could use the parking spots on site. In addition, the applicant has included some on-street parking. Ms. Miller said the development code also allowed applicants to count on-street public parking to meet the parking requirement as long as it was within 500 feet of the doorway to the site. The applicant showed additional parking on Alexander Lane (8 spaces) and Smith Avenue (7 spaces) within 500 feet of the hotel site. She explained that additional parking would be provided by the applicant north of the hotel, but when the city received comments back from ODOT they stated that the applicant could not count those (6) spaces to meet the minimum parking requirement; ODOT was in favor of the parking spaces because it would be public parking adjacent to the Cedar Creek Trail and they could see a good public use. She said the applicant would still need to go through the requirements of receiving ODOT approval for the specific design. Ms. Miller stated the city engineer had reviewed the parking and the applicant had to get a design modification for the parking. She explained most streets included parallel parking, but the city engineer thought cars would have trouble pulling in and out of the parallel parking and asked that it be removed from the proposal. Ms. Miller summarized the parking with 62 spaces on the hotel site,

12 additional spaces through the Cheyenne Plaza parking lot agreement, seven spaces on Smith Avenue open to the public, eight spaces on Alexander Lane and six additional spaces next to Hwy 99W that cannot count toward the minimum parking.

Ms. Miller showed the frontage between the Alexander Lane and the Meinecke Parkway intersection. She said the Cedar Creek Trail was proposed to go along the front of the hotel which will be constructed by the applicant. The rest of the area will include landscaping and a seating area.

Ms. Miller said part of the staff review included neighborhood impacts. She said commercial properties adjacent to a residential property are required to have the same yard setbacks as a residential property and should be at least twenty feet between the building and the property line. They are limited to the height restriction of the residential zone. In this case 30'. So the building portion within 100 ft. of the adjacent residential property should be no more than 30'. This requirement has been met, because the portion of the hotel containing the swimming pool, closest to residential properties, was at a lower height than the rest of the 47 foot tall building. She said another buffer between commercial and residential was a required ten foot perimeter screening as proposed along the parking lot edge adjacent to the residential lots and along Cheyenne Plaza property line. The applicant proposed required parking lot landscape islands a minimum of every 10 spaces and additional landscaping along the front, side and rear of the site. The landscaping requirement appears to be met, but will be confirmed by a landscape architect through final site plan approval.

Ms. Miller said there were visual corridor requirements for properties adjacent to collectors, arterials and Hwy 99W. Property adjacent to SW Meinecke Parkway (a collector) required a ten foot visual corridor; a visual corridor can have no buildings within the buffer and there has to be an adequate landscape plan along SW Meinecke Parkway. She said the site met the required findings and the proposed development met the zoning district and design standards. The general commercial zoning allowed hotels as a permitted use in that zone. She reported that all the public facilities could serve the site; meaning there was adequate storm, sanitary, and water, which would be finalized during engineering approval. Ms. Miller summarized that there were no significant natural features on the site except for some trees the applicant was proposing to retain, but otherwise the site was vacant with no other wetlands or natural features that would impact the site. She said traffic mitigation was required in the form of constructing the Cedar Creek Trail and Alexander Lane improvements. The driveway design met standards because it was at least 24 feet in width. Staff recommendation was to approve the application with conditions of approval discussed in detail in the staff report. She asked the Commission to hold a public hearing and offered to answer questions from the Commission.

Ms. Miller reviewed the written comments received after the packet was created.

Exhibit L, additional information from Kittleson and Associates in response to the DKS Associates memorandum in the packet.

Exhibit M, additional information provided by the applicant concerning the parking area.

Exhibit N, citizen comment from Jennifer Matzinger

Exhibit O, citizen comment from Jason Siebers

Additionally there were a couple of conditions of approval that were not copied to the end of the staff report. She gave the Commission a page with the edits to the staff report and said the changes included changing the numbering from "a" to 18 and adding conditions 21 and 22 (see record, Exhibit 3). The exhibit referred to on page 39 of the packet should have been Exhibit D.

Chair Simson asked for questions of staff by the Commission. None were received. She called for a recess at 7:37 pm and reconvened at 7:50 pm.

Chair Simson asked for testimony from the applicant.

Lloyd Hill, Hill Architects, 1750 Blankenship Road, Ste. 400, West Linn representing the applicant came forward and said staff had provided a good overview of the project. He said the project was a new, 73 room, Hampton Inn and Suites Hotel; a Hilton Hotels project. He said Hilton was picky about locations and operators and his client had received approval from Hilton for this site and there would not be another Hilton Hotel within a certain mileage distance from this site because this was the one they wanted to build. Mr. Hill explained it should be a very nice hotel which would benefit the people that live in Sherwood as well as visitors from out of town. He thought the kind of people to use the hotel would be a combination of business and vacation travelers. He said one of the benefits of having a hotel in town was the tax benefit of a 3% room tax of gross revenues and the estimated taxes for this hotel was about \$150,000 per year. Over the first ten years of the hotel there could be \$1.5m worth of taxes which would go directly to the City of Sherwood and could be a source of revenue the City could use for running City business and doing other projects the City has that were important.

Mr. Hill stated there was a traffic engineer from Kittleson to answer questions and commented that the project design should reduce the amount of traffic going through the neighborhoods on Smith Avenue and Alexander Lane to get to the Cheyenne Plaza businesses; the only way to get to the businesses was through the neighborhood. A significant benefit of the new project would be interconnection between the parking for Cheyenne and the hotel. He said ODOT was encouraging developments along the corridor to have shared parking and access agreements to minimize the need for access to and from Hwy 99W. He said neither delivery trucks nor guests were anticipated to drive through the neighborhood on Smith Avenue and Alexander Lane and thought virtually all of the traffic for the hotel would utilize the right in, right out on Meinecke Parkway and there should not be a lot of trips added to the neighborhood.

