



April 21, 2008

**STAFF REPORT:**

TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: Planning Department

**RE: HCP 3-08: Area 69, South Hillsboro Community Plan; HCP 5-08: Area 71, South Hillsboro Community Plan; and ZOA 2-08: Areas 69 & 71, South Hillsboro Community Plan**

The Planning Commission is scheduled to conduct a Public Hearing on April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2008 to receive testimony on proposed amendments to the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan (HCP) and the Hillsboro Zoning Ordinance (HZO). On February 27, 2008, the Planning Commission initiated the amendments described in HCP 3-08, HCP 5-08, and ZOA 2-08 through adoption of Resolution Nos. 1658-P, 1659-P, and 1660-P, respectively. Notice of the hearing was published in the April 8<sup>th</sup>, April 15<sup>th</sup>, and April 18<sup>th</sup> issue of The Argus in accordance with Section 1 (III) of the HCP and Section 116 of the HZO. The Planning Commission previously received staff reports dated February 21<sup>st</sup>, March 27<sup>th</sup>, and April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2008.

This is a preliminary staff report. As new information arises on outstanding issues staff anticipates transmitting a supplemental staff report prior to the April 29<sup>th</sup> public hearing on this matter.

This preliminary staff report addresses HCP 3-08, HCP 5-08, and ZOA 2-08, and staff recommends that the hearings run concurrently. Attached to this preliminary staff report are:

1. South Hillsboro Community Plan map
2. Initiating Resolution Nos. 1658-P, 1659-P, and 1660-P by the Planning Commission of proposed amendments in HCP 3-08, HCP 5-08, and ZOA 2-08.
3. South Hillsboro Infrastructure Funding Review, February 14, 2008
4. The Draft Infrastructure Financing Strategy, dated April 16, 2008

5. Draft Year 2013 Area 69 & 71 Transportation Evaluation (April 21, 2008)
6. 2030 No-Build Scenario Preliminary Transportation Evaluation (Dec. 15, 2007)
7. 2030 Build Scenario Preliminary Transportation Evaluation (Dec. 24, 2007)
8. Staff Report Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Compliance for Area 69 and Area 71 Urban Growth Boundary Expansions (April 19, 2008)

The proposed amendments are legislative in nature, therefore the 120 day rule does not apply. However, under the terms of the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between Metro and the City, the city is obligated to undertake concept planning for Area 69 and Area 71 and adopt provisions necessary to comply with Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP).

The amendments concern properties in Area 69 and Area 71 of the South Hillsboro planning area. Area 69 encompasses approximately 248 acres generally located west of SW 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue and south of the current Hillsboro city limits. Area 71 encompasses approximately 87 acres and is located east of Witch Hazel Village and immediately adjacent to the current Hillsboro city limits. Areas 69 and 71 are shown in orange and brown lines respectively on the attached 11"x17" color photocopy.

## **BACKGROUND**

Area 69 and Area 71 were added to the Urban Growth Boundary by Metro in 2002 to meet an identified regional need for housing. Prior to urbanization of the Areas, the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requires development of a concept plan and adoption of local comprehensive plan amendments that will guide future development in them. In Hillsboro, Zoning Ordinance amendments are also required to implement the new comprehensive plan policies and implementation measures.

Areas 69 and 71 are "pieces in a larger puzzle" as evidenced by the South Hillsboro Community Plan Map (attached). To establish their context, the Commissioners received a copy of the draft *South Hillsboro Community Plan*, dated February 22, 2008 when the HCP and ZOA resolutions were initiated. Planning staff requests that the Commissioners bring the Plan document to the April 29<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

The configurations of Areas 69 and 71 are the result of previous UGB expansion criteria (based on land resource value) which allowed only lower value agricultural land to be added to the UGB. These criteria resulted in additions that did not in some cases have the locational qualities or physical relationships to create successful future neighborhoods and communities. To achieve the goals of compact urban form, efficient use of land, mixed-use development, and rational and economic provision of urban services, the City determined, and Washington County and Metro concurred, that Areas 69 and 71 should be planned as part of the larger South Hillsboro planning process. The South Hillsboro Community Plan will enable Areas 69 and 71 to develop as part of a larger community

that incorporates the core principles of smart growth in Metro’s Regional 2040 Growth Concept and its Great Community characteristics. Planning staff also notes that because of current traffic generation, the South Hillsboro Community Plan Area was divided into two areas. The Concept Planning Area [shown with various comprehensive plan designations on the color photocopy] comprises 1,566 acres and includes Areas 69 and 71. The potential future urban reserve area [outlined in purple on the color photocopy] encompasses 636 acres.

