



MINUTES
Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting
Wednesday, August 11, 2021 Virtual Via
Zoom 7:00 PM

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Don Robertson, Board Member, Will Toogood, Board Member, and Mary Casey, Board Member

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: David Breames, Board Member and Sarah Schrodetz, Board Member

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Richardson, Community Services

MEDIA PRESENT:

1. Meeting Format

Meeting Format Notice:

The Parks and Trails Advisory Board will conduct this meeting electronically using the Zoom video conference platform.

Members of the public may listen, view, and/or participate in this meeting using Zoom.

Using Zoom is free of charge. See the instructions below:

- To login to the electronic meeting online using your computer, [click this link:](#)
- **Note a passcode may be required:**
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 844 3378 6198
- If you do not have access to a computer or telephone and would like to take part in the meeting, please contact the Sandy Community Center (503-668-5569) by August 10th and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment

4. Consent Agenda

4.1. Meeting Minutes

Moved by Mary Casey, seconded by Will Toogood

Motion to approve the minutes.

CARRIED. 3-0

5. Changes to the Agenda

6. New Business

6.1. Bell St. - 362nd Extension Project

Mike Walker, Public Works Director attended to discuss required mitigation related to the Bell St. -362nd Extension Project. Seeking feedback from the Parks Board regarding some options in city owned open space near Bluff Park.

Mike provided an overview of the extension project and introduced Ivy Watson an environmental scientist with Harper Hauf. Ivy presented two options for the board's consideration.

Ivy explained that there will be some wetland and stream impact that is less than a 10th of an acre, although that could change depending on the design. The city will be required to provide mitigation matching the type of impact. The ratio of mitigation that the Oregon Department of State Lands requires varies depending on whether we will be enhancing an existing resource or creating a new resource.

Ivy provided an overview of the open space area that is being considered for mitigation and shared two options.

Option 1: Drain the in-line pond and convert the depression to scrub-shrub wetland and stream channel.

Option 2: Enhance existing stream and pond and create wetland at the pond fringe. Result would be water quality and habitat enhancement.

Board member Will Toogood asked about what the construction of the stream channel would look like in option one. Ivy described the plan and explained that the channel would move around naturally once the area was graded and other enhancements completed. Clarified that this would change the area to more of a marsh in the winter. Might be able to add an access point for wildlife and wetland habitat viewing. Will asked if either option was beneficial to migratory birds. Option 1 would provide less attractive habitat for migratory birds, and option 2 would provide more attractive habitat for migratory birds.

Mary Casey asked a question about pollinators and whether the plan could incorporate habitat to support them. Ivy noted that flowering wetland shrubs could be utilized. Mary expressed some concern about marshland attracting mosquitos etc. Wondered if this would be an issue. Ivy noted they are already likely breeding in the pond and that both options would likely attract more frogs. Identified Option 1 as likely best for native frogs. Clarified that marsh is not the best description of what will be the result of option 1.

Don Robertson asked if Option 2 would create any flow through the pond. Ivy noted that it would flow longer than it does now but once it drops below the outlet level it would slow. Don asked Mike Walker about stormwater. Mike provided an overview of the stormwater systems. Don noted the pond had been there for quite some time and Mike described its history. Don asked if Public Works had a preference. Mike identified Option 2 as a preference.

Public Works is interested in advice from the Parks Board and noted that it will be Council who makes the final decision. Mike noted these options will likely be acceptable to the regulatory agencies. Important that this parcel is owned by the public and will remain so whereas other nearby areas will likely be developed.

Don asked if the board members had a preference. Mary noted both have good points with Option 2 being more migratory bird friendly. Don identified the path and some benches that are already there and good for viewing. Will noted he is torn between what may be better water quality vs better habitat for migratory birds and esthetically likes Option 2. Don said his personal preference would be Option 2. Likes that it maintains the historical use, viewing opportunities, and it really is an amenity for the park area.

Don asked that along with the motion that the feedback about habitat for birds and pollinators be included in information being forwarded to council.

Moved by Mary Casey, seconded by Will Toogood

Mary Casey moves that the board recommend Option 2.

CARRIED. 3-0

6.2. Deer Meadows Proposed Development

Kelly O'Neill, Development Services Director attended to provide an overview of the Deer Meadows proposed development.

Deer Meadows is a 32 lot proposed subdivision in the area of Hwy 26 and Dubarko road. Kelly provided a visual denoting the proposed development site. Deer Meadows is adjacent to parkland dedicated with the Deerpointe plat. It is undeveloped and is about 1.4 acres. One of the main reason this park has not been developed is because of the intended parkland dedication that would expand the area of the park that is part of the subject property. It is staff recommendation that dedication of this land would be consistent with the long term vision for this park, and align with the new Parks and Trails Master Plan that will be before council for adoption in September.

