



City of Sandy

Agenda

Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting

Meeting Location: City Hall- Council Chambers, 39250 Pioneer Blvd., Sandy, Oregon 97055

Meeting Date: Thursday, November 12, 2020

Meeting Time: 7:00 PM

Page

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- 2.1. Meeting Minutes 3 - 14
- [Parks & Trails Advisory Board - 14 Oct 2020 - Minutes - Pdf](#)
[Parks & Trails Advisory Board - 14 Oct 2020 - Minutes - Html](#)

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. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

5. NEW BUSINESS

6. OLD BUSINESS

- | | | |
|------|---|---------|
| 6.1. | Bull Run Terrace Development | 15 - 20 |
| | Bull Run Terrace Final Staff Report November 12, 2020 Meeting | |
| 6.2. | The Views Planned Development | 21 - 23 |
| | The Views November 12, 2020 Meeting Final | |

7. STAFF UPDATES

- | | | |
|------|--------------------|--|
| 7.1. | Master Plan Update | |
|------|--------------------|--|

8. ADJOURN



MINUTES
Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting
Wednesday, October 14, 2020 Virtual
Meeting 7:00 PM

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Laurie Smallwood, Councilor and Sarah Richardson, Community Services

MEDIA PRESENT:

1. Roll Call

2. 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: 788531**
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 850 4562 9480
- 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) and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

3. Consent Agenda

3.1. Meeting Minutes

Moved by Michael Weinberg, seconded by Kathleen Walker

Motion to approve the minutes.

CARRIED. 5-0

4. Changes to the Agenda

5. New Business

5.1. The Views Development

Sarah Richardson reached out to Shelley Denison about the proposal and there are no additional updates. Board had requested it be on the agenda.

Don Robertson intent was to chat more about it. Comfortable waiting until November since there are no changes.

Kathleen Walker had a question about lot 71 or 72. Appears it is going to be a big apartment building. Sarah Richardson will follow up.

Location for the development was reviewed.

Don Robertson noted one of the questions was how the SDC's and Fee in Lieu would be addressed. Wanted to pay upfront for the SFR, but delay the payment for the multifamily units.

Sarah Richardson reminded the board they had a question about how the parkland dedication was going to be calculated. Kathleen Walker, yes the density will determine what the calculations will be.

Don Robertson concerned because they are going to have their own HOA and keeping parks and open spaces private or semi-private wants to be sure they are still required to pay the Fee in Lieu and SDCS.

Kathleen Walker - Lot 72 and lot 122 - two large lots that are proposed as apartments? Would like clarification on what is proposed and how many units are proposed.

Makoto Lane asked if this was a Planned Development, and yes, it is.

Discussion about Planned Developments and what the somewhat subjective criteria for "Outstanding" features means. Specificity is important to be able to understand what is being proposed and whether it meets the outstanding criteria for a Planned Development.

Don Robertson noted we need some answers before recommendations can be forwarded.

5.2. Location Discussion - Dog Park

Kathleen Walker suggested a dog park might fit well with the additional site for the Sewer Treatment Plant that is off of Sunset/University. There is a big parcel that used to be the old Public Works Shop. That parcel is proposed to have a supplemental sewer treatment plant. About a 4.3 parcel plus another one off of Sunset that the city owns. A resident said we should do a walking trail dog park. One option might be this as part of the supplemental treatment plant site. Might have some acreage around the rest of the site to create some sort of walking trails. Laurie Small noted it is a brown site. Don't know what the land use laws are for brown sites. Might need to be investigated. Brown properties can only be used for certain things. Need to sit for a period of time etc. Might be a good location but we need to be aware of the brown site.

Don Robertson noted it doesn't mean it is disqualified for use. All depends on what types of pollution, quantities etc. Example, splash pad in Gresham was a brown site. Laurie Smallwood noted it might be a good location but something to be aware of.

Kathleen Walker noted the parcel is already fenced.

5.3. Code of Conduct for Boards and Commissions

Laurie Smallwood reviewed the Code of Conduct Council passed for Boards and Commissions.

