



## **AmberGlen Community Plan – Zones and Development Regulations Steering Committee Meeting – October 24, 2011**

### **Participants:**

AmberGlen Implementation Steering Committee (SC)  
Don Elliott, Clarion Associates  
Bill Reid, Johnson Reid  
Hillsboro City Staff

### **DISCUSSION SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Introduction**

Following introductions, Paige Goganian reviewed the agenda, noting that the purpose of the meeting is to review and discuss the first complete draft of a new section to be included in the Hillsboro Zoning Ordinance: Chapter 143 Urban Center Zones and Development Regulations, Draft October 7, 2011 prepared by Don Elliott and Darcie White, Clarion Associates. Goganian reviewed the timeline and said that comments on the October 7, 2012 Draft Document should be received by staff by December 1. This allows the project team to incorporate feedback and distribute a second Draft Document before the end of the year, prior to the final SC meeting in January, 2012 and the public hearing before the Planning Commission targeted for February. (Paige Goganian, Project Manager)

#### **Presentation and Discussion:**

**Chapter 143 Urban Center Zones, Draft October 7, 2011 (AmberGlen Zones and Development Regulations Document)**  
(Don Elliott, Clarion Associates)

Presentation: Chapter 143 Urban Center Zones (See TAC/SC Presentation dated October 24, 2011)

Don Elliott noted that the purpose of the six new Urban Centers (UC) zones is to implement the AmberGlen Community Plan and to provide for the densities that need to be achieved for this regional center. The zones may also be applied to other locations where urban densities are indicated. The six districts have not changed, aside from the name from “Regional Centers” to “Urban Centers”. The text and map will be approved together, so if there are any issues with the lines on the map, this should be discussed.

Elliott reviewed the structure of the new chapter and explained how the format coordinates with the ongoing project to reorganize the existing Hillsboro Zoning Ordinance (HZO) into a streamlined and coordinated with the Draft Community Development Code (CDC): The first 68 pages (Sections 1 – 9) are the substance of the UC zone district standards. Sections 10 and 11 are taken from the draft CDC directly with the remaining sections structured as a ‘hybrid’ incorporating components from both the existing HZO and Draft CDC.

Elliott reviewed the eleven draft sections. He explained that minimum density requirements are identified and provisions for development below the minimum are included for existing buildings that do not meet the new threshold for density. Also, eight different parking adjustments are included that allow parking requirements to be lowered. Don noted that each new section covers items previously discussed in outline form. These include permitted housing types and land uses, base zones and standards, parking, adjustments in return for public benefit, site planning standards, building and design standards, and procedures with a focus on non-conforming uses and structures. Don identified areas where additional attention was needed based on initial feedback from stakeholders and ongoing coordination work by staff.

---

<sup>1</sup> This summary includes only a portion of the conversation from the meeting. The comments and responses outlined above provide a summary of the discussion and are not verbatim.

## Discussion

- Comment (C):** I agree that the green building language referencing LEED certification needs additional attention. What is the threshold for requiring an existing building retrofit need to meet the new UC standards? (Steve Abel, Representing Principal Financial)
- Response (R):** The code allows up to 20% expansion before compliance with the UC standards is required. Under the current code, Development Review is required beyond a 10% expansion. Expansions of existing buildings greater than 10% up to 20%, the standards in place at the time the new zones are adopted may apply. Additional work will be done to replace nonconforming uses and structures provisions with language based on existing uses and structures, similar to what currently applies in Volume 2. (Elliott)
- C:** Is there a master plan option that would allow phasing in of requirements like structured parking and density? This would lessen concerns about out-pacing market. For south waterfront, the mechanism for phasing was a condition of development. Regarding the HCT alignment, alignment along 194th may not be ideal but the ROW exists. It's unclear when ROW for the HCT would be established if the proposed road for it isn't already in place. Finally, I am concerned with the smaller blocks and their ability to develop and shoulder the costs of structured parking. (Brian Newman, OHSU)
- R:** Regarding block size, feedback from staff is that higher level streets are required as shown with significant flexibility for developing the grid at the level of local streets. (Elliott)
- C:** The market dynamics for South Waterfront are unique in that there was an institutional landowner with a master plan who needed to move forward. Market factors are different for AmberGlen and it's not clear that allowances for phasing will be effective. (Detweiler)
- C:** Whether adjustments are based on public or private improvements is not explicitly stated and needs further clarification. Consider a no preclusion approach where the first stage doesn't preclude the opportunity to move forward in future stages. (Abel)
- C:** This interdisciplinary approach to the issues will be helpful when requesting federal funds. How will affordable housing fit into the mix and regarding the mixed income housing requirement for adjustments, is 80% AMI (area median income) really "affordable" in this context? Concerns about code would be alleviated if public sector investments made the project more inclusive. I'm interest to know more about the role of urban renewal for the area. (Detweiler)
- R:** We will coordinate with Washington County on the affordable housing component and appropriate median income thresholds. (Colin Cooper)
- C:** What happened to the district utility approach discussed at previous meetings? (Marvin Lamascus)
- R:** The district utility approach has been taken out because other than aspirational comments, there is not a regulatory aspect. The City will continue to pursue the opportunity as part a broader set of implementation actions. At the regulatory level, the code addresses sustainability at the site and building levels and includes green building standards. (Elliott)
- C:** LEED certification was too costly for the Living Green project in Orenco Station, even with transit nearby. I'm not sure how far the project is from meeting LEED Silver requirements. At this time, structured parking does not pencil. The real key to making this happen is urban renewal assistance. (Gary Vance)
- C:** The certification cost of LEED is the problem. Construction costs associated with features required by LEED is not the issue. Rather, costs for certification alone roughly range from \$80,000 to \$120,000 per project. The contract for certification is independent and does not include design or construction costs and does include pre and post certification. (Newman)
- C:** Our concern is that the code is stating a private, albeit non-profit, business (LEED) as a requirement. Linking government regulation to an outside shop is is questionable. LEED is a profitable non-profit. What if LEED goes out of business? Green standards should be more generic. (David Reinhart, Felton Properties)
- C:** We have concerns about the costs of certifying and then re-certifying to show that the site remains green. That could be an on-going \$50,000 expense. (Laura Gentry, Principal Financial)
- R:** The City would not require re-certification. Approvals would be based on how the project is built, not maintenance over time. (Elliott)

**Closing** (Paige Goganian, Project Manager)

More work is needed on green building standards, street standards and stormwater management. Part of this work will be to coordinate with Public Works on the Design and Construction Standards. In terms of process, more time has been built into the schedule for feedback on the drafts. We would like your comments by the end of November. We have come a long way, but we still have areas that need additional work. I look forward to working with some of you to iron out the remaining issues.