The South Hillsboro Community Plan will also provide a guide for future potential Urban Reserve and UGB decisions. Senate Bill 1011, enacted by the 2007 Legislature, enables Metro and local counties to designate Urban and Rural Reserves in order to determine where the Portland metropolitan region will — and will not — expand to accommodate population and employment growth over the next 40 to 50 years. Based on the new State legislation the Land Conservation and Development Commission have adopted new rules that allow an alternative way for the Portland metropolitan region to consider the designation of urban and rural reserves. Metro, together with Multnomah, Clackamas and Washington Counties are proceeding with a process to establish future urban and rural reserve areas, based on the new State legislation and rules.

#### **MAJOR PLAN AMENDMENT PROCEDURES**

Pursuant to HCP, Section 1 (II) (G), a Major Plan Amendment includes any significant change to the Comprehensive Plan text map initiated by the City Council or Planning Commission. Section 1 (III), Plan Revision and Major Plan Amendments, states that major plan amendments shall be processed as legislative actions subject to the following provisions which effectively comprise the requirements to be met for valid HCP amendments:

- (A) For each proposed plan revision or major plan amendment to the Comprehensive Plan:
  - (1) With the advice and assistance of the CIAC, establish and conduct ***a citizen involvement program which provides for public involvement and input into the proposed revision or amendment*** which complies with Statewide Planning Goal 1 requirements. At a minimum, such a public involvement program shall provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for public involvement in all phases of the planning process applicable to the proposed plan revision or major plan amendment as determined by the CIAC.
  - (2) ***Identify issues*** to be addressed and related information and data to be collected, reviewed and made available for public review. Inform citizens of these issues; and ***provide opportunity for citizen access to the related information and data*** and for ***citizen input on these issues***.

- (3) ***Notify affected government agencies of planning activities; invite review and comment.***
- (4) Collect relevant information and data.
- (5) ***Analyze each issue and identify proposed actions which address the issue sufficiently.*** As part of the public involvement program for the plan revision or major plan amendment.
  - (a) Compile and combine the issue, relevant data and information and actions into text format and make copies of such text available for review and comments by citizens and affected government agencies.
  - (b) Compile comments received from citizens and affected government agencies for consideration by the Planning Commission. The Planning Department shall prepare written responses to comments and make the responses available for public review and to the Planning Commission during its consideration of the proposed plan revision or major plan amendment.
- (6) ***A Planning Commission public hearing on a plan revision or major plan amendment*** shall be conducted after completion of the tasks set forth in Section (III)(A)(1 through 5) above and the citizen involvement program for the plan revision or major plan amendment established by the CIAC. Notice of any public hearing by the Planning Commission or City Council on a plan revision or major plan amendment to the Comprehensive Plan shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City a minimum of 20 days prior to the date of the initial public hearing. Any such notice shall contain:
  - (a) A summary of the plan revision or major plan amendment.
  - (b) The time, date and place of the hearing.
  - (c) The location(s) at which copies of the plan revision or major plan amendment summary may be obtained.
  - (d) A statement that all interested persons may appear and provide testimony and that only those persons making an appearance of record may appeal the determination of the Planning Commission or City Council.
  - (e) A general explanation of the requirements for submission of testimony and the procedure for conduct of the hearing.

