



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

### **Participants:**

AmberGlen Implementation Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
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 TAC 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):** Will adoption of this fall under current Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) or will the new TPR amendments apply? (Pat Ribellia, City Planning Director)

**Response (R):** I'm not sure if the amended TPR would apply. (Brian Harper, Metro)

**R:** The new language says that if you pass TPR in the comprehensive plan amendment stage then you don't need to pass it again in the zoning stage. We should be fine with TPR. (Don Odermott, City Transportation)

**C:** Was the proposed streets plan reviewed at the comprehensive plan stage for TPR findings? (Steve L. Kelley)

**R:** TPR findings and related analysis are included in the record for adoption of the AmberGlen Community Plan, with ODOT and the DLCDC participating in the review. (Odermott)

**C:** Washington County is in the process of "greening the code" – have you looked at this in terms of review? (Alwin Turiel, City Long Range Planning)

**R:** I am not sure the status as far as adoption, etc. We have been working in it for a while. (Kelley)

**R:** Thank you for noting the County's work in this area. Staff will follow up with Nadine Smith. (Goganian)

**C:** Does the exception to minimum density provision apply to the entire AmberGlen area? (Ribellia)

**R:** Yes. We did not consider limiting exceptions in certain locations. This is something we can look at to see where it may make sense to be more selective. (Elliott)

**C:** How do vacant parcels get factored into the minimum density calculations? (Goganian)

**R:** We probably want it to apply to only developed parcels – that's an edit we should make. (Elliott)

**C:** Another loophole to consider is the possibility that someone could subdivide to get around the adjacent parcels minimum densities requirement. (Kelley)

**R:** We will need to address this more. If we limit it to only include developed parcels, the odds of someone splitting a parcel that already has a building on it is probably pretty low. (Elliott) **R:** Maybe there needs to be something about ownership – you count it as one site. (Kelley)

**C:** We don't currently require minimum densities in AmberGlen, so how does the exception to minimum density language "parcels that are currently developed below the minimum densities" work? (Ribellia)

**R:** The intent of the wording is to ask if the building is below the minimum density of the new code. We work to clarify the wording. (Elliott)

**C:** Have we switched our direction in terms of parking requirements and flexibility? (Henry Reimann, Hillsboro Police)

**R:** This says you can reduce the minimums, which is in-line with the Community Plan. Later on I will talk about flexibility to get more parking above the maximum permitted.

There are a series of sections related to the site planning standards in the code. It was separated in the former version but we decided to group them moving forward. The major network of streets is important – those connections need to be preserved. The alignment is not so important at the local street level. The hatched areas on the map are retail-focused frontage areas. Refinements to these areas respond to stakeholder comments regarding the inability to realistically have a mile-long stretch of retail frontages in the plan. The alignment of the HCT line is still unknown. (Elliott)

**R:** The city is continuing to work on a variety of alternatives. We are working on a pre-engineering study with TriMet to move through the Metro process which will continue to inform the ultimate location of the HCT. (Colin Cooper, Current Planning Manager)

**R:** In regards to the retail center at Quatama, I wanted to reinforce that access to that node needs to be set far enough away from the gated crossing. There have been past issues with this. (Odermott)

**C:** Are all the streets subject to this Type II approval? Normally the major streets would not be subject to an administrative approval. Also, the County would strongly suggest remove "potential" from Wilkins alignment – that connection is not potential; it is a connection that needs to occur. Also, there is no definition of structured parking – that would be appropriate. And in terms of redevelopment, it is important to make sure that structured parking doesn't limit opportunity for future redevelopment. (Kelley)

**R:** We have specified that future changes that might need to be made to the street network would be a Type II approval process – an administrative process, not a public hearing. I agree with the flexibility to not apply to major streets. There is a definition of structured parking on page 139 but I think it can be revised to get at the issue. As far as your last comment, I really don't know how to get at that – I can foresee the problems that might be created. The property owners have requested a policy similar to that of South Waterfront which allows temporary surface parking for a limited time and then require structured parking. (Elliott)