Mr. Hill said parking was the other hot button issue. He pointed out that the required parking for the proposed 73 hotel rooms would be a total of 73 parking spaces and it was unusual for a hotel like this to be fully occupied, except for a few times of year during the holidays or festivals. Generally occupancy would be at 70-75% and it was expected that the 60 parking spaces provided on the hotel property should be enough parking to satisfy the entire hotel parking demand the majority of the time; leaving empty spaces in the parking lot. He said if there was a need for more parking it would not be during normal business hours, but in the evenings after 8pm when the last guests check in which was why a shared parking arrangement was negotiated between the applicant and Cheyenne Plaza. Mr. Hill said there were about a dozen parking spaces in the back of Cheyenne Plaza that were rarely filled and available for hotel parking after the Cheyenne Plaza businesses closed. He said comments were received from neighbors about the street parking being all full, but a traffic survey was conducted midweek at 7:30 pm when the health club and restaurant were still open and there were a number of empty spaces open on the street and in the plaza parking lot. He said a survey was also conducted on a Friday evening at 8:30 pm when the health club was closed and there were again a number of empty spaces. Mr. Hill was confident there was adequate parking to serve the needs of the hotel without requiring any of the guests to park on the street. He added that the application included on-street parking on Alexander Lane and Smith Avenue, but the expectation was that it would never be needed to service the hotel.

Mr. Hill commented the site was a relative urban zoning with zero required setbacks on the front and sides of the property so the hotel was placed on the front along Hwy 99W, which was encouraged by the planning code, allowing a bigger setback from the neighbors in the back. He said the part of the hotel just under the 50 foot height limit and four stories high was over a hundred feet away from the neighbors in the back, plus there were no windows on the part of the building closest to the neighbors; the windows look to the sides. He suggested the location of the hotel was sensitive to preserving the privacy of the neighbors in the adjacent residential neighborhood when added to the city's ten foot landscape buffer with trees and shrubs and a privacy fence.

Mr. Hill commented that Hilton was in the business of building and operating hotels and the fact that Hilton

had identified this site as a place they wanted a hotel as a strong reinforcement for the need. He pointed out that a hotel was an allowed use on the site and a variance had not been requested. He said there were quite a few allowed uses for the site that could generate far more traffic and impacts like certain types of restaurants that would have more people coming and going and a hotel was a nice, benign neighbor.

Mr. Hill specified that the building was designed to be consistent with the Hilton brand standards for the Hampton Inn which included a prominent cornice element on the corner tower and the front of the hotel which projects out. He said it would have subtle up-lighting at night to draw your eye to it and it was designed with a post-modern/ mid-century modern with a northwest character to it using a combination of natural stone at the base of the building, some wood accent elements and a smooth, dark metal finished surface. He said the upper three floors had stucco elements that would be synthetic plaster. Mr. Hill reported that they tried hard to do a building that would be handsome and something the city could be proud of. He showed renderings of the hotel from Meinecke where you would enter the right in/ right out and the lower one story portion on the back corner where the enclosed swimming pool would be. He noted there was a dining area in the front facing toward Hwy 99W, which was proposed to have outdoor patio area fronting the new Cedar Creek Trail extension. Mr. Hill offered to answer questions about the building design. None were received.

Shawn Quail, senior traffic engineer with Kittleson and Associates, 610 SW Alder Street, Suite 700, Portland 97205 explained the overall conclusions had not changed in the updated traffic study. He said specificity and clarity were added based on concerns the City's traffic engineering firm, DKS Associates, had. He said traffic mitigation on 99W included a committed enhancement to install an adaptive traffic signal control system; which would look at real time volumes at the intersection to adjust and allocate green light time on the fly to allocate time more efficiently and get a greater percent of traffic pushed through the intersection. He said they went back out and looked at the roundabout the project would increase trips through and while the reported safety issues are relatively low there were two reported crashes between 2009-2013 at the 99W and Meinecke intersection and four reported crashes at the roundabout at Dewey Drive. He reported there were concerns from neighbors about safety at the intersection and they thought there was an opportunity to enhance safety operations at the roundabout by managing the vegetation better to improve the line of site between drivers and pedestrians.

Mr. Quail stated new items in the study included an updated parking analysis with the survey data information where the potential traffic for the neighborhood use of Smith Avenue was quantified and in their professional opinion no more than 5% of new traffic trips would be using the neighborhood route; likely less because of the new connection through the site to Meinecke Parkway. He said they estimated it to be up to 5% or 0-3 new peak hour trips or one extra car, at most, every twenty minutes.

Mr. Quail said ODOT staff had no additional issues regarding 99W beyond the original traffic analysis other than distinguishing the ODOT right of way parking from other general on-street parking and emphasizing the Cedar Creek Trail connection.

Mr. Quail said the sound wall modification specified in the conclusions and recommendations would ensure the line of sight is protected. Mr. Hill clarified portions of the existing sound wall would remain on either side of the emergency access driveway after clear vision standards were met.

Chair Simson asked if the commission had questions for the applicant before public testimony and stated there was eleven minutes remaining for rebuttal. The Commission deferred questions until after public testimony.

Ms. Hajduk inserted that she had received an email during the recess from the Community Development Director in Newberg who had received and forwarded comments on the project. The written comments were included in the testimony (see record, Exhibit P).

Chair Simson asked for public testimony.

Ashley Weston, Sherwood resident said she lived near the project site on Noble Fir Court and her house could be seen in a number of photos from the presentation. She said she understood the need for a hotel and had family that visited from out of town. She said as a neighbor to the site she thought it was a terrible location for a hotel and there were other sites in Sherwood for a hotel. She expressed concerns for the increased traffic on Smith Avenue and consequently the intersection of Sequoia Terrace and Noble Fir near her house. Ms. Weston said there was no stop sign at that location and a hotel would add cut through traffic onto her street where her kids play. She noted that traffic impact could be worse, but did not see that as a reason to approve the application. She said there were already enough people that did not see pedestrians in the crosswalks, that are clearly marked, and now there would be even more traffic added with people who were not familiar with the crosswalks or the kids. Ms. Weston commented on turning the high school into a middle school and having even younger kids using those roundabouts with the additional traffic. She recognized the applicant was following the rules about how tall the building with 30 feet here and 47 feet there, but she did not want to look directly out of her back yard at the four story building every day. She said the hotel would not likely be at capacity so it could be built with two or three stories. Ms. Weston said her main concern was traffic and commented on leaving Newberg wine country and being welcomed by a four story hotel in Sherwood and it was not the impression Sherwood would want. She was more than happy for Hilton to build a lovely hotel closer to the commercial areas where there would be easy access to walk to other restaurants or shopping areas and not where all the other kids are.

