



CIVIL LAND USE PLANNING SURVEY
P 503.643.8286 F 844.715.4743 www.pd-grp.com
9020 SW Washington Square Rd Suite 170
Portland, Oregon 97223

March 6, 2017

Wilsonville Planning Commission
City of Wilsonville
29799 SW Town Center Loop E.
Wilsonville, OR 97070

RE: Comments on Draft Frog Pond Master Plan and Development Code (3-1-17)
Pioneer Project No.: 338-001.

Chair Greenfield and Commissioners:

We appreciate the Commission's responsiveness to comments and concerns raised, to date, during the work sessions for the Frog Pond Area.

We have reviewed the 3-1-17 draft Plan and Code and provide the following comments:

DRAFT PLAN

1. Draft Plan, Page 64, Hammerhead Diagram.

This diagram is much less detailed as compared to the other cross-section diagrams, so we are not clear as to the minimum design standards intended for right-of-way, versus pavement, sidewalks, etc.

We are familiar with the 120 foot overall length for the hammerhead, and the typical 28 foot curb radius. But we do not understand the basis for the 29 foot dimension. Is this minimum pavement width? If so, 29 feet is an odd width, and seems excessive. Further, what about sidewalks and utilities, where do they go in relation to the 29 feet? We are accustomed to a 20 foot minimum pavement width, with sidewalks and utilities outside of the curbing, sometime within easements.

Since the diagram indicates final design will be determined by the City Engineer, we assume there is some reasonable level of flexibility.

2. Draft Plan, Page 101, Infrastructure Funding Plan.

We realize this Section is not complete at this point. However, we do remain concerned that the strategy for funding Boeckman Road improvements is not proportionally distributed.

We realize that the Commission does not typically address funding issues. However, since this Section is intended to be part of the overall Plan adoption, we

feel it is important to address our concerns at this point in the process, as equitable and proportional infrastructure funding will be an essential implementation element.

The draft strategy provides two alternatives for Boeckman Road improvements along frontage of the West Neighborhood.

1. Current Developer funded, without Reimbursement, estimated at \$15,619 per unit; or
2. Developer funded, with Reimbursement, distributed to all units within the West Neighborhood, estimated at \$3,524 per unit.

There is also a Supplemental SDC proposed for funding the Boeckman Bridge, estimated at \$1,610-\$2.254 per unit.

This amount is based on the proportional traffic volumes projected for the West Neighborhood compared to total volumes projected for Boeckman Road. The residential portion of the West Neighborhood is projected to generate only 9.18% of total ADT, with an additional 5.06% for the school property, or 14.34% combined.

The current base Street SDC is \$7,695.

We agree with the proportional Supplemental fee for the bridge, as it is proportional to the projected impacts of planned neighborhood development.

However, we are concerned that the frontage improvements (both alternatives) are not appropriately proportional to direct impacts of the planned residential development. There are two issues of concern with regards to the frontage improvements.

1. First, we submit that the same proportional traffic volume compared to total projected ADT should be applied along the neighborhood frontage as it is being applied for the bridge. And, that these cost need to be proportionately spread across the entire neighborhood, not just imposed on the properties fronting Boeckman Road, as addressed in the #2 Reimbursement option above.

The traffic to be generated from the West Neighborhood does not magically change once the bridge is crossed. The proportional 9.18% impact remains the same along the entire length of the street.

This is particularly an issue for the lots that will front on the road. These frontage lots will generate an even lower percentage of the total ADT projected, and therefore should not be responsible for the full

cost of the frontage improvements. It is not reasonable nor equitable for this limited number of lots to be burdened with an additional \$15,619 per unit more than other properties in the neighborhood.

Therefore, at a minimum these costs need to be spread across the entire West Neighborhood, as in the #2 Reimbursement Option above. However, because the entire neighborhood will only generate 14.34% of the total traffic, they should only be responsible for that proportion of the cost of the improvements.

2. Second, with the proposed Boeckman Road cross-section design, except for the provision of a center turn lane and the bike lane, the identified improvements do not essential add any significant traffic capacity. Boeckman Road is currently a two lane street. The future design simply adds a center turn lane and bike lane within the paved section.

All of the other improvements are predominantly aesthetic in nature, including the 10 foot PUE/Landscaped Buffer, and brick wall. These beautification measures will not provide any significant direct benefit to the abutting lots. But more importantly they are in no way directly associated with the traffic impacts to be generated by neighborhood development.

We view these beautification measures as benefitting the general public rather than the abutting and/or neighborhood properties. Therefore these improvements should be funded by the general public and not just the abutting properties fronting on Boeckman Road. This general public funding could be met in part by allocation of the standard SDC to that portion of the improvements.

The frontage design includes a 10 foot wide landscaped buffer, which will also serve as a public utilities easement, plus a decorative brick wall. We estimate these design improvements will cost in the range of \$300 to 400 per linear foot.

The Wolfston property has 1,450 feet of frontage on Boeckman Road. This puts the cost at \$435,000 to 580,000, just for the aesthetic improvements, which have no direct relationship to the traffic impacts of the pending development.

Again, we emphasize these improvements add no traffic capacity, and have not direct nexus to the traffic impacts to be generated. Therefore it is not equitable for these frontage properties to be burdened with such as cost that benefits the greater community.

At a minimum these aesthetic improvements need to be spread proportionately to all units planned for the West Neighborhood. However, because there is a general public benefit to these purely aesthetic improvements we believe funding should be spread citywide.

The typical road widening, including the turn lane and bike path, can be appropriately addressed as a creditable element of the frontage improvements based on the City's current SDC credit provisions, except for the concerns over proportionality when considering total ADT.

But, we do believe the non-capacity design elements are appropriately and proportionally being assigned.

(Maybe these costs should be added to the bridge package rather than attached to the required frontage improvements.)

Additionally, the reality is that the properties fronting on Boeckman Road will most likely be the first to develop.

This means, under the current and proposed strategies these initial developments will be forced to front costs, with the possibility for a Reimbursement District.

But even with a Reimbursement District the total cost of frontage improvements will be an unreasonable financial burden, which places the developers in the inappropriate role of being project bankers for future developers. And, given the 10 year limit on reimbursements, there is no guarantee the money fronted will actually be recovered.

If the frontage improvements are to be required up front as development occurs, this will most likely seriously delay or maybe even eliminate any short term development.

Consequently, our basic concern is that the current draft funding package may not be financially feasible.

DRAFT CODE

3. Draft Code, Page 9, (.08).B.2. Open Space, Small Lots

We appreciate the revisions to allow consideration of local accessibility to other open and/or recreational spaces as a waiver to the 10% open space requirement for small lot developments. The revised language allows for meeting this requirement in a variety of alternative ways.

4. Draft Code, Page 24, Section 4.1279(.15)F. requires 10% of Small Lot developments of 10+ acres to be Duplexes and/or Attached SF.

However, there is no minimum lot standard f specified or duplexes? We assume attached SF would still be the 4-6,000 sq. ft. lots. Is it the intent for duplexes to be also provided on the same sized lots, at 4-6,000 square feet?

Thank you for your consideration of our input.

Sincerely,
Pioneer Design Group, Inc.

Ben Altman

Cc: Jim Wolfston