Don Robertson asked is this a first time policy for the city?

Laurie Smallwood yes, came to Councils attention with regard to some things that have been put out on social media over the last few months. Ways people have been treated online and in person and there was no Code of Conduct for Commissions or Advisory Boards and wanted to get something in place.

Recognizing that everyone is a volunteer, including council and trying to do the best they can. Important that we need to treat each other with respect, fairness and a little bit of grace sometimes.

Don Robertson asked if it goes for both elected officials and board members?

Laurie Smallwood, yes correct. Council intends to sign it as well. Does not

pertain to employees who have their own Code of Conduct and ORS. Council is also bound by ORS.

Don Robertson noted that when he was with the City of Ashland they had annual training. City Recorder would come around to every board and elected body that dealt with ethics and conduct and everyone was certified as receiving the training. Don also sits on the Local Government Grants Program and they have requirements as well. What is being asked is not foreign and is surprised that this hasn't happened already. Standard Operating Procedure for many communities throughout Oregon.

Don Robertson asked if there are questions about the Code of Conduct.

Makoto Lane feels there is subjectivity and wording that is open to interpretation. Would be better if it was more tightly worded. Discussion about the wording and a variety of examples shared.

Laurie Smallwood asked for specifics to be sent to her so she could look at it.

Makoto Lane asked where he would go to get an issue resolved. Laurie Smallwood noted there is a chain of command. Laurie Smallwood offered to help if needed.

Michael Weinberg clarified about signing and where to send it. Yes, send a signed copy to Sarah Richardson.

Sam Schroyer asked if this COC is the final version. Suggested could add what steps to take if needing resolution. Susan Drew asked if it could go back to Council. Sarah Richardson noted it has been formally adopted. This is specifically for Boards and Commissions.

Kathleen Walker asked for clarification about discussing differences of opinion/disagreements. Concern expressed about interpretation. Laurie Smallwood's interpretation is that everyone has a responsibility to speak truthfully. Feels there have been things out on social media that misrepresented information. More discussion about interpretation. Discussion about representing the councils position but disagreeing. Laurie noted this is not what the Code of Conduct is about. Everyone is entitled to their opinion and no one has to agree. What we do have to do is represent each other factually.

Makoto Lane referenced page 3. Asked if it was retroactive. Asked what is the process of removing board members. Laurie Smallwood noted council does

not have to renew a position. Laurie Smallwood noted if you don't follow the Code of Conduct council would have the option to ask a member to step down. Don Robertson noted that in all his years of service this has never occurred. Laurie Smallwood added she hoped that would not be the case. Everyone is here volunteering and trying to do the best job they can.

6. Old Business

6.1. Parks and Trails Master Plan Update - Virtual Open House Response Extended Deadline

Deadline extended to October 25th but so far few people have participated. Hope all board members will visit the Virtual Open House. As of a few days ago there were 54 completed visits. Discussion about ways to get the word out, including Instagram. Discussion about finding the link.

7. STAFF UPDATES

7.1. Community Garden Update

Sarah Richardson discussed the garden beds at the Community Garden, and the need for repairs. Did receive a proposal from the Ant Farm but far above our budget. Nunpa is taking a look at it and will see what else they can come up with.

7.2. Pesticide Policy Update

Working to make the changes the board requested and will bring the 2nd draft back to the board at a future meeting. Don Robertson noted that the plan is to approve a final version to forward as a recommendation to Council.

7.3. Oregon Community Paths Program

Sarah Richardson discussed the grant opportunity and asked the board if they had any projects in mind. Grant is available every two years and a good idea to keep it on our radar.

7.4. Meeting Guests/Board Applicants

Don Robertson thanked guests Mary Casey and Rachel Stephens for attending and their interest in board positions.

8. Adjourn

Draft



MINUTES
Parks & Trails Advisory Board Meeting
Wednesday, October 14, 2020 Virtual
Meeting 7:00 PM

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Laurie Smallwood, Councilor and Sarah Richardson, Community Services

MEDIA PRESENT:

1. Roll Call

2. 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: 788531**
- If you would rather access the meeting via telephone, dial 1-669-900-6833. When prompted, enter the following meeting number: 850 4562 9480
- 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) and arrangements will be made to facilitate your participation.