- (7) The Planning Commission may recess the hearing in order to obtain further information or provide additional notification. Upon recessing for these purposes, the Commission shall announce the time and date when the hearing will be resumed.
- (8) After hearing the plan revision or major plan amendment, the Planning Commission shall forward a recommendation of denial, approval, or approval with modifications of the plan revision or major plan amendment to the City Council.
- (9) The City Council shall hold a hearing during its consideration of a plan revision and may hold a public hearing on any major plan amendment. Notice of the hearing shall be provided in the manner prescribed in subsection (III)(A)(6). After consideration of the plan revision or major plan amendment, the City Council may adopt or deny the plan revision or major plan amendment.
- (10) The Planning Department shall keep copies of adopted text of the plan revision or major plan amendment on file at the City Hall and City Library for inspection by the public and shall notify citizens and government agencies that copies of the adopted text are available for inspection.
- (11) The final City Council decision on a plan revision or major plan amendment may be appealed in accordance with applicable State statutory provisions, relating to appeals of decisions amending an acknowledged comprehensive plan.
- (12) The Planning Commission shall also establish and publicize a procedure whereby interested individuals, community organizations and public agencies may request to be included on a regular mailing list of parties to be notified of the initiation of proposed plan revisions or major plan amendments.

### **HCP 5-08 (HCP Section 26) and HCP 3-08 (HCP Section 27) AMENDMENTS**

Two new Plan sections are proposed. Section 26 would include four goals, six policies and four implementation measures for Area 71. Section 27 would include five goals, six policies and four implementation measures for Area 69. In each new section, the new amendments would generally guide land use, development lotting patterns, and public facilities planning and implementation within the Area consistent with the South Hillsboro Community Plan specific to that Area. These concepts were developed as part of a joint effort between the City and the South Hillsboro Task Force, comprised of property owners within and adjacent to the larger South Hillsboro concept plan area, and State, Regional, County, and City staff representatives who comprised the South Hillsboro Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Additional amendments to Section 12

regarding Public Facilities and Section 14 regarding Plan Maps are also proposed in connection with Areas 69 and 71.

A team of consultants assisted in preparation of the South Hillsboro Concept Plan document that address requirements contained in Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 11. These requirements include: an urban growth diagram for the areas; conceptual public facilities plans; a conceptual transportation plan; a natural resources protection plan; and a historic and cultural resources protection strategy, as applicable. The South Hillsboro Community Plan also addresses State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) requirements.

### **ZOA 2-08 AMENDMENTS**

Proposed General Development Policies for Area 69 authorize restrictions on annexation due to inadequate infrastructure. Therefore, a new subsection 97A is proposed to be added to the Zoning Ordinance consistent with proposed HCP Section 27. (Existing Section 97A would be renumbered as 97B).

In addition, proposed Implementation Measures for both Areas 69 and 71 would require that future urban development in those Areas be processed under the Planned Unit Development standards and criteria. A new Zoning Ordinance Section 127K is therefore proposed to be added consistent with proposed HCP Section 26 and Section 27.

Planning staff will forward a supplemental staff report prior to the April 29<sup>th</sup> public hearing transmitting three draft resolutions including the proposed amendments related to each Area.

### **SOUTH HILLSBORO TASK FORCE and OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS**

In accordance with a CIAC-approved project citizen involvement program, the South Hillsboro Community Planning process included establishing and relying upon interested landowners within and outside the South Hillsboro Community Planning area as the project's citizen Task Force. Over the course of the South Hillsboro planning process three open houses and seven Task Force meetings were held.

All task force meetings were held in the Hillsboro Civic Center on the following meeting dates in 2007:

- 1) March 8
- 2) April 12 (Joint Planning Commission and South Hillsboro Task Force meeting)
- 3) June 7
- 4) June 25
- 5) July 26
- 6) October 29
- 7) November 29

The South Hillsboro Community Plan draft dated January 25, 2008 was distributed to all South Hillsboro Technical Advisory Committee and Task Force members for final comments on the draft plan. Planning staff received comments from Tim O'Brien (Metro), Steve Larrance (Task Force member), Marah Danielson (ODOT), Aisha Willits (Washington County), Bernie Monahan (City Water Department), Read Stapleton (Task Force member), and Dave Wood (Task Force member). These comments were attached to the Staff Report dated February 21, 2007 for the Commissioners' information.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION DISCUSSION**

A Planning Commission Work Session on the details of the South Hillsboro Community Plan and discussion of comments received from TAC and Task Force members was conducted on April 2, 2008. The following discussions identify and respond to the key issues raised at the Planning Commission work session.