Michael Buffington, Sherwood resident on Dewey Drive came forward and posed several questions. He asked if it was true that every hotel guest would need to use the round-about to enter the hotel and was curious why there was not an entry way off of 99W. He said access from 99W would not make hotel guests go through the round-about at all if there was an exit there. Mr. Buffington was puzzled by when the traffic studies were done and said it is not immediately clear what days they were done. He said there was data from June 30, 2015, August 29, September 9, and September 15, 2016. He asked if there were more and said they were days that were not representative of days around the area. Mr. Buffington said if a new traffic study was done today it would be dark, but on the other days the studies were done they were light days. He understood the study was counting cars, but he thought that safety changed depending on the time of year the studies were done; probably the traffic patterns too. Mr. Buffington commented that three days of data seemed inadequate, that the background traffic conditions used data from the middle of November 2015, and he did not think the data was reliable or accurate enough to predict the traffic for 2017, nor did it take into account things like the middle schools being combined into the current high school site, kids traveling across 99W to the school, and all the kids at the current high school going across 99W the other way. Mr. Buffington said the study on August 29 analyzed the school peak hour traffic, but it was not an actual school day. He could not find anywhere in the traffic report that showed data for why we sit four or more cycles turning left off of 99W into Meinecke. Mr. Buffington remarked there were a lot of studies showing the impact on the city services, but none about the impact on levels of crime. He said even the best hotels could attract criminal activity and meth labs had been found in Hampton Inns, human trafficking and prostitution occurred in hotels. I did not say this was going to happen in Sherwood, but it could and there should be a study on the impact on our law enforcement.

Mr. Buffington asked what happened if the hotel went out of business or stopped making a profit and commented that hotel buildings could not be repurposed. He asked if the same landscaping standards would be required. He commented that one of the benefits for having a hotel was to provide employment for Sherwood residents and assumed that meant pay greater than minimum wage considering that Sherwood has a cost of living 42% higher than the national average.

Jared Cordon, Sherwood resident said he had lived on Dewey Drive for the last twelve years and he was familiar with the traffic patterns around the area including walking patterns. He expressed concern regarding

the safety impact to community members, particularly young children and students walking to the middle and high school, as well as the high school students driving. Mr. Cordon also shared concerns about the dates of the traffic analysis on August 29 and said the estimated 650 cars per day entering the roundabout in a residential area was approximately 1300 cars crossing a crosswalk where there were kids. He did not think the proposed mitigation to reduce the height of the shrubs would significantly improve the impact of cars coming into the neighborhood that neither know how to use a roundabout nor would they see kids crossing during the morning or for an evening event. Mr. Cordon was also concerned about the secondary entrance, because there was another crosswalk on the north side. He hoped the Commission considered the impact of the proposed high school and elementary school boundary changes that would likely put 1200-1300 elementary school kids at the current high school location which would mean younger walkers using the crosswalk as well as students crossing from the Woodhaven side using Meinecke Parkway to cross 99W to get to the new high school. Mr. Cordon said the traffic was backed up all the way along Dewey every morning to get out on 99W and the traffic study was laughable. He requested that the Commission review and revisit the traffic study and ask if the size of the roundabout was adequate. He said there were several roundabouts in the city that were a more adequate size for cars to get through (Langer, other side of 99w).

Chris Austin, Sherwood resident on Noble Fir Court said he had been a resident over 16 years. He expressed concerns for the one-way in and out access onto Meinecke Parkway and said there was already a lot of traffic on Smith Avenue. Mr. Austin commented there was parking on both sides of Smith Avenue, so when there was a car parked on each side of the street, there was only room for one car at a time to travel down Smith Avenue. He said he had seen accidents on Smith Avenue and Meinecke Road as well as a lot of close calls. Mr. Austin explained that there were over twenty children living on both Sequoia Terrace and Noble Fir Court and there were a lot of cars that his neighborhood to avoid the Smith Avenue turn. He expected hotel guests would miss the entrance to the hotel and use the side streets to get to the entrance the back way. He was confident that many map applications would point guests down Smith Avenue or Sequoia Terrace to get access to the hotel, or directed through Old Town Sherwood for guests coming from I-5 to Meinecke Road onto Smith Avenue to get to the hotel. Mr. Austin commented the Cheyenne Parking lot was full most of the time with just with the restaurant, hair salon and work out facility. He asked if RVs, large vehicles or trailers coming to the hotel had been considered for parking and asked what would stop residents from cutting through the hotel parking lot to get onto 99W. Mr. Austin hoped the Commission could take these into consideration that a middle school was going in where the high school is and the number of kids that would be using Meinecke every day. He thought the area near Walmart would be a better location for a hotel of this size.

Mara Broadhurst said she owned the commercial property across Meinecke Parkway for the project and said without the visual corridor the forty seven foot hotel limited her property's visibility from the highway. Ms. Broadhurst stated Alexander Lane and the six proposed parking spaces were both in the ODOT right of way and were being used to avoid doing highway frontage improvements or to have a twenty five foot visual corridor. She explained that Alexander lane was the old driveway access off of 99W and could not logically continue into the 99W intersection which left a section of their site directly abutting ODOT right of way. Ms. Broadhurst held the application should trigger a visual corridor and highway frontage improvements per the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and ODOT requirements as it did on her property. She asked who would do the highway frontage improvements once the hotel was developed and the corner built out and for any improvement plans that would be required for the hotel's section, especially for the turn lanes, curb and storm drain, and acceleration merge lane onto 99W from Meinecke Parkway. She asked if the hotel would use up all of the trip counts for the intersection, before improvements were necessary, as her property was already burdened with improvements and would not be able to absorb any extra imposed, because of the hotel's impact. She stated the hotel had no responsibility for their fair share and were doing no highway improvements. Ms. Broadhurst said this also affected the safety and aesthetics of Sherwood's entrance to Old Town and a main Sherwood intersection should not be left without a plan for the highway

frontage.