3. Consent Agenda

3.1. Meeting Minutes

Moved by Michael Weinberg, seconded by Kathleen Walker

Motion to approve the minutes.

CARRIED. 5-0

4. Changes to the Agenda

5. New Business

5.1. The Views Development

Sarah Richardson reached out to Shelley Denison about the proposal and there are no additional updates. Board had requested it be on the agenda.

Don Robertson intent was to chat more about it. Comfortable waiting until November since there are no changes.

Kathleen Walker had a question about lot 71 or 72. Appears it is going to be a big apartment building. Sarah Richardson will follow up.

Location for the development was reviewed.

Don Robertson noted one of the questions was how the SDC's and Fee in Lieu would be addressed. Wanted to pay upfront for the SFR, but delay the payment for the multifamily units.

Sarah Richardson reminded the board they had a question about how the parkland dedication was going to be calculated. Kathleen Walker, yes the density will determine what the calculations will be.

Don Robertson concerned because they are going to have their own HOA and keeping parks and open spaces private or semi-private wants to be sure they are still required to pay the Fee in Lieu and SDCS.

Kathleen Walker - Lot 72 and lot 122 - two large lots that are proposed as apartments? Would like clarification on what is proposed and how many units are proposed.

Makoto Lane asked if this was a Planned Development, and yes, it is.

Discussion about Planned Developments and what the somewhat subjective criteria for "Outstanding" features means. Specificity is important to be able to understand what is being proposed and whether it meets the outstanding criteria for a Planned Development.

Don Robertson noted we need some answers before recommendations can be forwarded.

5.2. Location Discussion - Dog Park

Kathleen Walker suggested a dog park might fit well with the additional site for the Sewer Treatment Plant that is off of Sunset/University. There is a big parcel that used to be the old Public Works Shop. That parcel is proposed to have a supplemental sewer treatment plant. About a 4.3 parcel plus another one off of Sunset that the city owns. A resident said we should do a walking trail dog park. One option might be this as part of the supplemental treatment plant site. Might have some acreage around the rest of the site to create some sort of walking trails. Laurie Small noted it is a brown site. Don't know what the land use laws are for brown sites. Might need to be investigated. Brown properties can only be used for certain things. Need to sit for a period of time etc. Might be a good location but we need to be aware of the brown site.

Don Robertson noted it doesn't mean it is disqualified for use. All depends on what types of pollution, quantities etc. Example, splash pad in Gresham was a brown site. Laurie Smallwood noted it might be a good location but something to be aware of.

Kathleen Walker noted the parcel is already fenced.

5.3. Code of Conduct for Boards and Commissions

Laurie Smallwood reviewed the Code of Conduct Council passed for Boards and Commissions.

Don Robertson asked is this a first time policy for the city?

Laurie Smallwood yes, came to Councils attention with regard to some things that have been put out on social media over the last few months. Ways people have been treated online and in person and there was no Code of Conduct for Commissions or Advisory Boards and wanted to get something in place. Recognizing that everyone is a volunteer, including council and trying to do the best they can. Important that we need to treat each other with respect, fairness and a little bit of grace sometimes.

Don Robertson asked if it goes for both elected officials and board members?
Laurie Smallwood, yes correct. Council intends to sign it as well. Does not

pertain to employees who have their own Code of Conduct and ORS. Council is also bound by ORS.

Don Robertson noted that when he was with the City of Ashland they had annual training. City Recorder would come around to every board and elected body that dealt with ethics and conduct and everyone was certified as receiving the training. Don also sits on the Local Government Grants Program and they have requirements as well. What is being asked is not foreign and is surprised that this hasn't happened already. Standard Operating Procedure for many communities throughout Oregon.

Don Robertson asked if there are questions about the Code of Conduct.

