

MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT NUMBER: 2150495.00 ISSUE DATE: November 1, 2017
PROJECT NAME: Woodmont Natural Park

RECORDED BY: Brad Theurer, Project Manager
TO: FILE
PRESENT: Ivan Anderholm (Parks and Rec.), Bruce Powers, (Parks and Rec.) Jessica Numanoglu (Planning), Todd Knepper (Engineering), – City of Lake Oswego
Noah Herlocker (Consulting Ecologist) – AECOM
Brad Theurer, Steven Tuttle, Matt Butts, Brian Varricchione – Mackenzie

SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes #07 – Pre-Application Conference (October 26, 2017, 1:15 pm)

ACTION ITEMS

1. None at this time.

UNRESOLVED ITEMS

1. None at this time.

RESOLVED ITEMS

1. None at this time.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Pre-Application Conference Case File # - PA 17-0081, 13600 Atwater Lane, Design Review and RP Resource Enhancement for Woodmont Park, Staff Coordinator Debra Andreades, Senior Planner.
2. Process: LOC 50.07.003 It was stated by Jessica Numanoglu that this type of application submittal review is good for a 3-year period.
3. The Master Plan did not go through the City's formal master plan approval process so development review (but no conditional use) is required. The City is not requiring a formal neighborhood meeting and current indications suggest that the project would be reviewed at the staff level. If a major variance is needed or if there are a lot of objections from the public, then the application would require a hearing by the Development Review Commission.

The following are information items that will be needed for the application process (no action required at this time):

- A. The plans need to show the boundaries of the delineated resource protection area. The land use application needs to include a mitigation plan and report prepared by a natural resource specialist.
- B. A surveyor will need to prepare an existing conditions plan.
- C. The discussion in the Planning notes regarding having the restroom complement nearby buildings “of good design” may not be applicable since there are no other non-residential buildings nearby. Nonetheless, we should send a draft restroom elevation to Debra Andreades in the Planning Department for comment. Restroom design for this park will help to set the standard for hybrid park structures.
- D. The City may accept a photographic materials board instead of physical samples (confirm with Debra).
- E. A parking study is required for the land use application. Parking is normally needed to be provided on site, but in this case the deed disallows an impervious lot on site. Jessica Numanoglu will research whether the project will need to request a major variance to only have off-site parking or if it can be portrayed as continuing the existing nonconforming situation.
- F. **(10/31/2017)** via email from Jessica Numanoglu: “The Parking standard (LOC 50.06.002) requires a certain amount of on-site parking spaces for uses specified in the parking table. Parks are not specified in the parking table and you indicated that you did a parking study, which determined that 11 spaces were needed for the use. The question was whether the proposed minor park improvements (soft surface pathways, wetland restoration, and a restroom) would increase the parking requirement on the site and if so, a Major Variance to the on-site parking requirement would be needed because the parking spaces are proposed in the right-of-way.
The park is an existing use, so one argument could be that you conducted a parking study to determine the parking needed for the existing park (11 spaces), that there are 11 or more informal parking spaces used by visitors around the park now, and although the proposed improvements don’t generate a new parking need, the proposal is to consolidate those spaces in one area along the right-of-way for convenience. Alternatively, if there are fewer than 11 spaces around the site, you could state that the existing park is nonconforming with regards to parking because you determined by your parking study that 11 spaces are needed for the existing park and there are not currently 11 spaces either on or off-site; the proposal would not increase the degree of nonconformity because the minor improvements proposed do not generate a new parking need and the new parking in the right-of-way would alleviate the lack of parking for the existing park.”
- G. The project will need tree removal permits. Different types of permits apply depending on whether the trees are invasive, dead, hazardous, or being removed for development or landscaping. Land Use Review only requires type 2 trees being removed to be shown on LUR plans.
- H. Jessica will investigate whether the land use application may be eligible for a reduced fee due to the small size of the restroom. Application fees under development review were projected at \$5,017.00 + 37% of building permit fee. However, Jessica will explore a section of the building code that covers structures less than 300 sf. If the proposed restrooms foot

print is 300 sf. or less the fees may drop to \$1,600 + a percentage of the building permit fee.

- I. **(10/31/2017)** via email from Jessica Numanoglu: “The fee in the pre-app notes is stated to be \$5017 + 37% of the building permit fee. Since the proposed application consists of minor site improvements and a restroom building that is less than 300 sq. ft. in size, no CUP is required, and the application will be processed administratively, we have determined that the lower Minor Development fee for “Alterations with minimal impacts...and accessory structures 300 sq. t. or less” should apply instead of the Development Review fee. That fee is \$1662. All other fees (records retention, Fire Marshal) listed in the pre-app notes would apply. Please note that fees change on Jan 1, 2018, so please check with Planning for updated fees if applying after Jan 1.”
 - J. Parks staff can request that City GIS staff prepare the map and mailing labels required for public notice.
 - K. Hillside Protection: Provide a Slope Analysis that includes area of slope hazard/effected if it effects less than 30% typically no issues are triggered.
4. Atwater Road is under Clackamas County jurisdiction. The County did not object to the proposed on-street parking.
 5. Neither the City nor the County is requiring half-street improvements since there is no change in the use. Similarly, no new street lights are required.
 6. A public sewer extension would be required, and the restroom would require a private sewer pump to discharge to the public main.
 7. Todd Knepper will discuss the project with Brown & Caldwell (the City’s storm water consultant) regarding storm water management. A storm report is required with the land use application.
 8. AASHTO sight distance evaluation is not required since the park will not have on-site parking or a driveway. Sidewalks are also not required.
 9. It is acceptable for pathways and other park uses to utilize Atwater Lane and the street does not need to be vacated. There are 2 public water mains in Atwater Lane. No excavation is permitted over these lines. Trees shall not be planted within 15’ of these lines.
 10. The project will need bicycle parking. Bike racks are acceptable within the Atwater Lane right-of-way.
 11. Fences at neighboring properties are considered a structure and therefore prohibited by the deed.
 12. Setbacks only apply to the restroom structure, not to other elements of the park. Fire Department review will NOT be required for this land use case when the formal application is submitted if the proposal is substantially similar to the development as presented in the pre-application materials.
 13. City Engineering is ok with the addition of soil/cover over the existing onsite utilities located within Atwater right-of-way and requested that any further coordination occur with Joel Kuhnke.
 14. City informed the group that the pavers installed at the southwest corner of the site within the right-of-way will need to be removed since these were never officially approved by the City.
 15. Coordination with PG&E to provide future power to restroom interior will need to occur.

16. Existing tree protection (e.g., fencing) should be coordinated with Bill Youngblood prior to construction.

Every effort has been made to accurately record this meeting. If any errors or omissions are noted, please provide written response within five days of receipt.

Enclosure(s): Handouts from Pre-Application Conference

c: Present
Dina Balogh – City of Lake Oswego, Parks and Recreation