- R:** The key word is “alignment area” (in response to Steve Kelley’s comment about Wilkins). More conversation needs to happen with the stakeholders, but your point is well taken. (Ribellia)
- C:** The street design section doesn’t distinguish between the public and private streets – I’d like to see it do that so we can address the standards differently. We are not set up to maintain green streets. (Bob Sanders, Public Works)
- R:** That’s the road we want to go down. It’s hard to draft but we can take a stab at it. (Elliott)
- R:** We are in the process of creating our new Public Works Street Standards – for the public side; there is more flexibility in the private streets. (Sanders)
- C:** We have made some modest revisions to the dimensions of the local streets and access lane street sections to allow for the fire department to provide service. The boulevard street and the green connector streets have not been revised – the strategy is that between the local streets and the access lane we will be able to get at it. I just wanted to acknowledge that we didn’t revise all of the streets, but I don’t think we need to. The street sections in the code are draft and will need to be reviewed against the new Public Works street standards. (Goganian)
- C:** I need to touch base with Bob on the Public Works street sections to make sure we are on the same page as far as Clean Water Services standards. The cross section on page 43 – it is unclear to me where the vegetative corridor is? Also, we need to make sure that we define the green street treatment – publicly or privately maintained? (Carrie Pak, Clean Water Services)
- R:** I don’t think that the intent of the cross-section is to show where the vegetative corridor is – it could fall anywhere along that slope. (Jennifer Wells, City Current Planning)
- R:** The label should be removed – and will be. There will be more refinement on the street sections. (Goganian)
- C:** Does the zoning code look at speed designation because the mixed use residential streets don’t have any bicycle facilities on them? I want to make sure that the connectivity is for pedestrians and cyclists, not just for vehicles. (Heather McCarey, Westside Transportation Alliance)
- R:** Our intent would not be to add more pavement for those facilities. We need to look from a design point of view how to ensure a slower, safer environment. (Goganian)
- R:** On the principal routes that are carrying heavier volumes of traffic that’s where we want to designate space for cyclists. (Odermott)
- R:** The operation of the street once it’s built is not usually governed by the zoning code; it’s governed by your engineering standards. (Elliott)
- R:** The speeds will be in our public works street standards. (Sanders)
- C:** Is there a bicycle/pedestrian plan to reference? (Lisa Goorjian, Hillsboro Parks and Recreation)
- R:** There is a map in the community plan. It is also located in the TSP and in the Parks Trails Master Plan. How off pavement bicycle facilities cross driveways and intersecting streets, will need to be addressed from a safety perspective. (Odermott)
- C:** In terms of the connections to the County arterials – I’m still not sure that County spacing requirements are met. (Kelley)
- R:** There is one access point that is still in question on Walker Road – it is between the relocated Stucki intersection and the existing intersection off Walker road. It does exceed 600 feet in spacing – the question is whether that roadway is carrying collector standards or not. The crossroads of Walker and Stucki will be congested and I think this particular roadway will provide a relief valve that can divert traffic coming from the east into AmberGlen. This is the only area of conflict – more analysis to come. (Odermott)
- C:** In high density development we are encountering space for garbage and recycling containers. Would this be included here? (Peter Brandom, City of Hillsboro Sustainability)
- R:** We’ve done a couple of studies about this – we can put something in there that addresses size and space of containers. (Elliott)
- C:** On page 53 when it references the City drainage master plan, what are the consolidated facilities referring to? [Additional comment added later about concern of potential water quantity issues. Suggestion for the City to master plan the area’s drainage needs for both water quality and quantity perspectives] (Pak)
- R:** We do not have a storm water master plan – in the absence of that we have been looking at distributing the treatment through LIDAs through the plan area. (Goganian)

**C:** It might be simpler to generalize references to CWS requirements for LIDA's, etc in the case of future changes. Also, I would encourage you to do a detailed review in this area if you are considering consolidated facilities. Also, Ordinance 9174 is outdated – you would want to replace that with 07-20 which is our current design standards. (Pak)

**R:** Noted. (Cooper)

**R:** We shouldn't be referencing other ordinances as specifically amended to because we don't have any control of future changes they make. (Wells)

**R:** There is Oregon case law that says that when your reference a document in your code it's the document at the time you adopted it – you can't do rolling amendments in Oregon. (Turiel)

**C:** G, 1B (pg 67) – is the intention for them to attain silver level or better? (Turiel)

**R:** Yes. Need to add "or better". The idea is that you would get silver LEED preliminary approval and build the building that way, but you do not need to pay money to get the certification. (Elliott)

**R:** The issue is not that developers don't want to build green buildings. Rather, it's a matter of cost of actually certifying them. (Goganian)

**C:** Has the City considering adopting their own green program/standard? (Pak)

**R:** Yes, but it's more complicated than it seems. We have built multiple buildings to LEED standards without certification – it's on a project by project basis. (Brandom)

An issue with property owners has been, at what level of investment do I have to comply with your new standards? Our language says you may expand your existing building 20% without conforming to the new standards. We have been tweaking the language to give flexibility to expand without a public hearing process, even though it won't meet new standards (limit 20% expansion). A 10% is already exempt from public review currently– we're giving them another 10%. It's a huge issue for them. (Elliott)

**C:** Given my experience in North Bethany, one of the things we did was give development rights once they complied with the regulation standards and had an appropriate infrastructure funding strategy in place. I don't see that infrastructure funding strategy in place here. I think it's difficult to get afterwards. (Kelley)

**R:** We are looking at funding strategies with our stakeholders and also internally. This is occurring through the transportation study and urban renewal study, as well as other conversations directly with stakeholders. (Cooper)

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

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.