Makoto Lane feels there is subjectivity and wording that is open to interpretation. Would be better if it was more tightly worded. Discussion about the wording and a variety of examples shared.

Laurie Smallwood asked for specifics to be sent to her so she could look at it.

Makoto Lane asked where he would go to get an issue resolved. Laurie Smallwood noted there is a chain of command. Laurie Smallwood offered to help if needed.

Michael Weinberg clarified about signing and where to send it. Yes, send a signed copy to Sarah Richardson.

Sam Schroyer asked if this COC is the final version. Suggested could add what steps to take if needing resolution. Susan Drew asked if it could go back to Council. Sarah Richardson noted it has been formally adopted. This is specifically for Boards and Commissions.

Kathleen Walker asked for clarification about discussing differences of opinion/disagreements. Concern expressed about interpretation. Laurie Smallwood's interpretation is that everyone has a responsibility to speak truthfully. Feels there have been things out on social media that misrepresented information. More discussion about interpretation. Discussion about representing the councils position but disagreeing. Laurie noted this is not what the Code of Conduct is about. Everyone is entitled to their opinion and no one has to agree. What we do have to do is represent each other factually.

Makoto Lane referenced page 3. Asked if it was retroactive. Asked what is the process of removing board members. Laurie Smallwood noted council does

not have to renew a position. Laurie Smallwood noted if you don't follow the Code of Conduct council would have the option to ask a member to step down. Don Robertson noted that in all his years of service this has never occurred. Laurie Smallwood added she hoped that would not be the case. Everyone is here volunteering and trying to do the best job they can.

6. Old Business

6.1. Parks and Trails Master Plan Update - Virtual Open House Response Extended Deadline

Deadline extended to October 25th but so far few people have participated. Hope all board members will visit the Virtual Open House. As of a few days ago there were 54 completed visits. Discussion about ways to get the word out, including Instagram. Discussion about finding the link.

7. STAFF UPDATES

7.1. Community Garden Update

Sarah Richardson discussed the garden beds at the Community Garden, and the need for repairs. Did receive a proposal from the Ant Farm but far above our budget. Nunpa is taking a look at it and will see what else they can come up with.

7.2. Pesticide Policy Update

Working to make the changes the board requested and will bring the 2nd draft back to the board at a future meeting. Don Robertson noted that the plan is to approve a final version to forward as a recommendation to Council.

7.3. Oregon Community Paths Program

Sarah Richardson discussed the grant opportunity and asked the board if they had any projects in mind. Grant is available every two years and a good idea to keep it on our radar.

7.4. Meeting Guests/Board Applicants

Don Robertson thanked guests Mary Casey and Rachel Stephens for attending and their interest in board positions.

8. Adjourn

Draft



City of Sandy
39250 Pioneer Blvd.,
Sandy, OR 97055

Agenda Date: November 12, 2020

To: Parks and Trails Advisory Board

From: Sarah Richardson, Staff Liaison Parks and Trails Advisory Board

Subject: Bull Run Terrace Development

Attachments: None

Background:

In the June and July 2020 meetings the board reviewed the development proposal for Bull Run Terrace. Representatives from the development attended both meetings to give an overview of the proposal, answer questions and receive input.

The board opted to hold off on making any recommendations to acquire more information.

The main question surrounded the total Parkland dedication acreage, and how that would be calculated given the information provided in the proposal at that time. It was unknown as to how many dwelling units would be included in the Village Commercial lot.

At the most recent Planning Commission meeting Shelley Denison provided more clarity on the parkland dedication calculations. The applicant is proposing .11 acres greater than what would be required for the maximum density on the residential lots and that .11 acres would equal 13 multi-family units in the Village Commercial lot. If more than 13 dwelling units are ultimately proposed on the Village Commercial lot that will trigger a Fee in Lieu of parkland. *To listen to this portion of the meeting go to time stamp 2:42.42 of the Planning Commission meeting.*

On October 26th, the Planning Commission voted to forward their recommendation for approval to Council.