### **TRANSPORTATION ISSUES**

**Planning Commission Comment #1:** What are the transit options for the South Hillsboro area?

**Staff Response:** City staff continues to work with Tri-Met on long range transit planning for all of Hillsboro, including provision of transit service to South Hillsboro. The City's principal position is to focus future transit investments on north-south transit capacity to better link employment in north Hillsboro to housing to the south, both within Hillsboro and in other areas of the South County. A portion of this discussion includes the possibility of the commuter rail from South County utilizing the TV Highway corridor as a means of extending the Commuter Rail service further west and north to more effectively link its western terminus to the Sunset Corridor employment center.

**Planning Commission Comment #2:** When will Kinnaman Road and Century Boulevard connect? Will this roadway connection be needed to proceed with Areas 69 and 71?

**Staff Response:** The Century Boulevard connection over Rock Creek is not needed to service Area 69 and Area 71. The Kinnaman Road connection is a requirement of Area 69 development.

**Planning Commission Comment #3:** Capacity should exist to address congestion in the area, especially due to the industrial base to the north.

**Staff Response:** Evaluation of existing traffic operations has been documented in the Draft Year 2013 Area 69 & 71 Transportation Evaluation by DEA. The study area evaluated in this report is consistent with the larger study area defined in the 2030 model year traffic studies. As such, it significantly exceeds the standard 10% impact

area used in TPR evaluations. The 10% impact area for Area 69 and Area 71, illustrated in Figure 10 of the report, extends east to SW 198<sup>th</sup> Avenue, south to SW Rosedale Road, north to TV Highway, and west to River Road. The analysis, however, extends north to Baseline Road and east to SW 185<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Based upon the rapid development of the Witch Hazel Village UGB expansion area, staff from ODOT, Washington County, Hillsboro, and Metro met and agreed that it would be prudent to evaluate the road system needs attributable to Area 69 and Area 71 development on a shorter term horizon year. This approach would provide better insight on needed improvements concurrent with the anticipated development schedule for these two UGB expansion areas. Thus, in addition to evaluating deficiencies in 2008, the Draft Year 2013 Area 69 & 71 Transportation Evaluation analysis has also evaluated anticipated traffic conditions in the year 2013 without Area 69/71 development (“2013 No-Build”) and with Area 69/71 development (“2013 Build”).

Listed below is a summary of identified existing deficiencies, including known deficiencies located north of the DEA report’s study area. Also indicated are estimated costs of improvements and anticipated funding source:

<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Estimated Cost (\$M)</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>
Brookwood (TV Hwy to Baseline): Widen to 3-lane	\$10.00	MSTIP-3C
Brookwood (River Rd to Alexander): Widen to 3-lane/roundabout	\$ 2.50	TIF
Brookwood at Cornell: Double Left Turn Lanes on Cornell	\$ 3.10	
TIF/MSTIP-4		
Cornell at 25 <sup>th</sup> : Double SB Left Turn Lanes	\$ 2.80	TIF
28 <sup>th</sup> Ave. (Main to Grant): Widen to 3-lane	\$ 4.20	TIF
River Rd (Rood Br. to Davis): Widen to 3-lane/new bridge	\$10.00	MSTIP-3C/TIF
Cornelius Pass Rd (Lois to Aloclek): Widen to 5-lane	\$24.50	MSTIP-4
TV Hwy at Century: Add southbound right turn lane	\$ 0.64	TIF
Convert south approach to Lt/Th + Rt		
Modify signal for NB/SB Rt Turn Overlaps		
(if 229 <sup>th</sup> closed) Improve Century to 5-lane operation	\$ 1.80	TIF
Extend Century bike lanes to Alexander		
TV Hwy at 209 <sup>th</sup> : Add eastbound right turn lane	\$ 3.80	TIF
Modify signal for protected lefts on 209 <sup>th</sup>		
Add second southbound thru lane		
Add second northbound left turn lane		
TV Hwy at 198 <sup>th</sup> : Add southbound right turn lane	\$ 0.30	TIF
209 <sup>th</sup> at Kinnaman: Add southbound left turn lane	\$ 0.24	TIF
198 <sup>th</sup> at Kinnaman: Add southbound left turn lane (east leg)	\$ 0.30	TIF
	Estimated	Funding

