

DRAFT for Planning Commission Review

**Bonny Slope West Planning Issues:  
Planning Commission Feedback & Staff Recommendations**

ISSUE	DISCUSSION DATE(S)	PC FEEDBACK	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p><b><u>SCHOOLS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the BSW Plan designate site(s) specifically for school(s)?</li> </ul>	<p>12/03 and 1/21 [Extensively discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BSW Plan should not designate any properties as school sites. (RV, TE, MW, EB, AM, MM – 1/21)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Concur with PC majority feedback.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed BSW residential designations also allow schools. The INST designation allows schools and other institutional uses, but not residential. Assigning an INST designation to a BSW site prior to school district ownership or near-term ability to purchase could be problematic from a legal and/or equity standpoint.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATIONS / DENSITIES</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should density transfers be allowed in BSW?</li> </ul>	<p>12/03 and 3/04 [Straw poll taken on 3/04]</p>	<p>3/04 straw poll:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the current CDC allowance for density transfers in Bonny Slope West. (Supported by 6 PC members - MW, AM, EU, TE, LG, RV; Abstention -JP; Opposed - MM)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Concur with PC majority feedback.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDC Section 300-3 allows for density transfer from unbuildable portion of a parcel (such as wetland or steep slopes) to the remainder of the parcel.</li> <li>This CDC allowance applies county-wide, except in North Bethany.</li> <li>The minimum dimensional and lot size standards continue to apply, which will limit the amount of density that could be transferred.</li> <li>The density transfer allowance provides development flexibility for parcels that contain unbuildable areas.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>CREEK VISIBILITY AND ACCESS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How should this be achieved?</li> </ul>	<p>12/17 [Extensively discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't pursue the one-sided parkway streets option; this has been problematic in North Bethany. (MM, MW)</li> <li>Support for Trails and for one to two Neighborhood Parks and/or Pocket Parks/Portals. (MW, MM, LG)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Concur with PC feedback.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parkway streets option will not be pursued.</li> <li>Creek visibility and access will be provided through the location of Trails, possibly through requirements for private development to provide Pocket Park/Portal connections to trail corridors, and through THPRD acquiring Neighborhood Park(s).</li> </ul>

ISSUE	DISCUSSION DATE(S)	PC FEEDBACK	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p><b><u>PARKS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should these be designated prescriptively or non-prescriptively in the plan?</li> </ul>	<p>12/17 and 3/04 [Extensively discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why does the county need to designate park locations in the plan? (MW, AM, RV, TE – 3/04)</li> <li>If parks must be designated, it should be non-prescriptive. (MW, RV, JP – 3/04)</li> <li>Park designations should be prescriptive, but with flexibility. (MM, 12/17)</li> <li>Staff should consider alternative methods for park designation (different scenarios or text requirement for a certain percentage/acreage of parks). (JP, TE – 3/04)</li> </ul>	<p><b>A “middle ground” approach between prescriptive and non-prescriptive.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show generalized “Potential Park Areas” on the Community Plan map to illustrate potentially desirable areas for a park; these would not be binding on property owners or developers.</li> <li>Plan requirement for developer to provide evidence of a discussion with THPRD about possibility of park land acquisition within “Potential Park Areas” prior to submitting a development application. This could be accomplished through a service provider letter.</li> <li>Do not require developer to convey park land to THPRD in order to obtain development application approval.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>TRAILS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should these be designated prescriptively or non-prescriptively in the plan?</li> <li>Should the plan require trails to be located within the CWS Vegetated Corridor?</li> </ul>	<p>12/17 [Extensively discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trail should be placed within the creek’s CWS Vegetated Corridor, to provide a more natural experience for the trail user and/or to utilize land that is not available for residential development. (MW, RV, EB)</li> <li>Is it appropriate for the plan to <u>require</u> that the trail be located within or outside of the CWS Vegetated Corridor? (MM)</li> <li>Trails should be placed along both sides of the creek (MM)</li> </ul>	<p><b>A “middle ground” approach between prescriptive and non-prescriptive.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show a generalized trail alignment on the Community Plan map.</li> <li>Include a generalized trail alignment description in the Community Plan text.</li> <li>A specific trail alignment would be set through the development review process with input from THPRD.</li> <li>Allow trail to be located either within or outside the CWS Vegetated Corridor, depending on the specifics of the site (slopes, vegetation, where development is proposed).</li> <li>At a minimum, property would need to not preclude a trail. If development is large enough, dedication of land could be warranted (this is the same as in the rest of the county.)</li> </ul>

ISSUE	DISCUSSION DATE(S)	PC FEEDBACK	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
<p><b><u>LANDSLIDE SUSCEPTIBLE AREAS</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How will these be regulated?</b></li> </ul>	<p>12/03 and 3/04 [Discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new restrictions should be applied beyond current CDC provisions for development in landslide susceptibility areas. (MW, RV)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not yet determined. Staff has not yet received DOGAMI's completed mapping and report.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current provisions in CDC 410-4 (Landslide Study Area Requirements) will be the starting point for the area.</li> <li>• If DOGAMI's information indicates major or catastrophic issues, staff may consider recommending additional requirements.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>STREET CONNECTIVITY</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Can streets that currently stub to BSW be maintained as dead-end streets when BSW is redeveloped?</b></li> </ul>	<p>12/17 [Extensively discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street connections are required in county's Community Development Code, and by Metro and State planning rules. (RV, MM, MW)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Concur with PC feedback.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State and Metro regulations, and county regulations (CDC Section 408-5.1.E) require new development to provide full street connections and limit closed-end street designs (e.g., permanent dead-ends, cul-de-sacs).</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>RIPARIAN CORRIDOR BOUNDARIES</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What methodology will be used to identify them?</b></li> </ul>	<p>12/03 [Discussed but no straw poll taken]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The riparian corridor boundary seems quite large – is it based on a conservative methodology? (EU)</li> <li>• Are there alternative methods for identifying the riparian corridor? If so, what are the pros/cons of the alternatives? (TE, RV)</li> </ul>	<p><b>This topic will be discussed at the PC's April 1 advisory meeting.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per the State's Goal 5 regulations, there are a couple of approaches for identifying riparian corridors. Staff will review implications of each approach for the PC's consideration.</li> </ul>

s:\ugb\_planning\area 93\briefings\_pc\pc\_advisory\_briefing\_040115\BSW\_planning\_issues\_table.docx