If the Parks Board wants to include a recommendation on parkland development and potential SDC credits to the developer, in exchange for helping develop the park, the Board will need to pass a motion to be included in the formal packet for Council. A motion should be made at the Board meeting on November 12th. If the developer is eligible for SDC credit in exchange for parkland development the City Engineer and staff will negotiate the amount of credit.

Attachments: See minutes from previous meetings below. More in depth information is available in the Planning Commission packet for the October 26th, 2020 meeting.

Recommendation: Pass a motion to approve of SDC credits to the developer in exchange for park development.

Staff Contact:

Sarah Richardson
503-489-2150

srichardson@cityofsandy.com

June 10, 2020 Approved Meeting Minutes:

New Business

6.1. *Bull Run Terrace - Tracy Brown*

Tracy Brown and Alex Reverman attended to discuss the development plan for Bull Run Terrace, and in particular the park plan. Wanted to bring plan to the board and answer any questions.

Tracy Brown shared a visual of the plan proposal (see agenda packet) and provided an overview of the project to date. Tracy shared the history of the project and discussed the challenges in developing this parcel.

The new developer, because of the financial challenges in developing this land, is proposing a higher density project that includes some C3 zoning. Developer wants to keep the C3 zoning to preserve the build-able land inventory to prevent a deficit in C3 in the city.

Parkland dedication is included in the current plan and Tracy asked some questions about the draft Parks Master Plan. Kathleen Walker explained that the draft had been corrected to include the intent for additional parkland adjacent to the Deerpointe Neighborhood. It was the plan all along to have the additional parkland when the property was developed. Tracy reviewed the parkland development/Fee in Lieu formula. Developer is not opposed to dedicating parkland. Tracy discussed System Development Charges (SDC) and how they are assessed. The developer had two questions for the board. Will the city require the parkland dedication? Would the city/park board be interested in having the developer build out the park? Interested in SDC credits for some construction of areas of the park. Understands the council will ultimately make the decision/agreement but knows the Parks Board can also make a recommendation to council.

Tracy asked if the board had questions and asked if the Parks Board would consider recommending that the city engage with the developer to help build the park? Don Robertson asked if we were to accept the donation what would the total acreage be? Tracy Brown explained it will depend on the number of units, but roughly it would be around 1.5-1.8 acres. Don noted we would then have about a 3-acre park. Don Robertson clarified that the developer is asking that the board recommend the city accept the land donation and the developers offer to participate in the park development. This would be in exchange for SDC credits to the developer. Don Robertson shared that the city-wide Master Plan update will include two site plans and this park area is included in that contract. Don clarified that the developer's participation would be limited to the amount of SDC credits applied. Tracy Brown believes it would be in the \$450,000-500,000 range of SDC credits. Don Robertson noted this would be a good start but not cover the full park development.

Kathleen Walker noted the original zoning and clarified that they are going to be asking for a zone change. Tracy Brown explained they will have a revised submission. Noted the more units the greater the park requirement.

Alex Reverman expressed how difficult it has been to make this site work from all angles with different zoning and park needs. Kathleen noted that when the land in Deerpointe was acquired they were trying to get away from the highway frontage. Noted it is not ideal.

The commercial zoning was discussed.

Tracy Brown described the vision for the development. Kathleen asked if they had more detailed drawings for the development. Noted it would be helpful to have more specifics. Tracy Brown explained that they don't want to spend the money for a design until zoning has been determined. Assuming there is an approval, the developer would then go through the design review process which would determine the number of units before the subdivision is platted. At that time, they should know what the park land dedication could be. They want to be sure they are dedicating park land based on the final number of units. Tracy Brown asking if the board is willing to support the city entering into an agreement to help build the park. Kathleen Walker noted that this type of agreement has worked before. Concerned that what ends up there should reflect the desire of the neighbors. Timing is likely ok, as a site plan should be completed soon. Kathleen asked the rest of the board for input. Susan Drew asked for clarification about the park parcels being one parcel vs. two different parks. Tracy Brown notes it would be ideal if the design of the park included both parcels so the development could be seamless. Makoto Lane asked for some clarification on the design. Kathleen Walker noted it helps for the board to see how the park land would be incorporated into the development. This is unique in that the parks board is getting to weigh in earlier in the process.