Kelly reviewed the formula for determining parkland dedication and what variables can impact the total dedication.

Tracy Brown, the developers representative. reviewed the previous application known as Bull Run Terrace. As part of the Bull Run proposal the developer proposed dedicating 1.4 acres of parkland and offered to assist with preparing the land for park development. Tracy noted that the board at that time recommended the parkland dedication and entering into an agreement with the developer to do the initial park improvements.

The Bull Run proposal included a request for a zone change. Tracy noted this proposal was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission but denied by council. As a result the developers proposal to dedicate the parkland and to assist with the park improvements went away. The new Deer Meadow proposal is not requesting a zone change. Without a change in the zoning and the ability to increase housing density the dedication of parkland becomes problematic to the economic viability of the project, and the developers attorney believes that the city cannot legally require parkland dedication because the standards in 17.86 are not "clear and objective". The applicant is interested in working with the city on a win-win scenario. Tracy outlined the applicants proposal and invited questions. Kelly shared a visual of the proposal.

Will noted the proposed dedication is not a lot of land. Mary agreed. Don shared that he is extremely disappointed that we are having this conversation although he doesn't doubt council had good reasons for the denial. Referencing the current proposal he noted that just because you have the legal right to do something, doesn't mean it is the right thing to do. Don shared that he believes that the board got it right the first time and is inclined

to stand pat on that original decision. Recognizes that the applicant may go forward but noted they would be responsible for the Fee in Lieu and the System Development Charges.

Kelly shared that the city attorney agrees with the applicant's attorney that the current Parks and Trails Master Plan is not fully incorporated into the city development code but they disagree on parkland dedication. Our attorney believes the city has the legal right to require parkland dedication but may have difficulty dictating the location of the dedication within a proposal. Wants to be clear the attorneys do not agree on the interpretation. Don noted to acquire the parkland adjacent to Deer Pointe we would be relying on the good will of the applicant. Kelly added or alternatively relying on the city forcing the issue in an approval, and then the applicant would need to appeal it to the State of Oregon, or the city denying the application. It could lead to a legal decision.

Will noted the proposal doesn't come close to realizing the Deer Pointe vision and the strip of land proposed does not add much. Mary does not see another place in the proposal for a park except that one little area. Don shared that the neighborhood has been very patient and waiting a long time for a developed park.

Moved by Don Robertson, seconded by Will Toogood

Motion to stick with the first recommendation of accepting land dedication and some hope of connectivity to the other parkland property in Deer Pointe.

CARRIED. 3-0

6.3. Bornstedt Views Proposed Development

Kelly O'Neill, Development Services Director, noted Bornstedt Views application is considered incomplete at this time.

Staff recommends Fee in Lieu of Parkland Dedication given the size of the development and its proximity to both Bornstedt and Cascadia Park.

Mac Even, the applicant, notes they are proposing Fee in Lieu and they are proposing to preserve quite a lot of trees.

Don pointed out that we are pretty park rich in this area of the community. Agrees the best option is to accept the Fee in Lieu.

Mary asked about the blue area noted in the packet. Kelly clarified that is the retention pond.

Moved by Mary Casey, seconded by Will Toogood

Motion to accept the Fee in Lieu for Bornstedt Views proposed development.

CARRIED. 3-0

6.4. Sandy Woods Phase II Proposed Development

Kelly O'Neill, Development Services Director attended to provide an overview of the proposed development.

43 lot subdivision and although the application is currently incomplete the planning staff does not anticipate big changes.

Kelly shared a visual and noted the location of Sandy Woods Phase I. Noted pedestrian access between the two Sandy Wood Phases. Sarah Richardson, staff liaison, noted that it gives the residents in the new phase pretty direct access to Bluff Park. Kelly pointed out that the access points will be a requirement as well as a tree tract through Phase II. The tract will include many old growth trees. It will not officially be parkland but it will provide some open space in this new phase.

Don asked for board questions or comment.

Moved by Mary Casey, seconded by Will Toogood

Motion to accept a Fee in Lieu of land dedication for the Sandy Woods Phase II proposed development. Includes the support for the requirement of the access points connecting Phase 1 and Phase II which provides direct access to Bluff Park and future trail connections.

CARRIED. 3-0

7. Old Business

Don reminded the board that we have two open seats on the board, and a vacancy in the Vice Chair position that needs to be filled.

8. STAFF UPDATES

Looking forward to the updates to the development code that relates to parks (17.86 and 17.32). Will give the board a stronger position to implement the new Parks and Trails Master Plan and more certainty with regard to the interpretation of the code.

9. Adjourn

Draft