Project Description		Cost (\$M)	Source
185 <sup>th</sup> (Blanton to Kinnaman):	Widen to 3-lane	\$ 5.80	MSTIP-3C
Farmington (170 <sup>th</sup> to Kinnaman):	Widen to 5-lane	\$ 1.40	MSTIP-3C
209 <sup>th</sup> at Butternut Ck:	Construct 3-lane bridge	\$ 2.00	Road Capital
229 <sup>th</sup> at Butternut Ck:	Construct 2-lane bridge	\$ 0.80	MSTIP-3C

Washington County has been discussing and preparing to take to voters a proposed MSTIP-4 package as a six-year serial levy. It has not been decided yet when, or if, the package will go to the voters within the next two years. Should it move ahead, the City of Hillsboro anticipates that its top two priority projects will be the Cornelius Pass Road 5-lane improvement from Lois to Aloclek (see above) and the Century Boulevard extension from Lois to Baseline Road, including the Rock Creek bridge which is estimated to cost approximately \$16.5 million. Improvements identified in the Area 69 and Area 71 traffic analyses consider needed road improvements assuming these MSTIP-4 funded projects are not completed concurrent with Area 69/71 development.

**Planning Commission Comment #4:** Sufficient infrastructure should be put in place first, we want to be sure that we have the ability to fix roadways or we will face larger problems.

**Staff Response:**

Please find attached a staff report dated April 19, 2008 from Transportation Planning Engineer Don Odermott regarding transportation issues in Area 69 and Area 71 and the entire South Hillsboro planning area.

**Planning Commission Comment #5:** Transportation improvements for the larger South Hillsboro Community Plan area need to be added to the existing document so that the Planning Commission can decide on phasing and rollout. The City cannot impose additional congestion burdens on the South Hillsboro residents and neighbors until the larger transportation issues are addressed.

**Staff Response:**

The preliminary reports published in December evaluated transportation system performance in 2030, which is the current modeled study horizon year. The 2030 Build analysis evaluated the impacts of traffic generation from the larger South Hillsboro study area, generally bounded by TV Highway on the north, SW 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the east, SW Rosedale Road on the South, and SW 229<sup>th</sup> on the west. An additional growth area was evaluated south of the Witch Hazel UGB expansion and west of the Reserve Golf Course. The identified transportation system deficiencies resulting from development of the larger study area outside of the current UGB, including Area 69 and Area 71, and required roadway system improvements, are documented in the December 24, 2007 draft report. The identified improvements necessary for serving the broader study area provide critical insight as to the roadway infrastructure necessary to guide infrastructure decisions related to development of Areas 69 and 71.

One example of the insight provided by the 2030 analysis includes the determination that the extension of 234<sup>th</sup> Avenue within Area 71 should be accomplished under an Arterial road standard, contrary to its current adopted Transportation System Plan designation as a Collector road. Insight provided on future traffic demand impacts anticipated with urbanization of areas outside of the current UGB allow for informed current transportation planning decisions on system needs within the UGB. This allows the City of Hillsboro to make decisions to ensure adequate road right of way and infrastructure are planned and constructed which will be compatible with future needs.

Comparison of the 2030 No-Build and 2030 Build analysis results identifies the additional roadway system improvements attributable to development in Area 69, Area 71, and the other Urban Reserve areas located within the broader study area. These improvements, and the off-site improvement costs, will be detailed in the Executive Summary of the final 2030 Build Transportation Evaluation report.

**Planning Commission Comment #6:** Can the cost for transportation improvements be passed onto developers?

**Staff Response:**

A South Hillsboro Planning Area *Infrastructure Financing Strategy* draft report, prepared by Leland Consulting Group, is attached for your information. This report documents the proposed financing methodology: an enhanced traffic impact fee for all development in the South Hillsboro Planning Area to fund needed transportation improvements.