Kathleen Walker asked the board to weigh in on the proposed boundaries and shape of the proposed park land dedication. Don Robertson said there are things they can do to mitigate the highway noise. Notes it is an expensive piece to do. Don Robertson would be comfortable supporting entering into an agreement with the developer but would like more information before definitively making a recommendation to do so. Feels it is worth discussing. Alex Reverman notes he was told when talking to previous developers the plan was to take the Deerpointe park land and just flip it over but believes they can reduce the freeway frontage. Kathleen Walker suggested the southern end wider, and the highway end narrower. Michael Weinberg concurs with Kathleen Walker and is also concerned about the highway frontage. Also concerned about frontage on the commercial area without knowing what it will be. Agrees trading SDC credits is something the board could consider recommending.

Kathleen Walker asked about the timeline for construction. Alex Reverman said they want to get going as soon as they can sort out the zoning and park piece. Tracy Brown believes next summer might be feasible. Alex Reverman said they could get more park detail outlined. Don Robertson confirmed it would be hard to go forward without more information. Don Robertson asked what the board needs to accomplish tonight. Kathleen noted they are looking for a recommendation for park dedication rather than fee in lieu, and secondly, getting an idea of whether the board would consider

recommending credits for SDCs in exchange for park development and agrees it is premature to decide on a recommendation. Asked for any additional feedback from the board. Alex Reverman shared his desire to work with the board. Don Robertson is comfortable moving forward but not comfortable sending a recommendation until there is a tighter concept on what it is going to look like.

Kathleen noted that there will be continued work under the Master Plan update to engage the neighbors in the park design. Seems to be a good economical option to work with the developer if an agreement can be reached at some point.

Kathleen Walker noted some examples of where developers helped build parks in Sandy.

Don Robertson asked if other board members had anything to add.

Kathleen asked Tracy Brown if they can bring more information to the next Parks Board meeting. Tracy Brown noted it will likely be months before they know the specific number of units etc. but the goal is to work with the Parks Board and Planning Commission to come up with a win/win for residents, the developer and the city. Don Robertson noted that is the spirit of his motion.

Tracy Brown asked to be kept in the loop on the progress of the Master Plan Update with regard to the park design in this area.

Moved by Don Robertson, seconded by Susan Drew

Move the board continue discussions with developer on this potential park property in the Bull Run Terrace Development.

July 8th 2020 Approved Meeting Minutes:

5.1. Bull Run Terrace Development - Park Dedication

Tracy Brown attended to discuss the Bull Run Terrace Development. Shared the latest Plat with changes from the last meeting. This is the proposal they will go forward with. Proposing slightly more parkland dedication than what is required by the code. Reduced the highway frontage and considered the other comments and seeks the boards support. Will offer to make the park improvements in exchange for SDC fees.

Susan Drew asked about the utility easement and if it was underground. Tracy Brown noted it is underground. Precluded from some development over the top.

Some discussion about the existing drainage on the Deerpointe side.

Discussion about the preservation of existing trees. Will ultimately be determined by the Park Design.

Kathleen Walker asking about what acreage is required for a development of high-density vs Single Family Residences. Tracy Brown noted the max units will be 163 units in the current proposal. The commercial zoning changes the original number of units built. Current calculation is 1.43 acres of parkland dedication.

Discussion of the village overlay requirements and how it affects this property. Alex Reverman explained the challenges with the property with regard to the overlay. Their intent is to submit this proposal as shared here. Wanted to eliminate the commercial piece but can't because of the commercial inventory needs within the city. They would prefer to take out the commercial piece but can't. Kathleen Walker noted that housing can be included in the commercial zone. It can be added above, below or beside. This could affect the total number of units and the parkland dedication.

Discussion of ODOT and the build out of Dubarko and the challenges it adds to the project.

