



Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

SHERWOOD CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

22560 SW Pine St., Sherwood, Or

Pursuant to House Bill 4212 (2020), this meeting will be conducted electronically and will be live streamed at <https://www.youtube.com/user/CityofSherwood>

March 1, 2022

WORK SESSION

- 1. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Mays called the work session to order at 6:00 pm.
- 2. COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Keith Mays, Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Doug Scott, Kim Young, Sean Garland, and Renee Brouse.
- 3. STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Josh Soper, Finance Director David Bodway, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, Senior Planner Joy Chang, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

OTHERS PRESENT: Planning Commission Chair Jean Simson.

4. TOPICS:

A. Development Standards Housing Choices

Senior Planner Joy Chang presented the "Housing Choices" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit A) and stated that this work session was to discuss the second phase of the Sherwood Housing Choices Project, which was a two-phase project. The first phase was the Residential Building Standards which addressed the entry location and orientation, garage and off-street parking areas, windows or entrance doors, additional design elements, and was approved by Council in 2021. She explained that Phase II would amend the Development Code to include triplexes, quadplexes, and cottage housing types. She reported that duplexes and townhomes were already permitted in the Development Code. Phase II also required a Transportation Code Amendment that was tied to housing choices. She reported that the Planning Commission was serving as the advisory committee for the project and explained that the proposed development standards were typically the minimum standards required by the state. She addressed triplexes and quadplexes and reported that they were proposing the minimum standards as required by OAR Division 46. She provided an overview of the development standards for triplexes and quadplexes on page 3 of the presentation and reported that plexes were allowed in all residential zones that allowed for detached single family dwellings. She stated that Minimum Lot Width, Depth, and Setback standards were the same as Single Family. Mayor Mays asked if quadplexes were permitted on lots that were less than 7,000 square feet? Senior Planner Chang replied that quadplexes would not be permitted on lots that were less than 7,000 square feet. She provided an overview of the minimum parking standards for triplexes and quadplexes. Council President Rosener asked for clarification on the minimum parking standards for

triplexes. Ms. Chang explained that the minimum number of parking spaces was based on the lot area of the site. Council President Rosener commented that in general, the rule was one parking space per unit, but the Minimum Parking Standards per the OAR would result in some triplexes only having two spaces instead of three. Mayor Mays commented that it was important to keep in mind that the minimum lot size for new development in Sherwood was 5,000 square feet and would therefore always necessitate three parking spaces for triplex units. Discussion occurred. Community Development Director Julia Hajduk asked if the table on page 3 of the presentation could remove the lines that were not applicable to development in Sherwood? Ms. Chang replied that those lines could be removed. Councilor Scott commented that in the future, the minimum lot sizes could change, and then those lines would become applicable. Senior Planner Chang addressed triplex and quadplex driveways and the orientation of entrances and explained that in order to comply with the legislation, the standards related to the size and location of the structure rather than the number of units. She explained that because the proposed standards were largely taken from the Model Code, Sherwood would have some flexibility with the standards because the OAR did not address driveway approaches, but the Model Code did. She reported that the Model Code identified that driveway approaches could not exceed 32-feet per frontage, as measured at the property line. She reported that if driveway frontages were separated by a local street, the driveways must meet the applicable driveway spacing standards for local streets. She reported that triplexes and quadplexes could either have two driveway approaches not exceeding 32-feet in total width on one frontage, or one maximum 16-foot-wide driveway approach per frontage if they were located on lots or parcels with frontages on local streets only. Mayor Mays asked if the state standards allowed for cities to protect the potential for on-street parking spacing, and could Sherwood mandate that there be 20-foot sections for on-street parking if there was room on the street? Ms. Chang replied that that language had not been included, but because the proposed standards were taken from the Model Code and provided some flexibility, language to protect potential on-street parking could be added. Councilor Scott commented that at the Planning Commission meetings, Chair Simson and other Planning Commission members had also advocated for enough space between driveways to allow for street parking. Senior Planner Chang replied that that language would be added. Community Development Director Hajduk commented that she and staff would include any direction from Council they received at this meeting prior to the next Planning Commission meeting. Discussion occurred. Mayor Mays asked if eight feet was the appropriate width for a single car driveway? Council President Rosener stated that eight feet was the maximum allowed width for a trailer or vehicle on a highway and commented that eight feet for a driveway seemed too narrow. Mayor Mays stated that homeowners were likely to widen their driveways if they were eight feet wide and commented that driveways and impervious surfaces in the front yard needed to be discussed and that he felt that driveways should be a minimum of nine feet. Ms. Chang replied that staff would reevaluate the work to ensure that on-street parking was optimized and would bring their work to the Planning Commission. Councilor Scott reported that the average garage door was nine feet wide, and it would be odd to have a driveway that was not as wide as the garage door. Council President Rosener commented regarding fire hydrant placement and street light placement and stated that the code for transportation and street design needed to be looked at "holistically" to ensure that the city was maximizing the streets for on-street parking. Senior Planner Chang reported that additional standards for driveway approaches required that lots or parcels must access the street with the lowest classification. Mayor Mays gave an example of a lot that was 70 feet by 100 feet and the 70 foot side faced a local street and the 100 foot side faced a collector, and asked if a developer had no choice but to have the driveway approaches on the local street even if doing so resulted in the loss of a unit in order to meet the standard? Ms. Chang replied that was how the language was currently written. She continued that lots or parcels with frontages only on collectors and/or arterial streets must meet the applicable driveway access standards for collectors and/or arterials. Community Development Director Hajduk asked for further clarification on driveway approaches and commented that the intent of the standard of not exceeding 32-feet of frontage was to ensure that there was not an excess of asphalt or concrete along the frontage, but