**ACCESSIBILITY ISSUES**

**Planning Commission Comment #8:** When roadways are widened can the median refuges be designed to better accommodate wheelchairs?

**Staff Response:**

This issue arises on large arterials (wider than 5 lanes). Since Washington County is the road authority on these types of facilities, their position typically governs the scope of improvements. Enlarged medians can be provided as a refuge for pedestrians who travel at speeds slower than the average pedestrian. Median refuges typically pose a maintenance and roadway hazard as they are difficult to clean and maintain, and historical evidence indicates that they are frequently struck by motorists. The trade-off which comes with their use is that the average pedestrian who is attempting to cross the entire street width now has more distance to travel, thereby imparting a higher demand for side-street green time to cross the wide arterial street. This is detrimental to intersection operation and can sometimes result in the need for even more lanes to mitigate the resulting capacity deficiency. A more preferred practice is to utilize islands at all right turn lanes in order to shorten pedestrian walking distances across roadways.

**Planning Commission Comment #9:** How will accessible and affordable housing be folded into the South Hillsboro Community Plan? Is there anything the Planning Commission can do to encourage the creation of accessible housing within the South Hillsboro plan area?

**Staff Response:**

The draft HCP resolutions have been amended to address both issues: affordable housing and accessibility. The Housing Policies under the General Development Policies has been amended to read as follows:

(B) Housing Policies.

- (1) The *housing stock* ~~planned residential densities~~ within Area 69 within the South Hillsboro Community Planning Area shall be consistent with those established by HCP Section 3, Housing.

Planning staff will pursue implementing in the South Hillsboro Community Plan a policy that will request and encourage the delivery of one-level and two-level housing units that are capable of meeting accessibility requirements.

**IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

**Planning Commission Comment #10:** Does moving the South Hillsboro HCP and ZOA Ordinance Amendments forward imply approval of the overall South Hillsboro Community Plan?

**Staff Response:**

Area 69 and Area 71 are functionally integrated in a way that would be very difficult to separate those two areas within the UGB from the entire South Hillsboro planning area. Historically the City has felt that this was a way to approach these awkward pieces that were brought into the UGB. Although the South Hillsboro Community Plan cannot be adopted unless the larger area is added to the UGB and may be revised during a future adoption process, its inclusion as findings for the proposed HCPs and ZOA will constitute an endorsement of the concepts in the Plan.

**Planning Commission Comment #11:** Has Metro provided feedback on the South Hillsboro Community Plan?

**Staff Response:**

A Metro representative is a standing project TAC member and has participated in all TAC meetings. Metro staff provided comments to City staff via email on February 19, 2008. Comments made were either formatting issues or clarifying the Urban Reserve process language. Those amendments as cited will be made to the South Hillsboro Community Plan document.

**Planning Commission Comment #12:** What will happen if the HCP and ZOA Ordinance Amendments are not adopted?

**Staff Response:**

There are three reasons to move forward: 1) the City has entered into an IGA with Metro to concept plan Area 69 and Area 71 and is receiving funds through the construction excise tax grant to do so; 2) If the City does not plan for areas already brought into the UGB the chances of the inclusion of more land into the UGB for industrial or housing purposes decreases; and 3) improve the City's jobs/housing balance. The City has approximately 800 acres of industrial land recently concept planned, Helvetia and Evergreen. Right now the City does not have much residential land left therefore it is prudent for the City to plan for this residential area to increase housing opportunities in Hillsboro given the large amount of industrial land to the north of the City. It is a policy choice in addition to fulfilling a grant obligation that the City signed on for through the signing of the IGA with Metro.

**Planning Commission Comment #13:** Is there a precedent on how City and County governance issues are typically resolved? Could issues of governance flare up anytime soon?

**Staff Response:** Two Washington County representatives are standing project TAC members and have participated in all TAC meetings. Planning staff have maintained throughout the South Hillsboro planning process that the City of Hillsboro should be the one to concept plan South Hillsboro both the County and Metro agreed. The City has not yet entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Washington County but expects to shortly which will formally assign concept planning responsibility for the entire 2,330 acre project area to Hillsboro. The MOU contemplates future annexation of the entire 2,330 acres to the city over the coming years.