Kathleen Walker feels the board cannot support the project until more is known about the commercial area and the zoning is resolved. Need to know the total number of residences, need certainty.

Alex Reverman asked what are the thoughts about putting a hotel/motel in the commercial area of the development?

Don Robertson asked if they will be submitting for Pre-App? Tracy Brown said it will be a revised application. Pre-App has already been done.

Don Robertson shared that the concept of working together to develop the park is all good. However, there needs to be a more definitive answer to what the total number of residences would be, what the Fee in Lieu and the SDCs and park acreage would total, need hard numbers before saying yes.

Best at this point is to say we agree with the concept but not ready to recommend an agreement until there is more definitive information.

Alex Reverman understand the concerns of the park board. They have some of the same concerns about the final details of the development.

Makoto Lane agrees that the board needs to do things in order and would like to see more solid information and not as many question marks.

Michael Weinberg thinks the park configuration is an improvement and is positive, but agrees we need more hard numbers.

Sam Schroyer asked if the work to develop would include the Deer Pointe piece. Yes, that would be the intent. Sam Schroyer on the commercial -is there any way to put a parameter on it. If over X number of residences more park area would be added? Tracy Brown explained the process. Would be appropriate to consider if the number of units requires it. Alex Reverman asked Tracy Brown - if we hit the threshold of units how much park would be added? For every 10 Multi Family units it is about .09 acres added to the park.

Don Robertson - the board is agreeable to the concept but can't give 100% endorsement for the SDC credits etc. until more information is available, and the numbers are final.

Tracy Brown noted they are moving forward and appreciate the time.

Discussion about the zoning with regard to the Parks and Open Space Zone.



City of Sandy
39250 Pioneer Blvd.,
Sandy, OR 97055

Agenda Date: November 12, 2020

To: Parks and Trails Advisory Board

From: Sarah Richardson, Staff Liaison Parks and Trails Advisory Board

Subject: The Views Planned Development

Attachments: Previous Meeting Minutes

Background:

The Parks and Trails Advisory Board discussed The Views PD (Planned Development) regarding parkland dedication at both the September 23 and October 14, 2020 meetings. The minutes from those meetings are attached. The board has not made a formal recommendation. The Views PD will be before the Planning Commission on November 23, 2020.

Follow-up to questions from board from Shelley Denison, Planning Division:

- A. The applicant is proposing two 24-unit apartment buildings, one on lot 72 and one on lot 122.
- B. The fee-in-lieu is calculated according to the number of dwelling units. I remember Kathleen asking if the calculation is different than it would be for a regular subdivision, and the answer to that is no. That is because it is calculated with the actual number of dwelling units, not with the underlying zoning district. The dedication calculation is proposed units x persons per unit (3 persons per unit for single family, 2 persons per unit for multifamily) x 0.0043. They are proposing 120 single family units and 48 multifamily units. So that's $(120 \times 3 \times 0.0043) + (48 \times 2 \times .0043)$, which is a total of 1.96 acres required for dedication. If they choose not to defer the fee in lieu, they will owe \$472,552.80. If they choose to defer, they will owe \$519,400.

Recommendation: Recommend the Fee in Lieu for The Views PD.

Staff Contact:

Sarah Richardson

503-489-2150

srichardson@cityofsandy.com

Approved minutes from September 23, 2020:

Shelley Denison from the Planning Dept. shared an overview for The Views development. As of this morning the Planning Director and applicants Lawyer removed the development from the Planning Commission agenda until November. Need a future street plan etc. That gives the board some time to continue to look over the application.

Don Robertson, Board Chair, noted they are planning to form an HOA and paying a fee in lieu. Asked how long the fee can be deferred. Shelley noted they can defer until they apply for a building permit. They are asking to split the fee between single family and multifamily units. Requesting to pay the Single-Family fee up front and to defer the Multifamily unit fee. Ultimately the city will receive more money.

