



**MINUTES**  
**Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting**  
**Thursday, November 12, 2020 City Hall-**  
**Council Chambers, 39250 Pioneer Blvd.,**  
**Sandy, Oregon 97055 7:00 PM**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Kathleen Walker, Councilor, Don Robertson, Board Member, Michael Weinberg, Board Member, Susan Drew, Board Member, and Makoto Lane, Board Member

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** Sam Schroyer, Board Member

**STAFF PRESENT:** Sarah Richardson, Community Services

**MEDIA PRESENT:**

**1. Roll Call**

**2. Consent Agenda**

2.1. Meeting Minutes

**3. Public Comment**

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 is required:** 463632
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 867 0955 8895
- 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 November 10th and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

**4. Consent Agenda**

4.1. Clarification for October's meeting minutes. Kathleen Walker noted under 5.1 new business paragraph 3. Third sentence. Kathleen Walker would like it to

read "the acreage of land dedicated should be based on what the densities actually are"

Makoto Lane wanted to be sure he noted that the confusion on these items and the variances requested stems from the fact they are Planned Unit Developments.

**Moved by Kathleen Walker, seconded by Makoto Lane**

***Moved to approve minutes as amended***

**CARRIED. 5-0**

**5. New Business**

**6. Old Business**

**6.1. Bull Run Terrace Development**

Tracy Brown noted that the Planning Commission has recommended approval and it is being forwarded to Council.

Don Robertson noted that one of the things that the board has an opportunity to impact is whether to recommend that the city works with the developer in the Phase 1 development of the park in exchange for SDC or Fee in Lieu credit. If yes, what would be the process. If no, then we need to make that recommendation.

Tracy Brown clarified that the developer is proposing to dedicate Parkland, so there would be no Fee in Lieu. Talked to the developer again because they had been offering to help construct the park, and they are still interested in that option.

Kathleen Walker wanted to clarify:

1. Process - thought we were waiting to get more information about densities before sending a memo as to what the findings were from the board.
2. Where we have these developments where zone changes are proposed the specific details are not clear. Parkland dedication is based on knowing these details.

Kathleen Walker reviewed the parkland dedication calculations based on the understanding of what is being proposed and what is unknown.

Tracy Brown notes they are proposing more parkland than what is being required. If exceeds 13 units in the commercial zone, Fee in Lieu would be added, or additional parkland dedication.

Don Robertson clarified that what is being proposed for dedication covers 13 units in the commercial zone. If the developer exceeds 13 units, there would be a choice of additional parkland or Fee in Lieu. If city entered into a development agreement the board could recommend working with the developer on the phase 1 development of the park to include grading, 1/2 street improvements and whatever else would be agreed upon based on the 13 units. Anything beyond that would be a determination of additional parkland dedication or Fee in Lieu. Kathleen Walker agreed with the concept and noted it provides flexibility.

Don Robertson notes it is important to have the development agreement. Don Robertson asked Tracy if the developer would be amenable to that and Tracy Brown noted it is basically what they are proposing.

**Moved by Don Robertson, seconded by Susan Drew**

***Move that Don Robertson write a memo to recommend a development agreement that includes what happens if more than 13 units are developed on the commercial property. Reference that the city would be able to decide if it wanted additional parkland dedicated or Fee in Lieu. Amended to recommend that the city credit the developer SDC's in exchange for the agreed upon park development.***

**CARRIED. 5-0**

## 6.2. The Views Planned Development

Tracy Brown shared that the developer is adding amenities that will be private. Don Robertson noted that this does not eliminate SDC's or the Fee in Lieu. Kathleen Walker asked under development code 17.64 - her understanding is that Planned Development is supposed to happen within village zones. How is this allowed to be a Planned Development? Tracy Brown notes it is the intent but not necessarily a rule.

Discussion about the private amenities and how it will be maintained by an HOA. Susan Drew clarified that the amenities would not be maintained by the city.

Makoto Lane mentioned that these neighborhoods over time can change. Tracy Brown noted the roads are public so it will not be a close gated neighborhood.

Tracy Brown shared a map of the amenities in the "Lower and Upper Views". Discussion about the trail system and why some were eliminated in the current plan in the restricted development area.

Kathleen Walker asked about the open space requirement in the code. What is shown is not developable.

Tracy Brown noted that by the code it is not required to be developable land. What they are proposing exceeds what is required by quite a bit. Open space is defined as slopes, wetlands etc. Not defined as developable.