what she heard from Council was that they desired wider driveways. She added that she knew Council wanted to maximize on-street parking and therefore some of the dimensions and spacing would need to be reviewed. Mayor Mays replied that in a different code that had already been adopted, there were requirements of impervious surface, and whatever that percentage was would impact things. Councilor Scott commented that it seemed to be about the percentage of the overall lot width and commented that perhaps a percentage ratio might be useful. Council President Rosener commented that street parking also needed to be taken into consideration and that it went back to optimizing what the standard parking spot looked like. Councilor Scott asked what the legal parameters were for driveways and driveway approaches. Ms. Hajduk replied that there were no set standards regarding driveways and driveway approaches. Mayor Mays stated that the most important rule was to protect the impervious surface requirement and then allow the Planning Commission to work on it further. Senior Planner Chang addressed the next slide and stated that for lots or parcels abutting an alley, access must be taken from the alley and explained that staff proposed a Transportation Plan amendment to adopt a public alley design cross-section detail. Mayor Mays asked if alleys were required under the new law? Ms. Chang replied that alleys were not required but they were allowed in the existing code. Mayor Mays stated he wanted the Planning Commission to determine if alleys should continue to be permitted in the code for triplexes and quadplexes. Discussion occurred. Mayor Mays asked if Sherwood had an alley standard? Ms. Chang replied that the TSP did not currently have a cross-section detail for a public alley, and the proposed amendment would fix that. Councilor Scott commented he was not in favor of removing alleys from the code for triplexes and quadplexes. Council President Rosener clarified that Mayor Mays wanted the Planning Commission to discuss if alleys should be in the TSP. Councilor Scott replied that that was fine, but it was out of the scope of this project and was a part of a much larger conversation about planning. Council President Rosener asked if the impervious surface requirement was the same for the rear of the development of the dwelling unit if there was a driveway approach in the back? Senior Planner Chang replied that the impervious surface standard only applied to the front.

Senior Planner Chang addressed cottage clusters and stated that cottage clusters were intended to consist of smaller homes at a lower price point and provided an overview of the OAR minimum requirements for cottage clusters. She outlined the proposed amendments as: a minimum of four cottages per cottage cluster regardless of lot size and no more than 12 dwellings were allowed to share a single common courtyard. She outlined the proposed development standards as: standards were applied to a cottage cluster(s) on one lot, cottage clusters were allowed in all residential zones that allowed for detached single family dwellings, and minimum lot areas were the same as the minimum of the base zones. Mayor Mays asked if it was a state law that cottage clusters were allowed in all residential zones that allowed for detached single family dwellings? Ms. Chang replied that it was required under OAR and the minimum lot areas were consistent with OAR. She explained that if developers wanted each cottage unit to be a separate tax lot, the creation of the lots would be done through the Condominium process. She clarified that staff was not proposing any language based on SB 458, which related to middle housing land division, and explained that conversations regarding how to implement SB 458 would occur in the future. Councilor Brouse asked for clarification on the number of cottage clusters permitted on different lot sizes. Councilor Scott explained that a cluster could be anywhere from four to twelve units and the minimum lot size to have a cottage cluster was 7,000 square feet in any zone, but that did not mean that twelve units would automatically be permitted as there were other requirements that needed to be met, such as setback requirements. Council President Rosener commented he was disappointed about the maximum square footage of cottage cluster units because he felt that cottage clusters would provide ideal single-level housing for seniors in the community and he was concerned about cottage clusters being multi-story buildings that were very close to each other with a common courtyard and parking lot. He commented that he felt that that defeated the purpose of cottage clusters. Councilor Scott commented he agreed with Council President Rosener and that cottage clusters