Don Robertson clarified that they are not proposing to give the city any of the undeveloped or open space area to the city (active and passive spaces). Shelly Denison confirmed this. Don Robertson asked if they are proposing any amenities for the space. Shelley Denison said yes, and they include a play structure, basketball court, gazebo viewpoint, and trails. Not considered above and beyond. Don Robertson asks if they are proposing to restrict public access. Don Robertson has had experience with both scenarios (restriction and easement). Don Robertson said it is their choice but can say from experience that unless it is gated the public will likely access it. Inevitably, the HOA may get tired of managing and providing secure access and they will ask to turn it over to the city. City needs to be sure that whatever they build is up to code and can sustain public use. Planning is also concerned that might happen.

Kathleen Walker asked if they are townhomes and yes, they are townhomes or row houses. Are all the other lots meeting the criteria for meeting single family residential? Shelley noted they are allowed within a Planned Development to deviate from the quantitative development standards. Some of the lots are smaller and some are larger than normally allowed. Part of the Planned Development process is making sure the applicant makes a good case for deviating from those standards and why deviating is warranted given other design elements. Code describes them as "outstanding design". One of the reasons the application is being deferred to the November meeting.

Kathleen Walker asked if parkland dedication is based on Single Family Residential. Sarah Richardson noted she can forward the full narrative to the board. Kathleen Walker asking about methodology to determine park acreage etc. Noted it is originally zoned as SFR but the density they are getting with townhomes should have a factor for parkland development. Shelley Denison wondering if this might be an issue with the code. Noted that they use the underlying zoning district to calculate parkland dedication but with the Planned Development the underlying zoning district does not matter as much when it comes to density. The logic behind using the underlying zoning district is about how many people are in the neighborhood who will be using the parks. With a Planned Development there would be more people than with a SFR development so that is a good point. Don Robertson feels it is important to use the proposed density.

Don Robertson recommends that the city put in writing that if the developer determines they ultimately want to give the land to the city, or if later the HOA asks to transfer the property, that this is at the cities discretion. The city does not want to automatically accept the property and maybe it should not be considered for at least 10 years.

Kathleen Walker noted there is a park in the current Master Plan to the west of this property and the money received from this development could help to build that park. So the city would not want to take on the responsibility and costs for the property in this development. Don Robertson clarified that this would not be the first choice of location or configuration for a park in this area.

Kathleen Walker asking about plans for changes in the PD code language. Are there plans to clarify and write more measurable criteria. Shelley Denison noted there is some inherent subjectivity to Planned Developments. Shelley agrees this is a good opportunity to look at this chapter in the code and see what is working and what isn't working.

Don Robertson would like to schedule this again for the October meeting. Asked Shelley to update the board on any changes with the proposal so they can have a substantive discussion and be able to provide a recommendation. Thank you to Shelley for joining the meeting and they look forward to working with her in the future.

Draft Minutes (not yet approved) October 14, 2020 meeting:

Sarah Richardson reached out to Shelley Denison about the proposal and there are no additional updates. Board had requested it be on the agenda.

Don Robertson intent was to chat more about it. Comfortable waiting until November since there are no changes.

Kathleen Walker had a question about lot 71 or 72. Appears it is going to be a big apartment building. Sarah Richardson will follow up.

Location for the development was reviewed.

Don Robertson noted one of the questions was how the SDC's and Fee in Lieu would be addressed. Believe the developer wanted to pay the upfront for the SFR but delay the payment for the multifamily units.

Sarah Richardson reminded the board they had a question about how the parkland dedication was going to be calculated.

Don Robertson is concerned because they are going to have their own HOA and keeping parks and open spaces private or semi-private and wants to be sure they are still required to pay the Fee in Lieu and SDCS.

Kathleen Walker noted lot 72 and lot 122 are two large two lots that are proposed as apartments? Would like clarification on what is proposed and how many units are proposed.

Makoto Lane asked if this was a Planned Development, and yes, it is.

Discussion about Planned Developments and what the somewhat subjective criteria for "Outstanding" features means. Specificity is important to be able to understand what is being proposed and whether it meets the outstanding criteria for a Planned Development.

Don Robertson noted we need some answers before recommendations can be forwarded.