Mike Meyer, owner of Generations Bar and Grill located in Cheyenne Plaza adjacent to the proposed hotel property and Sherwood resident and commented at first blush owning a restaurant next to a hotel would signal increased revenue. He said as a business owner he wanted any other business in Sherwood to succeed; a hotel was good for the community and the economy. Mr. Meyer's specified that his concern was parking, because on a Friday night home football game there was no parking available in the lot; every parking spot would be filled with up to seventeen cars parked on Alexander Lane and a large number of cars parked down Smith Avenue, from both the restaurant and people going to the football game. He acknowledged that it was about seven nights out of the year, but he thought that Friday nights would be a big night for the hotel as well from people coming into town to attend the sporting event and staying at the hotel. Mr. Meyer said the six proposed spots along Smith Avenue were often full. He believed a hotel was needed in Sherwood, but was concerned about how the parking was laid out.

F. Charles W. Heil, Sherwood resident on Sequoia Terrace said he was concerned that traffic would use the neighborhood streets and not 99W putting an additional burden on the neighborhood and the people who live there. He said a number of residents opposed the extension of Noble Fir Court to Smith Avenue, because of the cut through traffic which has increased traffic on his street with a car every one or two minutes from Sequoia Terrace during the day. Mr. Heil suggested that any traffic access needed to involve Hwy 99W and should not be limited to Meinecke Parkway, because it was hardly a normal feeder for reasons that have already been expressed. He commented that people are confused about using traffic circles and with strangers to the community the confusion rate would go up. He suggested restructuring the 99W/ Meinecke interchange completely and said he agreed that there were times of day when there was a backup for four lights trying to turn right. Mr. Heil urged the Planning Commission to look at the necessity to restructure the 99W/ Meinecke intersection so that traffic to the hotel could enter and exit directly from 99W rather than from Meinecke Parkway and take the weight off of the neighborhood streets. Mr. Heil said he has lived in Sherwood for 11 years and has seen the traffic increase regularly.

Ron McCullough, Sherwood resident of 12 years living on King Richard Court said before Smith Avenue was punched through King Richard Court was a quiet dead end street. Now the high schoolers park on the street and race during lunch time up and down the street trying to get out. He said there was no room for them to park at the high school. He said the high schoolers would be traded for middle school walkers. Mr. McCullough disclosed that he worked for a commercial contractor that built hotels that had just built one of these particular hotels in another city in Oregon. He said they were a nice facility and would bring business to Sherwood. He felt the people of Sherwood needed a hotel and it would bring money and taxes to City of Sherwood, but he did not feel the location in community was best suited for a hotel. He thought there were other locations in town that could place a hotel. Mr. McCullough was not opposed to it, because he might have an opportunity to work on it, but that tiny corner was not the right corner. He commented on traffic and said residents of the townhomes would not have to come up Smith Avenue to exit to Meinecke, but what would that do for the safety for the hotel guests. He said he would cut through the hotel parking lot to avoid the roundabout and get to highway 99W. Mr. McCullough said something would have to happen at that property, whether it was a hotel or a restaurant and there was a need to look at where a hotel in Sherwood can be built, but this is the wrong corner of the city to put it in.

Jennifer Miller, resident on King Richard Court and Smith Avenue had a lot of the same concerns as everyone else and agreed that a hotel would be great; great to have the extra income for the community, great for those who have far away relatives. She mentioned magazines choosing Sherwood as one of the best places to live and expressed that it was important to look at the reasons why. Ms. Miller did not feel it was the correct location for a hotel and she did not think it was needed where children play, cross the street and go to school on a regular basis. She explained that King Richard was a long road with fifteen children between fifth grade to high school senior in her section. She said she would not want her children on the

street with people who were trying to follow a GPS, because they did not know where they were going and were trying to find a hotel. Ms. Miller stated Smith Avenue was a collector street, which she knew because there were restrictions on her property when her house was built. She said parking on Smith Avenue should be taken into consideration, because there were cars parked up and down Smith at any given moment. She commented that one vehicle gets through at a time turning off of Smith Avenue onto Meinecke Road and she had witnessed hits and near misses in the intersection on a regular occurrence. Ms. Miller understood the location could be used for a hotel, because it was commercial property, but it was time the community took a look at how the city wanted to grow as a community. She asked if the hotel would be put there if a better option was available next to other commercial properties that would give guests access to places to eat, shop, a movie theater, bank, and grocery store. Ms. Miller commented she would prefer to stay at a hotel there and would not want to drive to get to those places. She added that the residents were trying to tell the commission what they thought and to take it into consideration.

No other citizen comments were received. Chair Simson called for a recess at 8:50 and reconvened at 8:55. She explained that the Planning Commission was a group of citizen volunteers who wanted to help keep Sherwood a great place to live, who volunteered a lot of time reading a lot of material and when applications came before the Planning Commission they are bound by the code set in front of them. She said the Commission was to look at what has been presented, make decisions based on what was already written in the code, and that was what the Commission was going to do.

Chair Simson noted the testimony that mentioned looking at the zoning and said the exciting thing was the Planning Commission would be looking at our Comprehensive Plan and zoning over the next three years. She wanted people to know that the Planning Commission was bound by a set of rules to review the site plan based on the code in place. She added that Hwy 99W was not something that the City of Sherwood controlled; ODOT rules that road and will not allow direct access to the limited access highway, the City cannot change ODOT requirements and let the hotel have direct access to Hwy 99W. She stated there were a lot of other questions that came up in testimony that she thought deserved more answers from the applicant and staff and encouraged people to stay through the process to hear what going to happen or contact Michelle Miller with further questions.

Chair Simson asked for rebuttal from the applicant and reminded them they had eleven minutes remaining.