could also be two-story units and that both of those things could be desirable, but the code was pushing its way to one reality. Council President Rosener commented that this would result in housing modes that were indistinguishable from each other with the exception of the common courtyard and parking lot. Community Development Director Hajduk expressed that cottage clusters were new across the state and staff would monitor what was happening at the state level. She stated that as communities started to develop cottage clusters in accordance to the standards, it may become apparent that the standards needed to be modified. Mayor Mays asked if there was a 10,000 square foot lot, what type of housing would a developer want to create in order to generate the most money, since that is what was likely to happen? He stated prior to the work session he expected to create a cottage cluster zone. Councilor Scott added that that was something that had been discussed separately. Mayor Mays stated he did not like the proposed amendments for cottage clusters and stated he wanted the Planning Commission to develop what cottage clusters could look like on different lot sizes. Councilor Scott asked for clarification on the OAR rules that stated that there was to be at least eight dwellings per cottage cluster, and the proposed amendment that stated that there was to be a minimum of four cottages per cottage cluster. Discussion occurred. Community Development Director Hajduk asked Senior Planner Chang to confirm that those two stipulations were correct per OAR. Discussion occurred. Mayor Mays commented that they would have to defer to lawyers at a later time, and that he assumed that Sherwood would establish a cottage cluster zone, in which cottage clusters would be located. Councilor Scott commented that that idea would not be completed before June, and the city had to do something by June. Mayor Mays replied that if the city followed the outlined standards, no cottage clusters could be built, but it would have followed the standards set by the state. Councilor Young asked that if a cottage cluster zone was created, cottage clusters would still be allowed in single family residential zones? Staff and Council replied that was correct. Council President Rosener clarified that it would prevent a developer from building triplexes and duplexes in that zone because HB 2001 only applied to single family detached zoning. Mayor Mays commented that the development of a cottage cluster zone could be a future project. City Attorney Josh Soper referred to the question about eight dwellings per cottage cluster per the OAR standards and explained that the OAR language stated that the city must allow up to eight cottages per common courtyard, not a minimum of eight dwellings per cottage cluster. Mayor Mays asked if there were standards for the size of a common courtyard? Senior Planner Chang replied there was. She provided an overview of the proposed development standards and stated that cottage clusters were to be a maximum height of 25-feet or two stories with 10-foot setbacks all around. Mayor Mays stated he did not agree with either of those standards. Ms. Hajduk replied that the height was per the Model Code and Sherwood did not have to allow for two-stories. Ms. Chang added that it could be required that cottage clusters be one-story, but the OAR stipulated that the building envelope could only be 900 square feet. She provided an overview of the cottage cluster building footprint and size slide and stated that the maximum building size was 1,400 square feet averaging which took into consideration any community building. Mayor Mays stated he did not like what was presented. Ms. Chang provided an overview of the requirements for a cottage cluster community building, cottage cluster orientations and courtyards, and cottage cluster parking designs on pages 13-15 of the presentation. Community Development Director Hajduk asked if the cottage cluster orientations and courtyards were based on Model Code or OAR? Ms. Chang replied they were based on Model Code and could therefore be adjusted since they were not in the OAR. Council President Rosener commented that more time was needed to be spent on developing standards for cottage clusters to ensure that development occurred within the vision they created. Ms. Hajduk stated that Council needed to adopt something by June, or the Model Code would apply. Planning Commission Chair Simson stated that many of Council's questions and concerns had also been discussed at the Planning Commission level and commented that she had similar concerns, but she did not know how to address those concerns when the Planning Commission would hold a hearing on cottage cluster housing choices on March 8th. She asked that Council detail what they wanted changed in writing and pass the document along to the Planning Commission before their meeting on March 8th so the Planning Commission could send it back to Council

