



WASHINGTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday, March 3, 2015

Area 93 (Bonny Slope West) Advisory Briefing and Discussion

Meeting Summary

Staff presented information on the following topics:

January 21, 2015 Open House

- The January open house took place at Jacob Wismer School and was the third and last for Bonny Slope West (BSW).
- Approximately 52 people attended the open house.
- The open house in January was primarily a report out on refinements to the BSW plan concepts that were made in response to feedback received from service providers and from the public at prior open houses and through the last couple of months of email and letter comments.
- A number of informational posters were displayed on the proposed plan elements, on the infrastructure funding plan, and on potential transportation projects. Posters included information on:
 - Proposed land use designations – Primarily R6 with approximately 12 acres of R9.
 - One to two neighborhood parks consisting of 1 ½ to 2 acres in size located within neighborhood park study areas. Park study areas are on groups of parcels that have some proximity to the creek corridors and trails. Within the park study area are kidney shaped areas representing examples of optimal park locations that have some level area for a play structure and are located near the creek or adjacent to a trail corridor.
 - Neighborhood park study areas are an overlay with underlying land use designation of R6. These are areas where a park or parks could be potentially sited. The parks provider could start talking with property owners within those areas to determine who would be a willing seller to provide a one and a half to two acre park site.
 - Trail alignment on the south side of the creek – staff noted that a loop option is also a possibility.
 - Proposed pedestrian/bicycle crossing of the creek in the northwest part of the area and also a potential auto/bike and pedestrian crossing between Marcotte Road and Laidlaw Road in the southeast portion of the area.
 - Street connectivity – Posters showed the State, County and Metro regulations requiring new development to provide full street connections. BSW would be required to connect to existing street stubs along the edge of the plan area.
 - Infrastructure Funding Plan for BSW – Posters indicated the various infrastructure types that would be addressed. The contents of the plan would include potential projects, estimated costs, existing revenue sources, potential new funding sources and options and strategies for the Board to consider.

**Department of Land Use & Transportation · Planning and Development Services
Long Range Planning**

155 N First Avenue, Ste. 350 MS 14 · Hillsboro, OR 97124-3072
phone: (503) 846-3519 · fax: (503) 846-4412 · TTY: (503) 846-4598 · www.co.washington.or.us

- Washington County's existing transportation funding mechanisms include: MSTIP (a voter approved property tax for existing deficiencies), URMD (a property tax for system maintenance), and TDT (development required improvements for keeping up with growth).
- North Bethany Transportation Funding Plan – Posters showed funding sources and specific amounts and rates used for transportation infrastructure improvements including MSTIP, TDT, new transportation SDC and a new transportation CSD.
- Potential transportation projects for the infrastructure funding plan – Projects include Thompson Road improvements between Saltzman and Marcotte; Laidlaw Road improvements between Saltzman and Marcotte; the realignment of Saltzman Road; interim improvements to Saltzman Road, and building a new urban collector connection between Marcotte and Laidlaw roads.
- After the open house, staff continued to evaluate the list of potential transportation projects for BSW. The list of potential transportation projects was revised to four projects that appeared to be most directly related to, and most potentially impacted by, the urban development of Bonny Slope West. The updated project list includes:
 - Thompson Road improvements between Saltzman and Marcotte; Laidlaw Road improvements between Saltzman and Marcotte; Marcotte Road right-of-way acquisition only; and interim Saltzman Road improvements.
- The possibility of using a similar infrastructure financing approach for transportation as was used in North Bethany is being considered.
- The State of Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) showed draft landslide susceptibility maps at the open house, but DOGAMI has not officially released the maps to the county.
- Staff will post the DOGAMI report and maps once these are released in final form to the county.

Public Feedback from Open House

- Staff received 23 comments.
- Almost half of the comments (12 comments) were either about Saltzman Road or about land use designations.
- Comments on Saltzman road included comments both in support, and opposition to, its realignment.
- Comments received on land use designations included three that emphasized a preference for designations at R5/R6 level. Two other comments requested that the county consider more R9 than is currently considered in the concept plan in order to cluster development and preserve more open space.
- The remaining comments were about several other different planning related issues.
- Staff posted a virtual open house on February 6th and sent an electronic newsletter to subscribers about that posting. No comments were received in response to the virtual open house.