**Planning Commission Comment #14:** Where is Hillsboro Parks & Recreation at the present in terms of park land acquisition and development?

**Staff Response:** The Parks & Recreation Department is currently updating their Parks Master Plan which will determine the general need for parks in the Community Plan Study Area.

In addition staff proposes that parks be designated as an open oval to show the underlying comprehensive plan designation on the South Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan map. Park locations shown on the South Hillsboro Community plan map are generalized locations for park sites and may be modified during plan implementation as detailed development plans are prepared and reviewed and the Parks and Recreation Department considers alternative sites during site acquisition. The Parks Master Plan will determine the general need for parks and recreation facilities in the South Hillsboro planning area.

**Planning Commission Comment #15:** How will Area 69 be serviced with sanitary sewer?

**Staff Response:**

The Clean Water Services “Aloha Pump Station” on SW 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue near SW Stoddard Drive and the Cross Creek Pump Station further south on SW 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue near SW Murphy Lane can serve Area 69 of the South Hillsboro planning area.

**Planning Commission Comment #16:** What is the back up plan if a water line cannot be placed on land between Area 71 and Area 69?

**Staff Response:** If a backup plan becomes necessary, the Water Department would look at finding a feasible route along TV Highway and down SW 209<sup>th</sup> Avenue. However, the City believes this approach will not be viable due to potentially difficult utility conflicts, as well as issues with obtaining required access from ODOT and the railroad. City staff is continuing to investigate these issues. The Water Department assumes that the current plan is the most efficient way to get Hillsboro Water to the areas, and we will negotiate approval from Washington County as this development proceeds.

Washington County staff has been involved in the South Hillsboro Community Planning process throughout the project and many of their comments submitted to date have been addressed. However, several issues remain unresolved. Given that planning jurisdiction for these areas has not yet been transferred to the City, the county is committed to partnering with the city to resolve issues in Areas 69 and 71. Planning staff anticipates that the County will submit a letter with comments regarding: 1) service provider issues, 2) restrictions on annexation in Area 69, 3) timing of transportation planning rule (TPR) findings, 4) specific transportation improvements and funding of improvements for Areas 69 and 71. Staff will forward the letter once received.

**ANNEXATION**

Prior to their annexation to the City and the concurrent application of the corresponding zones to properties within Area 69 and Area 71 in the South Hillsboro Community Planning Area, properties and land uses within both Areas shall continue to be governed by the existing Washington County zoning of the properties. Annexation of Area properties to the city shall take place in accordance with current City annexation policies and the Metro Boundary Change Code.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission open the hearing and receive any testimony on HCP 3-08, HCP 5-08, and ZOA 2-08. Following receipt of public testimony, if any, if no outstanding issues are raised, the hearing can be closed. Should the Commission decide, based on all information and evidence presented in

technical reports, findings of fact, staff reports, and public comment, to approve the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments, staff will come back to the May 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting with draft resolutions HCP 3-08, HCP 5-08, and ZOA 2-08 recommending City Council approval of the amendments. Procedurally, HCP 3-08 and HCP 5-08 should be considered and acted upon first.

Staff respectfully requests that Commissioners retain all materials attached to the staff report and the South Hillsboro Community Plan document, dated February 22, 2008 and bring them to the April 29<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

CITY OF HILLSBORO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Karla Antonini, AICP  
Urban Planner III

Attachments: South Hillsboro Community Plan map  
Initiating Resolution Nos. 1658-P, 1659-P, and 1660-P by the Planning Commission of proposed amendments in HCP 3-08, HCP 5-08, and ZOA 2-08.  
South Hillsboro Infrastructure Funding Review, February 14, 2008  
The Draft Infrastructure Financing Strategy, dated April 16, 2008  
Draft Year 2013 Area 69 & 71 Transportation Evaluation (April 21, 2008)  
2030No-Build Scenario Preliminary Transportation Evaluation (Dec. 15, 2007)  
2030Build Scenario Preliminary Transportation Evaluation (Dec. 24, 2007)  
Staff Report Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Compliance for Area 69 and Area 71 Urban Growth Boundary Expansions (April 19, 2008)