for a second work session on the 15th. After which the Planning Commission could continue their hearing on the subject at their March 22nd meeting. Mayor Mays stated he did not want garages in cottage clusters or anything that would decrease setbacks. He was in favor of open parking and carports, single-story or some sort of mix, a stipulation that the dwelling could not be remodeled to have a second story, and increasing setbacks. Council President Rosener stated there was a need for single-story housing and he wanted to have something in the code that encouraged developers to create single-story units. Councilor Scott commented that the first cottage clusters to be developed will be an experiment and Sherwood did not necessarily have to try and accommodate all possible eventual types of cottage clusters, and it may be more helpful to focus on what goal they were trying to accomplish with cottage clusters. He provided an example goal of providing single-level housing and commented that they could develop the code to fit that specific goal with the knowledge that the code could be reworked in the future if new needs arose. Mayor Mays stated he supported a cottage cluster zone type. Councilor Brouse commented that allowing lofts in the units could allow cottage clusters to work for more people. Councilor Scott asked for Council feedback on the ideas that had been discussed at this work session. He recapped that Council had envisioned the first phase of cottage cluster units being: single-story with a possible loft that would be targeted towards empty-nesters, seniors, or young couples without children, and would be at a lower price point. Councilor Young commented that what Council had discussed was what she had envisioned since she joined Council. Mayor Mays commented that if there was to be a loft in a unit, he preferred a floorplan that did not have a staircase. Councilor Scott commented that he, Senior Planner Chang, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, and Planning Commission Chair Simson could meet soon and put together their thoughts before the next Planning Commission meeting. Senior Planner Chang replied that she would organize that. She reported that developers would need to submit a Sufficient Infrastructure Verification form for triplexes, quadplexes, townhouses, and cottage clusters to ensure that the infrastructure needs could be satisfied.

Senior Planner Chang addressed the Transportation System Plan (TSP) amendments and explained that amendments included a new public alley cross-section detail. Mayor Mays commented on street lights. Ms. Chang replied that the public alley cross-section detail would have pedestrian scale lighting. Mayor Mays stated he did not want that. Community Development Director Hajduk asked what Mayor Mays wanted for alley lighting. Mayor Mays replied that he wanted the same street light standard that was required for new developments. Council President Rosener commented that moving vans would frequently damage the pedestrian level lights in the alleyway. Ms. Chang explained that full-scale street lights in the alley would reflect into existing bedrooms and having pedestrian level lighting would lessen that effect. Mayor Mays stated that the required 20-foot setback would also limit the light reflecting into bedrooms. Senior Planner Chang replied that she would modify the exhibit to reflect a typical street light. She reported that at the previous Planning Commission meeting, staff had presented a different residential standard for a local street that would allow for parking on both sides by making the residential street standard 36-feet instead of 28-feet. Community Development Director Hajduk clarified that it was proposed that it require that streets be 36-feet wide to accommodate parking on both sides of the street. Ms. Chang reported that after discussing that option with the DLCD, it was determined that that proposal would not meet the Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities Rulemaking standard. Mayor Mays asked if the DLCD was dictating the right-of-way that a city needed for a project? Discussion occurred. Ms. Hajduk remarked that she understood the frustration around this topic because both HB 2001 and the Climate Friendly Equitable Communities were creating rules, but they were not necessarily talking to one another. She commented that she believed that a representative from DLCD would meet with Council at their March 15th meeting. Council President Rosener asked that Representative Courtney Neron also be invited to the meeting. Mayor Mays asked when a city would have to adopt the DLCD standards? Planning Manager Palmer replied that she would have to look into it further, but typically, the DLCD gave cities 12-24 months to make changes to their code after legislation was passed. Mayor Mays stated he wanted to start with 36-foot roads and then change the

standard in the future if required to do so. Council President Rosener commented that Sherwood would be in a better position to advocate for a different standard if the 36-foot standard was already in place. Council President Rosener thanked Senior Planner Chang for her work.

5. ADJOURNED:

Mayor Mays adjourned the work session at 7:17 pm.

REGULAR SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Mays called the meeting to order at 7:20 pm.

2. COUNCIL PRESENT: Mayor Keith Mays, Council President Tim Rosener, Councilors Doug Scott, Kim Young, Sean Garland, and Renee Brouse.

3. STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Keith D. Campbell, City Attorney Josh Soper, Finance Director David Bodway, Public Works Director Craig Sheldon, IT Director Brad Crawford, Community Services Director Kristen Switzer, Community Development Director Julia Hajduk, Police Chief Ty Hanlon, Planning Manager Erika Palmer, and City Recorder Sylvia Murphy.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR YOUNG TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR SCOTT. MOTION PASSED 6:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

5. CONSENT AGENDA:

A. Approval of February 5, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes

B. Approval of February 15, 2022 City Council Meeting Minutes

C. Resolution 2022-013 Authorizing the City Manager to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County for maintenance of non-standard lighting and traffic signal poles, sound wall and landscaping associated with the Tualatin Sherwood and Roy Rogers Road widening project

D. Resolution 2022-014 Authorizing the City Manager to sign temporary and permanent wall and construction easements on publicly owned property located at tax map 2S129A000301 to the benefit of Washington County for the Tualatin Sherwood road widening project

E. Resolution 2022-015 Declaring a Sherwood City Council Seat Vacant

MOTION: FROM COUNCILOR BROUSE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED BY COUNCILOR YOUNG. MOTION PASSED 6:0, ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS:

The City Recorder read aloud the comments submitted by Sherwood resident Julie Nader regarding Sherwood becoming an age-friendly city. She stated that since 2005, over 33 cities had participated in the

World Health Organization's Global Age-Friendly Cities Project, including Portland, Oregon. She reported that the WHO's research identified the eight key areas of: outdoor spaces and buildings, transportation, housing, social participation, respect and social inclusion, civic participation and employment, communication and information, and community health matters that cities needed to focus on to improve the lives of seniors in their community. Ms. Nader stated that seniors made up nearly 10% of Sherwood's population, and that she supported the work the Senior Advisory Board and the City was doing to work toward making Sherwood an age-friendly city. She stated that of the eight key areas, Sherwood needed to immediately address transportation and affordable housing in order to improve the lives of seniors living in Sherwood.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

7. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Proclamation, Proclaiming April 11-25, 2022 as National Community Development Week

Mayor Mays announced that April 11-15, 2022 had been designated as National Community Development Week by the National Community Development Association to celebrate the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and the HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) Program. He stated the CDBG provided annual funding and flexibility to local communities to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing, suitable living environments, and economic opportunities to low-and-moderate-income people. The HOME Program provided funding to local communities to create decent, safe, affordable housing opportunities for low-income people and over one million units of affordable housing had been completed using HOME funds nationally. Mayor Mays stated that historically, Sherwood had received CDBG grants totaling over \$2.34 million. Mayor Mays stated that both the Community Development Block Grant program and the Home Investment Partnership program had made, "tremendous contributions to the viability of the housing stock, infrastructure, public services, and economic vitality of our community." He urged Congress and the Administration to recognize the outstanding work being done locally and nationally by the Community Development Block Grant Program and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program by supporting increased funding for both programs in FY2023. Mayor Mays indicated that many of the improvements at the Senior Center had been funded by CDBG grants.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item. The City Recorder read aloud the public hearings statement and reported that no public testimony had been received.

8. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Ordinance 2022-002, 002 Amending multiple sections of the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code relating to Marijuana Uses *(First Hearing)*

Planning Manager Erika Palmer presented the "Marijuana Code Updates" PowerPoint presentation (see record, Exhibit B) and explained that the proposed ordinance was for text amendments to the Sherwood Zoning and Community Development Code (SZCDC) relating to Marijuana Uses, development standards, and processes for applications. She reported that the ordinance was a city-initiated text amendment to the (SZCDC) and in November 2020, Sherwood voters approved a ballot measure that allowed for recreational marijuana facilities in the General Industrial Zone. She recapped that in December 2020, Council approved amending the Municipal Code through Ordinance 2020-011 and made various housekeeping amendments to the applicable code sections of the Municipal Code outside of the SZCDC via Ordinance 2020-013. Ms.