Next Steps in BSW Planning Process

- A draft Infrastructure Funding Plan is being reviewed internally. It will be released to the public for review later in the spring.
- Staff will meet with CPO 1 and 7 later in the spring when more information is known about some of the anticipated plan elements and how they'll be structured.
- In late spring and summer staff are anticipating completing the map and text for the plan and releasing it to the public for review.

- Hearings are scheduled to begin in August with the Planning Commission and Board hearings would start in September with plan adoption anticipated in late October.

Members of the PC offered questions and comments on the following topics:

January 21, 2015 Open House

- What does the neighborhood park study area mean for a land owner?
- Are we taking a North Bethany approach to siting parks in BSW?
- We are not doing our job if we can't develop a plan that makes provisions for parks.
- Couldn't THPRD simply identify areas of interest within BSW, speak with property owners, and negotiate a price for the land?
- What about an approach to siting parks that uses a few different scenarios such as setting out a set percentage or acreage of land that would be developed as park land as opposed to calling out study areas?
- It may make sense to designate study areas on properties with single ownership where a certain percentage of land would need to be set aside for park area, but it may be more difficult to use the study area approach and assemble parcels if there are multiple property owners.
- Does the county have a duty to impose a park location in BSW?
- We should be looking at the bigger picture and park locations are important to the look, feel and composition of the community.
- Would the pedestrian/bike bridge on the north side be an expensive bridge to nowhere?
- Is the pedestrian/bike bridge a transportation facility or an amenity? Typically, bike and pedestrian facilities are considered to be recreational, but because the purpose of the bridge is to provide access to the north side from the south side of the creek, couldn't it be considered a transportation facility?
- Any information on what the interim Saltzman Road improvements will be?
- Any additional conversations about rezoning the strip between Thompson Road and BSW?
- If density transfers from unbuildable to buildable lands are allowed in BSW, it is important to think about the impact on schools and potential number of new homes for the area.
- A straw poll taken by the PC on density transfers found that the majority of the commissioners are in favor of density transfers.
- The DOGAMI landslide susceptibility maps shown at the open house were concerning. Are the red areas on the maps (historical landslide areas) generally considered unbuildable?
- What impact will the DOGAMI landslide susceptibility mapping have on the number of homes built in BSW?
- One commissioner stated that having a private geotechnical assessment of DOGAMI's work relative to BSW could be informative.

Next Steps in the BSW Planning Process

- Could staff summarize the major issues related to BSW, staffs' understanding of the PC's position, and staff's recommendations on each issue at a later PC briefing?
- Could the PC review the ordinance before it's filed?
- One commissioner noted that if the ordinance only reflects the interpretations of staff, then there is concern that the PC's recommendations won't be known to the Board.

Stacey Wainwright, a property owner to the south of BSW, offered public comment. She made the following points:

- She and her husband purchased a home to the south of BSW at a time when she thought Multnomah County was no longer planning high density development.
- Her concern is residential density in BSW and how it will impact school and road capacity in the area.
- She believes that the proposed R9 zoning is too dense when one considers the surrounding density.
- She stated that her neighborhood is zoned R9 but is only developed at a density comparable to four units per acre.
- The county has discretion to zone for density less than 8 units per buildable acre, according to the state's Metropolitan Housing Rule.
- When she and her husband purchased their home, they felt they could reasonably expect to rely on what government officials were saying about residential density in BSW.

Dan Grimberg/West Hills Development

- The prescriptive method used in North Bethany for siting parks is not fair and doesn't work.
- There should be a flexible park siting system because there needs to be a fair agreement between THPRD and the property owner. Otherwise, the property owner is forced to concede to the terms of the park district.
- The permit and development fees per home in Washington County totals around \$30,000.

Members of the PC offered the following questions and comments in response to the public comments:

- Has West Hills or any other developer ever broken out the development fees per home?
- The net difference between R6 and R9 is about 30 units.
- Does Washington County require a traffic impact study and proportionality assessment tying the impact of development to infrastructure funding?