

**Date** 10 May 2017

**To** King City URA Project Management Team

**From** Marcy McInelly, AIA, Urbsworks, Inc., and Keith Liden, King City Planner

**KING CITY URBAN RESERVE AREA 6D CONCEPT PLAN PROJECT**

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #3 – Summary Notes**

On Tuesday, May 8<sup>th</sup>, the third SAC Meeting for the URA project was held at King City City Hall (15300 SW 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue, King City).

The following 16 people attended:

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Members**

Janet Black (Deane Black attended on behalf of), Rivermeade property owner

Mike O’Halloran, area property owner

Ruby Buchholtz, Tualatin Riverkeepers

Dave Robinson, Rivermeade property owner

Kathy Stallkamp, CPO 4K

Tom Hartz, Friends of Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge

Dick Werth, Rivermeade property owner

Jamie Morgan-Stasny (John O’Neil attended on behalf of), area property owner

Kyle Grant (SAC member not present)

**City of King City Staff**

Keith Liden, Planner

**Consultant Team**

Marcy McInelly, Urbsworks, Inc.

**City Council**

Gretchen Buehner

John Boylston

Chi Nguyen-Ventura

**Other attendees:** Charlene Bankston, Carla Bankston, Jeff Roberts, Zach Pelz,

**Agenda**

Welcome
Introductions
Update on project, including the Charrette (including Q & A)
Discussion of Vision and Values
Discussion of the Charrette Concept Plan Alternatives (including Q & A)
Ways to collect feedback from the SAC and the community
Adjourn and next meetings /next steps

## Summary

### Update on the Project

Following introductions, Marcy McInelly gave an overview of the URA 6D planning process, what has been accomplished, and what remains to be completed. She indicated that there will be a King City Council briefing on the plan May 17<sup>th</sup>. She introduced the meeting materials (should attach copies).

### Draft Vision and Goals

Copies of the Draft Vision and goals were distributed to the attendees. The group was asked if the vision and goals needed any amendment or if they appeared to include all of the important issues. The group had several comments regarding the vision and goals:

- Overall financial feasibility was noted by several attendees (especially Tom Hartz, Dave Robinson and Dick Werth). Marcy responded that the consulting team and the TAC would be reviewing the plan alternatives and associated improvements necessary to support it. A high-level assessment of financial feasibility will be included in the analysis of the concept plan alternatives.
- Meyer's airstrip is not recognized in the vision and it probably should be because of the use itself and the effect the related airspace requirements may have on future development (Kathy Stallkamp).
- The "community goals" (as captured in the Community Feedback from Charrette handout) doesn't appear to be captured in the vision (Kathy Stallkamp).

### Charrette Concept Plan Alternatives

Marcy reviewed the frameworks for circulation, natural resources, and infrastructure. This followed by a review of Preliminary Alternatives 1 and 2.

Alternative 1 features higher density and mixed-use development to the west transitioning to lower density residential development to the east and south toward the Tualatin River. The land use designations and standards would be developed specifically for this area opposed to simply applying existing King City zone districts. Concerns and comments were expressed regarding:

- The capacity of Beef Bend Road to handle additional traffic (Dave Robinson and Dick Werth). Keith Liden replied that the proposed 3-lane cross section is considered to be adequate, while acknowledging access on and off Beef Bend Road was another issue.
- The southern east-west connecting street connection to Fischer Road was opposed by Dave Robinson as either a street or path. Dick Werth indicated that more access to the southern portion of Rivermeade was problematic, especially relating to the general public trying to use their private park facilities and boat ramp.
- The desirability of through traffic on Fischer was questioned by Kathy Stallkamp and Dick Werth. Gretchen Buhner suggested using Macbeth as an east-west connection.
- Keith Liden mentioned different approaches to street design on Beef Bend Road to make it more like an urban boulevard rather than a highway. This would require close coordination with and acceptance by Washington County. Local streets could be designed to promote internal circulation while discouraging cut-through traffic.

Alternative 2 envisions a very similar land use pattern east of 150<sup>th</sup> and allowing the eastern and Rivermeade areas to remain generally as they are today because all or much of it would not be brought

into the UGB. The southern east-west connection shown in Alternative 1 is deleted and the northern east-west connection terminates at 150<sup>th</sup>. Concerns and comments were expressed regarding:

- Tom Hartz asked about how the proposed city hall and related civic uses on the west end would be connected with the rest of the city, especially with Alternative 2.
- Dick Werth indicated that he understood several property owners along Elsner Road were opposed to the concept plan and future urbanization.
- Tom Hartz asked about how stormwater impacts from development north of Beef Bend Road would be addressed if there is no new development in the east side. It was acknowledged that this could be more difficult without development adjacent to the drainages, which would be required to contribute to their restoration.
- Ruby Buchholtz noted that there are often advantages to accommodating stormwater with larger scale improvements and facilities.
- Marcy indicated that a third alternative would be created, which is primarily a blend of Alternatives 1 and 2.

### **Collecting Additional Feedback**

A closing discussion about obtaining additional community input regarding the concept plan alternatives yielded the following comments:

An on-line survey was generally supported.

FAQ information would be very helpful and would help obtaining good survey results.

The SAC should be given the opportunity to review and comment on survey before it is released.

An open house would be useful if the purpose is to provide new and fresh information and plan alternatives.

### **Handouts**

- 17\_0508\_KC URA 6D\_SAC Members + Agenda\_public
- Community Feedback from Charrette (Excerpted pages from 17\_0504 KC URA 6D Charrette Report)
- Preliminary Vision and Goals\_Final Draft\_SAC.pdf
- UW King City URA 6D\_opening night\_Vision and Goals images.pdf
- UW King City URA 6D\_preliminary alternatives.pdf