Mr. Hill and Mr. Quail returned. Mr. Hill, architect, said he would answer the general concerns and Mr. Quail would answer concerns focused on traffic and parking. He said the client wanted to point out that Hampton Inn and Suites was primarily a corporate hotel and would have full occupancy mostly be on weeknights, not Friday, Saturday; weekends would generally be lower occupancy for Hampton Inn and Suites, than the weekdays. As a result the peak demand for parking would be on weeknights and later at night. He specified the parking lot was not surveyed on a football Friday night, but the nights that were surveyed had a lot of parking available. The applicant was confident there was adequate parking to serve the needs of the hotel on the hotel site for almost every night.

Mr. Hill said one of the comments had to do with setbacks and visual corridor in a setback for properties fronting on Hwy 99W and pointed out that the section of Hwy 99W to the north of Meinecke had an extra wide right of way because Alexander Lane was platted before Hwy 99W widened. He commented that people who have been in Sherwood a long time remembered 99W as a much narrower road and Alexander Lane as a separate road that ran parallel. He said there was an extra setback from the edge of 99W over to the hotel property along this frontage. Part of that frontage would have the extension of the new pedestrian and bike trail system.

Mr. Quail, senior traffic engineer with Kittleson and Associates, referred to page 9 in appendix B and said it called out when the traffic counts were performed as a basis for the analysis. He said school was in session on Sept 15, 2015 when the counts were taken to ensure a valid analysis. He said the charts were done in

August 2016. Mr. Quail then worked with staff and ODOT to clarify the increase to existing conditions by adding an extra 2% of traffic growth on top of the counts to get to a 2016 existing condition and worked with staff to review and approve that.

Mr. Quail noted concern over waiting through multiple signal cycles or traffic lights, particularly in the west bound left turn and verified from being at the site that it was not the greatest movement during the AM peak nor the PM peak hours. He explained the way the standard worked for traffic analysis was based on the average delay or the average volume to capacity over the entire intersection. While a certain movement might suffer, it balances out the more critical movements of the through traffic. He said how traffic moved at that intersection was up to the approach ODOT took with timing their traffic lights and something that both ODOT and Washington County recognized as an issue. He said that was why he alluded to the future installation of an adaptive traffic signal system. He clarified that the enhancement was not adding new pavement, but he had seen through traffic studies and through the evaluation of the adaptive traffic signal system on Tualatin Sherwood Road benefits of 5-25% improvements in travel times to squeeze out a little bit more capacity.

Commissioner Walker asked if ODOT had committed to the adaptive traffic system. Mr. Quail explained that ODOT and Washington County were working on a project separate from the hotel to install an adaptive traffic system slated to come in 2017-18.

Mr. Quail spoke of safety enhancements for pedestrians crossed by 1300 cars and said he wanted to take a conservative approach with the recommendation to address the vegetation line of site issues first to see if that helped before going to a more heavy handed approach of installing active warning devices like rectangular rapid flash beacons or pedestrian beacons which can create further need for understanding of the drivers when there is a new device.

Chair Simson asked how many trips would trigger safety enhancements at the roundabout. She said 650 vehicles in a roundabout was 1300 crosswalk crossings when cars go around it. She said when you are not familiar with a roundabout it is difficult to see people getting ready to cross and she asked why she did not see any improvements on Hwy 99W acceleration lane, sidewalk improvements nor pedestrian safety improvements as part of the application. Mr. Quail responded that it had to do with the code and what the recorded crash history was when pulled from ODOT which did not indicate disproportionate safety concerns. He said concerns were heard from the neighbors which was why we assessed the conditions and looked at the roundabout, but in the opinion of the applicant, addressing the vegetation was an appropriate first step towards improving safety. Over and above the fact that there was not a pattern of crashes being reported, one of the shortcomings of crash reports was that we don't get to see any of the near misses, therefore we are stuck with a subjective approach and the guidance for traffic beacons were fluctuating. He said the report in its scope did not look at enhanced crossings, because the roundabout was within safety and operational standards. Chair Simson expressed concern and indicated she would consult with staff about getting safe crossings.

Mr. Quail said there were comments about Smith Avenue gaining additional trips and he referred the Commission to the traffic study conclusions that showed the maximum upset at 5% of all the trips or 0-3 new trips in the peak period. He said concerns over intersection control and an inability to find gaps might be an existing condition the City should look at on its own and stated the direction by staff was to study the three most critical intersections along Meinecke Parkway where a majority of the trips would be routed to and from for the hotel (Hwy 99W, roundabout, new driveway) and that was why none of the intersections along Smith Avenue were assigned for further evaluation. Mr. Quail said there were comments about parking on Smith Avenue and the width of passing along the street. He repeated that this was outside of the scope of the study and if the city recognized it as an issue they may want to take a look at it.

Mr. Hill added that one of the benefits from the new traffic signalization by ODOT was that it should

allocate more time at the light for left turn movement and make it better. He summarized that the Planning Commission was bound by a legal code to review the application and confirmed that the design for the building complied with the heights, setbacks, and design standards. He said the required parking was met on site with parking on Smith and Alexander which would meet the requirements, but there was additional parking available through the shared parking agreement with the adjacent property, which was also allowed under the Sherwood Municipal Code. Mr. Hill believed the parking requirement was met in multiple ways and the project was in compliance with all of the applicable regulations in the municipal code. He encouraged the Planning Commission to approve the application.

Chair Simson asked if the applicant was in agreement with all of the conditions outlined by staff and accepted all conditions as written. Mr. Hill said there were two conditions they wanted to clarify: The condition to install wheel stops in the parking adjacent to sidewalks or landscaped areas and the condition requiring a public utility easement along Alexander Lane frontage. He said the approach the hotel liked to take was to make the sidewalk wider so the car could overhang the sidewalk or to make the landscape area wider and not have a separate wheel stop, which could be a trip hazard. He believed that was an allowable way to deal with the wheel stops. For the requirement to have a public utility easement along Alexander Lane frontage he said they would need to request an exception so the utilities could be routed in the extra wide public right of way. He said the hotel would not fit on the site with the parking and the setback from the neighbors if the building was moved back 8 1/2 feet.