Makoto Lane noted that this is an issue with the Planned Development. These areas of the code are vague and there are lots of loopholes. Needs to be fixed.

Don Robertson concerned that down the road the HOA might dissolve and the city would become responsible for the parkland and open space. Need to be careful and be sure that everything meets city standards.

Kathleen Walker asked about the difference in total number of units. Tracy Brown noted the min. is 63 and max. is 159 and they are proposing 168. Kathleen Walker asked does that include subtracting out the FSH? Tracy Brown reviewed the calculations.

Don Robertson shared his experiences with HOA's in other communities. There are pros and cons, some work great and others not so well. A lot of them will over time come to the city to say they are dissolving. Kathleen Walker noted that there is a park identified near this parcel and will already have that to maintain.

Can a clause be added about about the HOA dissolving in a development agreement to address what would happen?

Don Robertson asked if the board wants to make a recommendation. Staff recommends Fee in Lieu.

Makoto Lane asked if a bond could be required.

Don Robertson suggested that the city might be able to say that it won't consider accepting any donated land from this development for 10-15 years.

Makoto Lane suggests a bond or some sort of account just in case the community board goes under.

Kathleen Walker asked about the trails and what the staff had asked. Tracy Brown noted the staff wanted more detail and the developer felt it was a lot at this stage and so they decided not to propose the trails.

Kathleen Walker noted a trail in this area is in the Parks and Trails Master Plan

as a proposed trail. If it was to be back in the development would it be open to the public? Tracy Brown said it could have an easement if in the Master Plan, and if not it would be up to the developer. Kathleen Walker feels it is important to have the easement and important to be included as part of this proposal. Does not agree with staff's request for the amount of detail at this stage. The city could work with the developer on a conceptual location and standard "typicals" and work out the details later on. Would feel better about the proposal. Having the trail connection open to the public would be positive and considered outstanding as per the code.

Don Robertson highlighted the concern that there is a city trail designated in the area and don't want to have a trail that ends at one side of the property and begins again on the other side with an off limits section in the middle of it. Would want to link the trail and be sure it is available for public use. Tracy Brown noted the developer was not opposed to the idea of the trails and a connection could be considered.

Kathleen Walker shared a conceptual trail alignment. Discussion about possible trail alignments within the development.

Suggestion that Nancy Enabnit on behalf of the Parks and Trails Master Plan discuss possible trail alignment and access.

**Moved by Kathleen Walker, seconded by Michael Weinberg**

***Motion to prepare correspondence for the Planning Commission with two concerns. First, the concern about having to accept the parks property sometime in the next decade or two. Second, to make sure we have public access to connect a city wide trail. Recommend Nancy Enabnit work with the developer to identify a future trail connection that is compatible with the Parks and Trails Master Plan.***

**CARRIED. 5-0**

## **7. STAFF UPDATES**

7.1. Master Plan Update

A TAC meeting has been scheduled to update members.

Kathleen Walker noted that the website needs to be updated with regard to the Survey.

7.2. Susan Drew asked to discuss the Code of Conduct

Susan referenced two letters from the Governments Ethics Commission. Susan Drew is disturbed that they have been asked to sign the Code of Conduct, and mentioned the Letter to the Sandy Post that Laurie Smallwood submitted regarding Kathleen Walker and a possible conflict of interest should she be elected to council. Didn't think the letter to the editor was appropriate.

Susan Drew let the board know that she is not going to reapply. Interested in a leadership role in the Community Garden.

Makoto Lane stated that he feels the Code of Conduct is hypocritical and is concerned about the interpretation. Feels the council needs to readdress it and consider including employees and elected officials.

Kathleen Walker discussed as board member the importance of respecting each other and listening. When out in the community and talking about parks as a board member it is important to represent board decisions, and not personal views. Having members sign a Code of Conduct in that regard is appropriate, but gets more difficult when out in the public talking about other issues. Important to be professional and involved and be as honest as we can. Being respectful doesn't mean that you can't point out things that concern you. Kathleen Walker shared that she called the Ethic Commission as soon as she read the letter and talked to them about conflict of interest. The Ethics Commission noted they can work with Kathleen if elected and Kathleen noted the City Attorney will also be helping. Kathleen Walker notes she will recuse herself when it is appropriate.

**8. Adjourn**