Palmer stated that the proposed ordinance would make similar housekeeping amendments to chapters related to marijuana uses. She provided an overview of the proposed changes on page 3 of the presentation and stated changes included adding a definition for "Major Commercial Plaza," adding that recreational marijuana facilities were permitted with special standards in the General Industrial Zone land use table, the stipulation that both medical and recreational facilities were required to comply with site planning requirements, that when a medical dispensary completed a conversion to a recreational license the review would be a Type I review and a new recreational dispensary was a Type II. She provided an overview of the applicable code criteria for the proposed ordinance and the completed public noticing requirements. She stated that no public comments had been received prior to this meeting and reported that a second hearing for the proposed ordinance was scheduled for March 15th. Mayor Mays asked for public comment on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Mayor Mays closed the public hearing portion of the meeting and asked for discussion or questions from Council. Councilor Scott commented that he was comfortable voting on the ordinance at this meeting. Councilor Young commented she preferred to wait to vote until the second hearing to allow for public comment. Mayor Mays asked Planning Manager Palmer if there was any urgency for passing the ordinance? Ms. Palmer replied there was no urgency. Council President Rosener commented he preferred to wait to vote. The Council continued the public hearing to March 15th.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

9. CITY MANAGER REPORT:

Community Services Director Kristen Switzer reported that Senior Center Manager Maiya Burbank was nominated for the Citizen of the Year award and read aloud the submitted statement from the award application. The application stated that Ms. Burbank's efforts to continue to provide meals and help provide internet access to seniors throughout the pandemic was appreciated and that, "taking care of our elders is a great honor and responsibility and she has done it with grace, determination, and a heart of gold." Ms. Switzer reported that since March 2020, the Senior Center had served nearly 20,000 meals. She reported that the grant Ms. Burbank had procured totaled \$192,000 and would assist with meal costs through June 2023, and she also procured a CEP grant and worked with the Friends of the Senior Center to secure an ADA accessible van to begin providing transportation for older adults in the community. Ms. Switzer commented that she was, "honored and thrilled" that Ms. Burbank had chosen to work for the City of Sherwood.

Police Chief Hanlon provided an update on the recent robbery that occurred at the 76 gas station and reported that the person of interest had been followed to Tualatin and had been taken into custody with the help of CNU (Crisis Negotiation Unit) and the Washington County Tactical Negotiation Team.

City Manager Keith Campbell reported that the OHA had announced that the indoor mask mandate would be lifted on March 12th and commented he anticipated that the March 15th Council meeting would be held in-person.

Mayor Mays addressed the next agenda item.

10. COUNCIL ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Council President Rosener reported on his attendance at the GPI meeting last week and stated that the reports and examples they used in the meeting had come from their work with Sherwood's Economic Development Manager Bruce Coleman. He gave his kudos to Mr. Coleman for his hard work.

Councilor Brouse thanked Councilor Scott for attending the Library Advisory Board meeting in her place. She reported that the Senior Advisory Board would meet next week where they would continue their work on making Sherwood an age-friendly city. She reported that the Sherwood Police Foundation gala would be held on June 24th and stated tickets were still available.

Councilor Garland reported that the Sherwood Foundation for the Arts annual puzzle competition was held this past weekend and stated that the event was successful. He thanked the volunteers and local businesses who had donated prizes and raffle items. He reported that the SFA would put on "Cinderella" for their summer play and stated that auditions would be held in March. He asked City Manager Campbell to recap the process for anyone interested in applying for the vacant Council position.

City Manager Campbell replied that the City would begin to accept applications for the vacancy starting March 2nd and would accept applications through March 18th at 5:00 pm. Interviews would be held on either March 28th or 29th to ensure that someone was selected within the 45-day period as required by the City Charter. More information on how to apply could be found on the City's website.

Councilor Scott commented he enjoyed getting to fill in for Councilor Brouse at the Library Advisory Board meeting. He reported that the Planning Commission held three public hearings last week and would meet again on March 8th. He spoke on the recent Russian invasion of Ukraine and explained that he had spent time in Ukraine over the years. He stated that his thoughts are with the people of Ukraine and that he was, "impressed tremendously by their resolve and their resiliency."

Councilor Young asked what documents were required for applying for the Council vacancy? Mayor Mays replied that it was an application that was similar to the application to serve on a city board or committee. Council President Rosener explained that the 45-day requirement to fill a vacant seat was a change voted on by the community the last time the city completed charter amendments to ensure that council vacancies were promptly filled.

Mayor Mays thanked Councilor Griffin for his service as a City Councilor and for his involvement in the community over the years. Mayor Mays spoke on the recent vehicular accident that killed two Sherwood youth and stated it was a tragedy, and the support the community had shown the families had been tremendous. He asked that the community continue to help and support the families going forward. He thanked the Sherwood Police Department for their work.

11. ADJOURN:

Mayor Mays adjourned the regular session at 8:00 pm.

Attest:


Sylvia Murphy, MMC, City Recorder


Keith Mays, Mayor