Bob Galati, City Engineer explained the City had requirements for the placement locations of utilities; if they are outside the right of way the city owns then they go in an easement. He said the project was set up in an unusual situation and did not fit all of the standards. The applicant will have to go through a design variation request by submitting a report to Engineering outlining why the variation was needed and how the utilities would be placed. If it is technically correct and feasible because it functioned, was easily maintained by the city, did not create an undue burden on the city long term it would be approved and the variation from the design standard would be allowed.

Chair Simson asked about the wheel stops. Mr. Galati responded the wheel stops were a Planning Department issue, but basically it has been done at Woodhaven Park where there was an extra wide sidewalk and the curb. Michelle Miller explained that the sidewalk requirement was five feet wide with a three foot overhang or additional landscaping. The sidewalk could be extended the additional three feet from the minimum or landscaping could be included in lieu of the wheel stop. She said she would review the details in final site plan review and this was allowed in the code section.

Chair Simson confirmed with the applicant that they were accepting the conditions as written based on those comments. She asked for questions from the Commission.

Vice Chair Griffin expressed concern for the near 30 parking spaces that face south against the existing privacy fence that would have a ten foot landscape buffer. He asked about cars with headlights parking in those spaces and asked if it would be a thick vegetative buffer. Mr. Hill replied the existing fence was about six feet tall and the grade was elevated above the parking lot and there would be extensive shrubbery along the fence which would grow to be taller than the headlights and create an effective shield for the headlights. Vice Chair Griffin commented that a concern was expressed for people looking into the back yards of the neighborhood; with a ten foot buffer and properly planted vegetation it would provide a good buffer. Mr. Hill said they would work with the owner and the landscape architect to ensure good evergreen vegetation.

Vice Chair Griffin asked about guests who would be hauling a trailer or an RV. Mr. Hill said they did not typically get RV guest, but this type of hotel, more often than not, had empty parking spaces in the parking lot. He had seen situations where somebody took a trailer and put it in one parking spot and parked next to it or parked parallel, taking up a couple of spots in a row. Mr. Hill said there was not a requirement in the code to provide parking for trailers, so the requirements of the code had been met. He said he did not think

there have been a lot of problems associated with this issue in these kind of hotels.

Chair Simson asked if there was signage expected to indicate how to get to the hotel around the roundabout. Mr. Hill said there would be signage on the hotel and on the property to show where the hotel entrance was. Mr. Galati said the City could make accommodations for special directional signage with informational signs that can provide the appropriate type of directions for getting it to the entrance. Vice Chair Griffin suggested that a guest should be directed to loop around the roundabout and not go through the neighborhood down Sequoia Terrace or Smith Avenue. Mr. Galati said that was doable.

Commissioner Rettig asked if there was an estimate on how many hotel staff would be taking parking spaces. Mr. Hill estimated there would manager, assistant manager, maintenance, up to six housekeeping staff and he would be surprised if at any one time there were more than 8-10 staff at the hotel. Generally staff like housekeeping were there when the guests were not; they clean the rooms during the day after guests have checked out and before new guests arrive, so there was not a need for staff parking at the same time there was a need for guest parking. He said there was limited food service at the hotel because there was not a restaurant; continental breakfast would be served.

Vice Chair Griffin asked for an explanation of the service deliveries. Mr. Hill explained there was a location on the site plan next to the *porte cochere* which was designated for the services trucks use. Vice Chair Griffin asked if there was a walk through lobby. Mr. Hill said there was an entrance on the Alexander Lane side that enters into the hotel lobby with another entrance from the hotel lobby to the parking lot so you could walk through the hotel lobby.

Vice Chair Griffin asked staff about the vegetation at the roundabout and asked if reducing the vegetation would improve pedestrian safety. Mr. Galati responded that anything that provided a clearer vision zone would help. He said it was a maintenance issue, that he did not have opposition to reviewing the proposed safety improvements and would need to be worked out with Public Works.

Chair Simson asked why the application did not trigger safety corridor or pedestrian enhancements. She said the larger land use projects normally triggered improvements to adjoining intersections. Mr. Galati explained that part of it was how much was an existing problem. He said the pedestrian crossings concerns at the roundabout were ubiquitous to all of the roundabouts in Sherwood and was more of a management plan for the City to deal with on a long term. He compared pedestrian improvements to a recently approved apartment project in Sherwood where the proposed development was adding pedestrian trips to the intersection which increased the pedestrian count, consequently signage and striping was added, because the development increased the number of pedestrians crossing the road. Mr. Galati explained that it was not the vehicle count that kicked it in, but because of the pedestrian crossing traffic counts and in the hotel's instance the pedestrian crossings were existing so they would stay the same. A hotel would not add to the pedestrian count.

Commissioner Walker asked if a permitted use in the area could technically meet all of the guidelines, but the existing conditions in the area, having nothing to do with the particular project, could not support the use any longer.

Mr. Galati explained that the City looked at what the impacts were and tried to create a nexus to the cost of the fix compared to the actual impact. The next step was to determine the impacts so the fix to the situation they were creating or exacerbating was cost-balanced.

Chair Simson questioned how many cars went through that roundabout. The study showed the hotel would generate 650 cars through the Meinecke/Dewey roundabout. She asked how many existing trips there were.

Garth Appanaitis, traffic engineer for the City of Sherwood from DKS Associates, responded that throughout the application process DKS coordinated and provided scoping input and review assumptions and he concurred with all of the findings presented by the applicant's traffic engineer. Chair Simson wanted

to know if a 2% increase of the September 2015 data took into account Sherwood's growth and the traffic counts in other study areas. Mr. Appanaitis confirmed and said the projections were from the TSP as well as other recent counts and comparisons that had been conducted. Commissioner Walker asked if it made sense to take one day of counts. Mr. Appanaitis answered that the practice was consistent with the requirements of the traffic study. He said there were some agencies whose code stipulated that more traffic data collection be done, but one was consistent with common practice. Commissioner Walker stated that traffic was probably the biggest concern the Planning Commission dealt with along with parking. The lay person thinks the thresholds for traffic are way under what they should be, but traffic engineers think there can be much more traffic than most people thought there should be in our neighborhoods. She asked how the Commission could request more samples going forward because this was an issue that came up all the time and although one example was technically enough it did not seem right.

Mr. Appanaitis replied that other cities stipulated for a broader traffic count period, such as over three days, however the more data collected the more the cost and it might inhibit development. He said Sherwood's code, and common practice, was one day of data collection and it was the extreme exception for agencies to require more than one day. Mr. Appanaitis said traffic volumes could change about 10% from day to day, not everyone takes the exact same route every day, and travel plans changed when there was a crash. He explained that the findings presented in the report were well under the mobility standards of the intersection. Even if traffic was counted on a different day, and 10% higher, the mobility thresholds would still not be triggered. In his professional opinion, the data allowed for more flexibility, the finding would not change, and the impacts would not be triggered.

Chair Simson said no safety improvements or road improvements were being triggered to the roundabout, improvements to Hwy 99 ingress/egress, or widening of the road even though 650 trips would be generated with the proposed hotel. Mr. Appanaitis answered that based on the safety observations and data collected there was not a recurring trend of an obvious correctable safety measure. He said there was an acknowledgement made for site distance limitations with a recommendation on how to improve safety to the roundabout, but for adding enhanced pedestrian measures, like flashed crossing or other measures, he would advise that such improvements should not be made without careful research, because it could actually create a safety hazard by putting them in if they are not warranted for the same reason that you would not put in a stop sign on a 55 mph roadway. He said the project was well within the city's and ODOT's thresholds at a Level Service D on the city streets and a volume to capacity measurement for ODOT. They are still under that.

Commissioner Walker asked what would determine the need for a bigger roundabout. Mr. Appanaitis said it came to how much conflicting volume there was. In this case it was a three legged roundabout so there were not as many approaches and some people might not be traveling around. It is a much different case than at Langer Farms Parkway/ Century Drive roundabout where there was a four legged approach and traffic coming from each direction.

Julia Hajduk reminded everyone that any new development has to pay System Development Charges (SDC) and Transportation Development Taxes (TDT). Developers who make improvements on certain roads can get credits, but the fees help pay for bigger picture projects that are not warranted by a particular project and over time as development contributes to system development funds the City would have the money to do those bigger projects. The applicant would be paying SDC's towards transportation just not doing an on-site improvement or mitigation by physical development.

Commissioner Walker commented on not collecting data at the intersection of Smith Avenue and Meinecke Road; and asked if that could be added to the review. Vice Chair Griffin suggested that was because they expected 90% of the traffic to go through the main entrance and only 10% to use Smith Avenue. Chair Simson said she had Mapquested it and the GPS service instructed drivers coming from I-5 to go through downtown Sherwood and to turn on Smith Avenue. She was confident people would use that option. Vice

Chair Griffin suggested that was a good location for a sign to direct traffic passed Smith Avenue and to use the main entrance on Meinecke Parkway.

Mr. Galati said intersections on the major roadways were selected for traffic studies, because localized intersections operate differently due to the slower speed and the local neighborhood. He reported the traffic impacts have a farther reaching effect on collector status roads and Smith Avenue was classified as a local or neighborhood route, not a collector or arterial, at this time. He said a study could be done to look at it as a secondary road and an intersection, but assumptions would still have to be made. An assumption of 5% is consistent with other studies that have been done.

Vice Chair Griffin asked if the City would consider making one side of Smith Avenue a no parking zone, because of the increased amount of commercial development at the north end of Smith Avenue.

Ms. Hajduk inserted that the City had already received a number of complaints, regardless of the project, about the parking situation on Smith Avenue and was actively discussing options with the City Manager and City Attorney. Mr. Galati said he looked at the project files to see how the road was designed and Meinecke Parkway was a combination road that was built for the city, but was designed and built by ODOT. Smith Avenue was intended to be a two lane road with parking on one side and was never intended to have parking on both sides. He was in support of putting no parking signage on one side of the street, however it was not part of this review, because it was related to the high school issue and it was not up to the applicant to fix the high school's parking issue.

Mr. Appanaitis said the AM peak hour which typically had the worst conditions, because of concurrent school traffic, at approximately 1000 plus vehicles going through the intersection between the three different approaches at the roundabout. The hotel would add about 40 extra AM trips from the site; a small portion relative to what was happening there today.

Mr. Galati suggested the Planning Commission look at Figure 13 of the traffic study and said it gave a diagnosis of traffic turns. All the numbers added up showed the PM peak hour turning movements, which equated to about 1000 trips going through the intersection. The hotel traffic count was minimum when added to the total trips generated.

Vice Chair Griffin asked regarding improvements to the signal at Meinecke Parkway and 99W that might increase traffic by 5%. Mr. Appanaitis explained an adaptive signal provided a benefit to the side streets in a typical highway corridor like 99W where the focus was getting highway traffic through; ODOT gives a lot of green time to that. He said during lower traffic times of day there might be a lot of green time on the highway with traffic waiting on the side street for a green light. The adaptive signal collected additional data and could have a better sense of what was going on resulting in a change to accommodate side street traffic and enhanced traffic on Meinecke Parkway.

Chair Simson asked if there were any more questions for staff. Commissioner Walker asked about the timeline for approval. Ms. Hajduk said staff conferred during the break and confirmed that if the meeting was continued to a meeting before January 10, 2017, there was time for an appeal period, public notice and a City Council hearing within the 120 day deadline. If the Commission decided to continue the hearing there would need to be clarification on how the record would be kept open.

Vice Chair Griffin commented that one of the constraints as mentioned by Chair Simson was the development code. He said it always seemed when certain applications were before the Commission that the public became involved. He said when the Planning Commission was amending the development code there was no one in the audience. He said the application before the Commission met the code and was technically correct; ODOT had signed off on the entrance off of Meinecke Parkway and there were a lot of "green lights" for the application. He said it might not be the right spot for a hotel, but it was technically correct and met the criteria the Planning Commission had to follow. The Commission would have to decide

and take a vote on it, based on the pre-established criteria. He said it was the City Council who had the power to hear other grievances with an open forum to hear comments. Ms. Hajduk clarified that an appeal was to be based on issues that had been raised and if the decision was appealed the City Council would hold another public hearing.

Vice Chair Griffin suggested if people realized there was zoning in a neighborhood that was unfavorable, they could go the Planning Commission or City Council and start the process of reviewing the allowed uses.

Commissioner Walker asked regarding the other portion on 99W that had not been developed and Ms. Broadhurst's comment about the hotel using up the trip counts for that intersection. She asked regarding the hotel development taking the remaining trip counts that would burden the last remaining vacant property with additional costs they would not have otherwise had. Mr. Galati responded that it was a process issue and the impacts were on a first come, first served basis. He said the city did not force a property owner to offset somebody else's impact.

Ms. Hajduk said it also had to be proportionate. If the transportation system was nearly broken and a developer added a few trips that breaks it, they don't have to fix the entire intersection. The City would require improvements proportionate to their impact as much as possible and that was what the SDC's go towards.

Chair Simson asked about the difference between a 24 foot driveway and the 26 foot aerial access requirement from the TVF&R. Michelle Miller said the driveway code requirements were for 24 foot wide drive aisles, but the fire equipment needed 26 feet of clearance for the aerial apparatus, so they needed to have an area where they could get to one side of the building and use their aerial equipment. She confirmed that TVF&R had worked out with the developer that the location adjacent to the lobby/ entry area was suitable. When the application submitted their final site plan the applicant would add a landscaping plan and tweaks that needed to be made per the conditions of the decision. They would be also submitting to TVF&R and verification would be required through that process as well as when they submit for building permits. All of the requirements from the TVF&R letter need to be complied with before they can be issued a building permit for construction.

Commissioner Retting asked if the parking spaces at the hotel would have an easement across Cheyenne Plaza and how it would impact the parking space requirements Cheyenne Plaza had in the first place. Ms. Miller responded that the parking requirement had several different tiers for joint use, mixed use and different times of day. She stated the applicant had submitted a table that showed the required parking for the restaurant use, the salon which used parking at a different time of day and the workout space with its own parking requirements. The site would provide 68 spaces.

Generations	40 spaces
Nail Salon	5.1 spaces
Fitness	12.3 spaces
<hr/>	
Total required spaces.	57.4 spaces

Commissioner Rettig expressed concern that parking spaces would be lost through the easement and no longer meet Cheyenne Plaza's required spaces.

Ms. Miller said the different types of uses were at 100% and there were requirements for parking that would allow for a 10% reduction if parking was used at different times of day. On-street parking was not included. Chair Simson said there was a discrepancy in the parking.

Ms. Hajduk said the code stated that mixed use projects or developments where a variety of uses occupy a development project required minimum vehicle parking shall be determined with the following formula.

Primary use (largest percent of total floor area)	100% of the minimum parking requirement
Secondary (second largest percent)	90%
Subsequent uses	80%

Jean Simson asked if the hotel needed the shared parking to meet the minimum parking requirement on the hotel and if the shared parking takes the original Cheyenne Plaza below their minimum parking, how could they give up something they needed to meet the parking requirement.

Ms. Miller responded that the hotel parking lot showed 62 spaces, Smith Avenue provided 7, and Alexander Lane provided 8 for a total of 77 total parking spaces. The hotel met the parking requirement without the shared parking agreement with Cheyenne Plaza. Vice Chair Griffin commented that a lack of required parking at Cheyenne Plaza should not affect the Commission’s decision on the hotel. Ms. Miller ensured that all requirements would be reviewed for compliance by staff.

Commissioner Flores asked if the required parking changed depending on the types of business in the plaza. Ms. Miller confirmed and said the plaza was originally general commercial use and required 4.1 parking spaces per 1000 square feet, but some uses like a restaurant generate more parking requirements and if they expanded more additional parking would be needed.

Lisa asked if the Commission was able to add conditions regarding directional signage and no RV parking. Ms. Miller said findings could be made for the directional signage because they would be in the right of way.

Ms. Hajduk suggested to condition a signage plan required prior to final site plan approval. Mr. Galati confirmed that a signage plan could be looked at during the Engineering design review stage on how customers would get to the hotel. Chair Simson commented that the GPS maps would send customers down Smith Avenue and a directional sign 50 ft. in front of Smith Avenue to eliminate the cut through traffic in the neighborhood. Discussion followed regarding restricting use of trailers for hotel guests. Staff was asked to draft a condition for the signage. Ms. Hajduk suggested “prior to final site plan approval submit a signage plan that identifies how customers will be directed to the site”.

Chair Simson commented a hotel was difficult on this property when the neighbors did not want it in their backyard, but the Commission was bound by the Comprehensive Plan that was created with zoning in place as well as a code that defined what an appropriate application was. She said the Commission had to look at the criteria that had to be met when they reviewed an application.

Chair Simson closed the public hearing. The following motion was received.

Motion: From Vice Chair Griffin to approve the application for SP 16-08/LLA 16-01 Sherwood Hotel Site Plan based on the applicant testimony, public testimony received, and the analysis, findings and conditions as presented and drafted tonight in the staff report. Seconded by Commissioner Rob Rettig.

Commissioner Walker thought it was an attractive property and the hotel would look very nice. Chair Simson commented that the City was not in the hotel business, but the people who were in the hotel business had concluded this would be a successful property. It was going to be in a neighborhood with parking and traffic concerns wherever it was built in the commercial zones the city had and if it were not a hotel it would be something else with similar impacts to the adjacent neighborhood because of where the zoning was.

All present Planning Commissioners voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Planning Commissioner Announcements

Chair Simson said she and Commissioner Flores attended the Boards and Commissions Appreciation Dinner and heard really good reports from all of the commissions and boards, because it provided more information from all of the other boards who brought more information about how they performed their duties and what was important to them.

8. Adjourn

Chair Simson adjourned the meeting at 10:25 pm.

Submitted by:

Kirsten Allen

Kirsten Allen, Planning Department Program Coordinator

Approval Date: February 28, 2017